

*In
the Name
of
Peace*

Collective Statements of the
United States Catholic Bishops on
War and Peace, 1919-1980



Publication No. 861
Office of Publishing Services
United States Catholic Conference
1312 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005



National Conference of Catholic Bishops
United States Catholic Conference

In order to provide background on what the bishops have said in the twentieth century about peace and disarmament issues, the United States Catholic Conference is issuing *In the Name of Peace: Collective Statements of the United States Catholic Bishops on War and Peace, 1919-1980*. This document was initiated by the Office of Publishing Services with the assistance of Dr. David Byers and Reverend J. Bryan Hehir, Director of the Department of International Justice and Peace, and is authorized for publication by the undersigned.

December 8, 1982

Monsignor Daniel F. Hoye
General Secretary, NCCB/USCC

"The Just-War Ethic and Catholic Theology: Dynamics of Change and Continuity" by J. Bryan Hehir is taken from *War or Peace? The Search for New Answers*, edited by Thomas A. Shannon, copyright © 1980 Orbis Books, Maryknoll, New York, used with permission.

© Copyright 1983
United States Catholic Conference
1312 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
All rights reserved.

Contents

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Introduction | 1 |
| Pastoral Letter, "Lessons of War" September, 1919 | 3 |
| Victory and Peace, Selections November 14, 1942 | 7 |
| International Order November 16, 1944 | 11 |
| Freedom and Peace November 19, 1959 | 17 |
| Peace and Vietnam November 18, 1966 | 25 |
| Resolution on Peace November 16, 1967 | 31 |
| Human Life in Our Day, Chapter II, "The Family of Nations" November 15, 1968 | 33 |
| Human Solidarity April, 1970 | 47 |
| Declaration on Conscientious Objection and Selective Conscientious Objection October 21, 1971 | 53 |
| Resolution on Southeast Asia November, 1971 | 59 |
| To Live in Christ Jesus, "The Community of Nations" November 11, 1976 | 63 |
| The Gospel of Peace and the Danger of War February 15, 1978 | 69 |
| SALT II: A Statement of Support September 6, 1979 | 73 |
| Statement on Registration and Conscription for Military Service February 14, 1980 | 83 |
| Appendix: The Just-War Ethic and Catholic Theology: Dynamics of Change and Continuity J. Bryan Hehir | 87 |

INTRODUCTION

The fourteen selections that follow will give the reader an overview of the collective positions the American hierarchy has taken on war-making and peace-keeping in the twentieth century. We have tried to be representative, not comprehensive. While covering every issue of substance the bishops have addressed, we make no effort to reproduce their every word. Statements that merely repeat material found elsewhere have been omitted.

The purpose of this book is to make the bishops' teaching available in convenient form. Ten of the selections represent complete statements. The other four are self-contained sections of longer works that deal with a variety of topics. We offer no interpretation. For ease of use, however, we have provided a prefatory note for every text. These notes underline the selections' sequential character by giving a few lines of historical background. They also summarize the principal points each text makes.

Despite its selectivity, the book contains most of what the bishops have written on war and peace. While the two world wars naturally focused the hierarchy's attention on this issue, they were the only occasions that did so during the first sixty years of the century. Absent actual fighting, the bishops showed more interest in the domestic scene than in international relations.

It is only in the last two decades that war and peace has become one of the American hierarchy's central public policy concerns. Several developments are responsible for this new emphasis. Participation in the Second Vatican Council fostered the growth of an international perspective among the bishops. Vietnam dragged relentlessly on, with combat in remote jungles and turmoil at home. The unrelieved cold war made hot war an ever-present possibility. Finally, the perfection of thermonuclear weapons and their delivery systems raised grisly prospects of a world aflame and dying.

The statements are an exercise of the teaching office. Through them, the bishops meet their weighty responsibility to help Catholics form their consciences in the nuclear age. At the same time, the statements place the Church in the public forum, making her "a moral voice placing restraints on war, a prophetic voice calling for peace and a prayerful community which has the courage to work for peace" (*The Gospel of Peace and the Danger of War*, 1978).

Pastoral Letter, "Lessons of War"

September, 1919

A few months after World War I ended in Europe, the American bishops issued their first pastoral statement since 1884. This lengthy document opened the record for the twentieth century in terms of perspective as well as time. By treating a wide range of foreign and domestic topics, the bishops signalled their acceptance of a new role as spiritual leaders in a great world power.

Inevitably, one of the subjects that claimed the hierarchy's attention was the Great War and the exhausted peace the armistice had brought. The pastoral letter comments briefly on the costs of the war: the physical and spiritual suffering and, more importantly, the moral wrong. "For we may not forget that in all this strife of the peoples, in the loosening of passion and the seeking of hate, sin abounded."

The bishops see value in America's involvement in the conflict: "a great nation, conscious of power yet wholly given to peace and unskilled in the making of war, gathered its might and put forth its strength in behalf of freedom and right as the inalienable endowment of all mankind." However, they recall Pope Benedict XV's prediction that the American people are "destined to have the chief role in the restoration of peace and order." This, they conclude, is a "glorious destiny, far more in keeping with the aims of our people than the triumph of armies or the conquest of wider domain. Nor is it an impossible destiny, provided we exemplify in our own national life 'the principles of reasonable liberty and of Christian civilization.'" While war, with all its horrors, may be fought to preserve fundamental values, the pursuit of peace is a higher good.

In order that our undertakings may be wisely selected and prudently carried on, we should consider seriously the lessons of the War, the nature of our present situation and the principles which must guide the adjustment of all our relations.

Our estimate of the War begins, naturally, with the obvious facts: with the number of peoples involved, the vastness and effectiveness of their armaments, the outlay in treasure and toil, the destruction of life and the consequent desolation which still lies heavy on the nations of Europe. Besides these visible aspects, we know somewhat of the spiritual suffering—of the sorrow and hopelessness which have stricken

the souls of men. And deeper than these, beyond our power of estimation, is the moral evil, the wrong whose magnitude only the Searcher of hearts can determine.

For we may not forget that in all this strife of the peoples, in the loosening of passion and the seeking of hate, sin abounded. Not the rights of man alone but the law of God was openly disregarded. And if we come before Him now in thankfulness, we must come with contrite hearts, in all humility beseeching Him that He continue His mercies toward us, and enable us so to order our human relations that we may atone for our past transgressions and strengthen the bond of peace with a deeper charity for our fellowmen and purer devotion to His service.

We owe it to His goodness that our country has been spared the suffering and desolation which war has spread so widely. Our homes, our natural resources, our means of intercourse and the institutions which uphold the life of our nation, have all been preserved. We are free, without let or hindrance, to go forward in the paths of industry, of culture, of social improvement and moral reform. The sense of opportunity has quickened us, and we turn with eagerness to a future that offers us boundless advantage.

Let us not turn hastily. Our recent experience has taught us innumerable lessons, too full and profound to be mastered at once. Their ultimate meaning a later generation will ponder and comprehend. But even now we can recognize the import of this conspicuous fact: a great nation conscious of power yet wholly given to peace and unskilled in the making of war, gathered its might and put forth its strength in behalf of freedom and right as the inalienable endowment of all mankind. When its aims were accomplished, it laid down its arms, without gain or acquisition, save in the clearer understanding of its own ideals and the fuller appreciation of the blessings which freedom alone can bestow.

The Costliness of War

The achievement was costly. It meant interruption of peaceful pursuits, hardship at home and danger abroad. Not one class or state or section, but the people as a whole had to take up the burden. This spirit of union and sacrifice for the common weal, found its highest expression in the men and women who went to do service in distant lands. To them, and especially to those who died that America might live, we are forever indebted. Their triumph over self is the real victory, their loyalty the real honor of our nation, their fidelity to duty the bulwark of our freedom.

To such men and their memory, eulogy is at best a poor tribute. We shall not render them their due nor show ourselves worthy to

name them as our own, unless we inherit their spirit and make it the soul of our national life. The very monuments we raise in their honor will become a reproach to us, if we fail in those things of which they have left us such splendid example.

The Present Situation

We entered the War with the highest of objects, proclaiming at every step that we battled for the right and pointing to our country as a model for the world's imitation. We accepted therewith the responsibility of leadership in accomplishing the task that lies before mankind. The world awaits our fulfilment. Pope Benedict himself has declared that our people, "retaining a most firm hold on the principles of reasonable liberty and of Christian civilization, are destined to have the chief role in the restoration of peace and order on the basis of those same principles, when the violence of these tempestuous days shall have passed."⁶⁵

This beyond doubt is a glorious destiny, far more in keeping with the aims of our people than the triumph of armies or the conquest of wider domain. Nor is it an impossible destiny, provided we exemplify in our own national life "the principles of reasonable liberty and of Christian civilization."

65. Letter to the Hierarchy, April 10, 1919.

*Victory and
Peace,
Selections*

November 14, 1942

The bishops addressed the subject of war and peace several times during World War II. Despite its optimistic title, the first of these statements came at a bleak hour for America and her allies. A Pacific counterattack had been launched on Guadalcanal in August and the invasion of North Africa was under way, but the tide of battle still ran with the Axis.

As in 1919, the bishops strongly defend U.S. participation in the war. "While war is the last means to which a nation should resort, circumstances arise when it is impossible to avoid it. At times it is the positive duty of a nation to wage war in the defense of life and right." Catholics are urged to work and pray for a peace that will come "through the victory of our armed forces."

Although their immediate concern is winning the war, the bishops place great stress on the peace that will follow. This peace, they insist, cannot be achieved by secularism or exploitation or totalitarianism. Rather, "the Spirit of Christianity can write a real and lasting peace in justice and charity to all nations. . . ."

Our country has been forced into the most devastating war of all time. This war, which is the absorbing interest of all the world, involves unquestionably the most important moral issue of today. Some nations are united in waging war to bring about a slave world—a world that would deprive man of his divinely conferred dignity, reject human freedom, and permit no religious liberty. We are associated with other powers in a deadly conflict against these nations to maintain a free world. This conflict of principles makes compromise impossible.

Justice of Present War

While war is the last means to which a nation should resort, circumstances arise when it is impossible to avoid it. At times it is the positive duty of a nation to wage war in the defense of life and right. Our country now finds itself in such circumstances.

Even while we meet here, the exigencies of war have driven our armed forces into unexpected areas of conflict in Africa. Our President, in letters addressed to the rulers of all the friendly nations concerned,

has given solemn assurance that the United States has no designs of permanent conquest or sordid interest. Our aim, he pledged, is to guarantee to countries under temporary occupation as well as to our own the right to live in security and peace. We bishops are confident that the pledge of our Chief Executive, not lightly made, faithfully mirrors the mind and conscience of the American people. That pledge is in full harmony with the expression of high purpose which the President made to the Catholic bishops of the United States when our own country was plunged into war: "We shall win this war and in victory we shall seek not vengeance but the establishment of an international order in which the spirit of Christ shall rule the hearts of men and nations" (See Doc. 77b.).

From the moment that our country declared war we have called upon our people to make the sacrifices which, in Catholic doctrine, the virtues of patriotism, justice, and charity impose. In every section of this nation the voices of our bishops have been heard. Their instructions, their pastorals, their counsels, their appeals for prayers are an encouragement and an inspiration to their flocks. Our priests as chaplains on the war front have inspired confidence in the men whom they so zealously serve. Our men in the armed forces deserve unstinted gratitude for their heroic services to our country and high commendation for the faithful practice of their religion.

Prayers for Victory

In every diocese prayers have been incessantly offered, asking God's pardon for the sins of individuals and nations, begging divine mercy for all, pleading for a victory which will have the sanction of infinite justice and for an enduring peace founded on the love of God and the love of all men. Priests and people have earnestly prayed that the Holy Spirit may guide our President and all who share with him the heavy responsibilities of directing the war efforts and of winning the victory from which all peoples will derive a just and lasting peace.

In the discharge of our pastoral responsibility, we are gravely concerned about the world peace of tomorrow.

Secularism cannot write a real and lasting peace. Its narrow vision does not encompass the whole man, it cannot evaluate the spirituality of the human soul and the supreme good of all mankind.

Exploitation cannot write a real and lasting peace. Where greedy might and selfish expediency are made the substitutes of justice there can be no securely ordered world.

Totalitarianism, whether Nazi, Communist, or Fascist, cannot write a real and lasting peace. The State that usurps total powers, by that very fact, becomes a despot to its own people and a menace to the family of nations.

The Spirit of Christianity can write a real and lasting peace in justice and charity to all nations, even to those not Christian.

In the epochal revolution through which the world is passing, it is very necessary for us to realize that every man is our brother in Christ. All should be convinced that every man is endowed with the dignity of human personality, and that he is entitled by the laws of nature to the things necessary to sustain life in a way conformable to human dignity. In the postwar world, the profit element of industry and commerce must be made subservient to the common good of communities and nations if we are to have a lasting peace with justice and a sense of true brotherhood of all our neighbors. The inequalities of nations and of individuals can never give to governments or to the leaders of industry or commerce a right to be unjust. They cannot, if they follow the fixed principles of morality, maintain or encourage conditions under which men cannot live according to standards befitting human personality.

Unfortunately, in our day we must wage a global war to secure peace. War is abnormal and necessarily brings on abnormal conditions in the life of a nation.

During the war crisis free men must surrender many of their liberties. We ask our people to be united and prepared to make every sacrifice which our government deems necessary for a just and enduring peace through the victory of our armed forces. We are confident that they will perform their wartime duties gladly because they know that our country has been the defender, not the destroyer, of liberties and has in the past always re-established the full measure of peacetime freedom on the conclusion of hostilities.

International Order

November 16, 1944

"We have met the challenge of war. Shall we meet the challenge of peace?" The opening words of the American bishops' pastoral letter for 1944 reflect their country's success on the battlefield. By November, the strength of the Third Reich was drained. The defeat of Japan, though not imminent, seemed inevitable. As a result, the bishops could look beyond victory and concern themselves with the postwar world.

Early negotiations for the establishment of the United Nations provided the occasion for their remarks. The bishops begin with the general observation that peace depends on principle. "If we are to have a just and lasting peace, it must be the creation of a sane realism, which has a clear vision of the moral law, a reverent acknowledgment of God its Author, and a recognition of the oneness of the human race underlying all national distinctions." Then, narrowing their focus, they point out that God has ordained that nations be interdependent. "It is not, therefore, a question of creating an international community, but of organizing it."

The pastoral reviews some of the qualities and powers that the successor to the League of Nations should have. It must promote international security and adopt "common policies for the solution of common economic, social, and other humanitarian problems." The strong nations must help the weak. The new organization should include a world court for the peaceful settlement of disputes; it should also have the military capability to punish "outlaw nations." Finally, all its member states must respect the basic human rights of their own citizens. "Surely our generation knows that tyranny in any nation menaces world peace."

The bishops conclude with a bright vision of the future. "It is a Christian hope we want to realize, the hope of a world at peace, a world of sovereign states cooperating in assuring all men the full enjoyment of their rights, a world of free men and free nations with their freedom secured under law." The international order should embody the ideas for which the war was fought.

We have met the challenge of war. Shall we meet the challenge of peace? This is the question uppermost in the minds of men everywhere

who in suffering and hardship have stood out against ruthless aggression. The men of our armed forces, the masses of our citizens, our leaders, all want to be true to our heroes who have given so much, some even their lives, in this war for freedom. They want to be true, as well, to future generations on whom we have been forced to place a heavy burden as the price for their freedoms. Honestly, earnestly we want to garner from the sacrifices, hardships, and losses which have gone into this war, the full fruits of victory, in a good peace. The foremost problem in postwar planning is how to secure for ourselves and all the world a just and lasting peace.

Recently representatives of the United States, the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union, and China at Dumbarton Oaks formulated and presented to their governments broad tentative proposals for an international organization for "the maintenance of peace and security and the creation of conditions which make for peace." These proposals have been given to the public for full study and discussion by peoples of all countries. Our own Secretary of State has expressed the hope that leaders of our national thought and opinion will discuss them in the spirit of constructive effort.

Freedom from Hatred, Greed

Public opinion in our country can exert a tremendous influence in making the peace and determining the manner of international collaboration for its maintenance. If public opinion is indifferent or uninformed, we shall run the risk of a bad peace and perhaps return to the tragedy of "power politics," which in the past divided nations and sowed the seeds of war. If public opinion is alert and informed, we can have a lasting peace and security. It is imperative that all our citizens recognize their responsibility in the making and maintenance of the peace. They must inform themselves on the issues and form their judgments in the light of sound reason and our Christian democratic traditions. They must free themselves from hatred, from distrust, and from the spirit of mere expediency, from national greed, and from indifference to right in the use of might, and they must form their judgments on the basis of stern objective realities.

This war came largely from bad education. It was not brought on by primitives or unlettered peoples. The contemporary philosophy which asserts the right of aggression is the creation of scholars. Discarding moral principles and crowding God out of human life, scholars produced the monstrous philosophies which, embodied in political and social systems, enslave human reason and destroy the consciousness of innate human rights and duties. In these systems the notion of the common good is utterly distorted; it is no longer conceived as the consequence of the common enjoyment of rights and the common

discharge of duties, but the creation of the caprice of a dictator or a group or a party. The gilded dreams of a new era, which these systems heralded, have proved to be a hideous nightmare. If we are to have a just and lasting peace, it must be the creation of a sane realism, which has a clear vision of the moral law, a reverent acknowledgement of God its Author, and a recognition of the oneness of the human race underlying all national distinctions.

Atlantic Charter, without Equivocations

We have no confidence in a peace which does not carry into effect, without reservations or equivocations, the principles of the Atlantic Charter. We feel, too, that it should provide assistance for prostrate nations in reconstructing their economic, social, and political institutions. If justice is compromised, if unreasonable concessions are made to might, grievances will rankle in the bosom of aggrieved nations to endanger the peace of the world. If prostrate nations are not assisted in giving to their people fair economic opportunities, they will become the arena of civil strife and turmoil. No international organization will be able to maintain a peace which is unfair and unjust.

There is an international community of nations. God Himself has made the nations interdependent for their full life and growth. It is not, therefore, a question of creating an international community but of organizing it. To do this we must repudiate absolutely the tragic fallacies of "power politics" with its balance of power, spheres of influence in a system of puppet governments, and the resort to war as a means of settling international difficulties.

Might Must Yield to Law

After the last world war an attempt was made to organize the international community. It failed not because its objective was mistaken but because of inherent defects in its charter and more especially perhaps because the nations were not disposed to recognize their duty to work together for the common good of the world. International law must govern international relations. Might must be subordinated to law. An international institution, based on the recognition of an objective moral obligation and not on the binding force of covenant alone, is needed for the preservation of a just peace and the promotion of international cooperation for the common good of the international community. The common good of every nation is inseparably connected with the common good of the international community.

The international institution must be universal. It must seek to include, with due regard to basic equality of rights, all the nations

large and small, strong and weak. Its constitution must be democratic. While it is reasonable to set up a Security Council with limited membership, this council must not be an instrument for imperialistic domination by a few powerful nations. Before it every nation must stand on its rights and not on its power. It must not allow any nation to sit in judgment in its own case. Frankly it must recognize that for nations as well as individuals life is not static. It must therefore provide in its charter for the revision of treaties in the interest of justice and the common good of international community, as well as for the recognition of a people's coming of age in the family of nations.

Strong Nations Must Help Weak

The function of the international organization must be the maintenance of international peace and security, the promotion of international co-operation and the adoption of common policies for the solution of common economic, social, and other humanitarian problems. In the maintenance of peace it is reasonable that the organization have at its disposal resources for coercing outlaw nations even by military measures.

In fostering and promoting international co-operation it must seek to guarantee to the weak and poor nations economic opportunities which are necessary to give their peoples reasonable standards of living, and it must seek to prevent selfish monopolistic control of raw materials which are needed for the economic stability of other nations. Effective international co-operation lays definite duties on favored nations. No nation may view with unconcern conditions that permit millions of workers in any country to be without the opportunity to secure from their labor adequate family support. Nations rich in natural resources must remember that ownership of property never dispenses from the social obligations of stewardship. Nations gifted with inventive and productive genius are obligated to serve the reasonable needs of other nations. Nations should open, under effective guarantees, world lanes of commerce and world avenues of communication to all law-abiding countries. Protective national legislation of legitimate national economic interests must not impede the flow of international commerce and the right social function of international exchange.

Teeth for World Court

In the international organization there should be a world court to which justiciable disputes among nations must be submitted. Its authority should not be merely advisory but strictly judicial. A condition for the right functioning of this court is the proper development

and codification of international law. Competent international authority must enact into positive law the principles of the moral law in their international references, and to these will be added positive treaty provisions and the charter and legislation of the international organization.

The world court should be empowered to render decisions in cases submitted to it either by any party in interest or by the international organization. It must have authority to refer its decisions to the international organization for execution. It would be useless to set up a world court and either deny it the right to demand the execution of its decisions or make the execution of them subject to the discretion of the international organization. Nations which refuse to submit their international disputes which constitute a threat to the peace or the common good of the international community should be treated by the international organization as outlaw nations. Moreover, obligatory arbitration of international disputes which threaten world peace would mark a signal advance in international relations.

Rights of Man

The international organization must never violate the rightful sovereignty of nations. Sovereignty is a right which comes from the juridical personality of a nation and which the international organization must safeguard and defend. However, national sovereignty may not be interpreted as absolving a nation from its obligations in the international community. Moreover, even within the State, national sovereignty is limited by the innate rights of men and families. Since civil authority does not confer these God-given rights, it may not violate them.

The ideology of a nation in its internal life is a concern of the international community. To reject this principle is tantamount to maintaining that the violation of the innate rights of men in a country by its own government has no relation to world peace. Just at this moment, in the interest of world peace, our nation is exerting itself to root out some ideologies which violate human rights in the countries we are liberating. We hold that if there is to be a genuine and lasting world peace, the international organization should demand as a condition of membership that every nation guarantee in law and respect in fact the innate rights of men, families, and minority groups in their civil and religious life. Surely our generation should know that tyranny in any nation menaces world peace. A nation which refuses to accord to its own people the full enjoyment of innate human rights cannot be relied upon to co-operate in the international community for the maintenance of a peace which is based on the recognition of national freedom. Such a nation will pursue its own selfish

international policies, while paying lip service to international co-operation.

Free Men, Free Nations

We have it within our power to introduce a new era, the era for which peoples have been longing through the centuries, the era in which nations will live together in justice and charity. It is a Christian hope we want to realize, the hope of a world at peace, a world of sovereign states co-operating in assuring all men the full enjoyment of their rights, a world of free men and free nations with their freedom secured under law. War may come, but if our hope is realized it will be a war of punishment meted out to outlaw nations. Through all the sufferings and sacrifices of this war we have remembered and we recall today the words of our Chief Executive, written at its beginning: "We shall win this war and in victory we shall seek not vengeance but the establishment of an international order in which the spirit of Christ shall rule the hearts of men and of nations."

Signed by the members of the Administrative Board, N.C.W.C., in the names of the bishops of the United States:

- ✦ EDWARD MOONEY, Chairman, Archbishop of Detroit
- ✦ SAMUEL A. STRITCH, Vice-Chairman, Archbishop of Chicago
- ✦ FRANCIS J. SPELLMAN, Secretary, Archbishop of New York
- ✦ JOHN T. McNICHOLAS, Archbishop of Cincinnati
- ✦ JOHN GREGORY MURRAY, Archbishop of St. Paul
- ✦ JOHN J. MITTY, Archbishop of San Francisco
- ✦ JOSEPH F. RUMMEL, Archbishop of New Orleans
- ✦ JOHN F. NOLL, Bishop of Fort Wayne
- ✦ KARL J. ALTER, Bishop of Toledo
- ✦ JAMES H. RYAN, Bishop of Omaha

Freedom and Peace

November 19, 1959

Freedom and Peace mirrors the cold war and American distrust of world communism. It was issued three years after the harsh Soviet suppression of the Hungarian uprising, and amid the tensions that would build the Berlin Wall in 1960. Unlike the statements of 1919 and 1944, no national crisis holds center stage. This frees the bishops to treat peace in a broad historical context: the rise of atheistic communism as a challenge to the largely Christian democracies of the West.

The bishops begin their pastoral with a blunt statement of theme. "All the world craves peace. Without freedom under God for every man and for every nation, there can be no peace." The chief obstacles to peace and freedom are world communism, "excessive" nationalism, and the abject poverty that makes people vulnerable both to nationalistic zealots and communist infiltrators. Much can be done to alleviate poverty and suffering through international cooperation. "In regard to communism, our goal is nothing less than the conversion of the communist world."

Statesmen must continue to seek better relations with the communist bloc, even while recognizing that "their system and ours are as basically different as slavery and freedom." These negotiators "must be firm in upholding principle and justice, knowing that appeasement in such matters leads only to the peace of the conquered."

The bishops end the pastoral with an appeal to political idealism. They chastise the American people for reveling in their material gifts rather than cherishing and sharing their precious freedom. "We must be ready to give our country's principles the same unlimited measure of devotion that led to the birth of our nation. Mankind will follow only those who give it a higher cause and the leadership of their dedication. It is up to us to give that leadership to mankind in the cause of God's freedom and peace."

All the world craves peace. Without freedom under God for every man and for every nation, there can be no peace.

On his recent visit to our country the communist spokesman took every opportunity to compare unfavorably, capitalism with communism in their economic aspects. This is not the basic issue. The choice

that men and nations must make today is between freedom and coercion.

Such words as "democracy," "republic," "peace," and "friendship" are words to which the Western world is long accustomed. These words have been taken into their current vocabulary by the proponents of communism. But while we may use the same words, we are not speaking the same language. By "peace" the communist means submission to his program. By "friendship" he means the acceptance on the part of others of his formula for coexistence.

Freedom is not the product of any political or social system; it is man's natural birthright, and, in the words of Pope Leo XIII, "the highest of man's natural endowments."

This freedom under God permits man to use his faculties for his own just benefit and for the service of his fellow man in accordance with the law of God. Furthermore, to protect the freedom and rights of its citizens, each nation has the right to be free.

Freedom—the American Ideal

Our country was "conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal." This recognition of the dignity of every citizen, endowed with inalienable rights that are God-given is indelibly woven into the origin and history of the American republic.

Ours is a tradition of freedom under God with justice and charity for all. It seems opportune to emphasize the importance of this heritage of freedom. In it lies the moral strength that makes the contribution of America to the world's rebuilding unique and distinctive.

Above and beyond the material aid that we distribute so generously around the globe to those in need, we should be equally concerned in sharing our ideals of liberty and justice. Proper standards of living and material prosperity are not enough. These are but means to an end and not in themselves the goal we would attain, if world peace is, as it should be, the aim of all our efforts.

The Foundations of Peace

Peace, as demonstrated by our nation's experience, rests on disciplined freedom with its attendant virtues. True peace for nations as well as for individuals comes from justice, from charity, from the faithful observance of the moral law. The might of arms can do no more for peace than to discourage aggressors that are belligerent. Pacts and treaties can bring at best an uneasy truce, restraining an open hostility without achieving friendship or understanding. Not even international organizations and international law, essential as they are for order in the world, can bring about world peace. Fun-

damentally, that peace depends on the acceptance by men and nations of a fixed, unchangeable, universal moral law.

There is no need to retell the noble efforts that have been made in behalf of peace since the dawn of the present century. Nor is there need to retell disappointments that have laid low the hopes of men. The two most destructive wars in history have left their indelible mark on the first half of our century. Now, well into the second half, men live under the threat of a third world war that would be immeasurably more destructive.

Present Obstacles to Peace and Freedom

We would recognize that the chief obstacles to peace are the obstacles to real freedom. First among the main obstacles to peace and freedom in our present world is obviously world communism. Communists do indeed preach peace and freedom and preach it incessantly; their actions, however, belie their word. They stir up hatred and mistrust. They reopen the old wounds of people who had real grievances in the days when they were subject to alien rule. While they themselves enslave whole nations over whom they have no shadow of claim, they seize wherever possible, upon economic and racial injustice to incite class warfare and violent revolution.

Thus the communist world poses a twofold threat to peace: first, that of military aggression of which the more recent instances continue to exemplify both ruthlessness and perfidy; secondly, the widespread sowing of the seed of hatred within nations and among nations. To meet this constant threat to peace is the free world's greatest problem.

A second obstacle to peace and freedom, personal and national, is the spirit of excessive nationalism. The world-wide movement toward independence is in itself good and laudable, and we rejoice that many nations formerly subjected to external control now guide their own destinies. But all too often a morbid preoccupation with past grievances arouses a spirit of revenge that defrauds certain minorities of freedom and obstructs the clear vision of the constructive and peaceful paths that lead to national greatness.

A third obstacle to freedom and peace is found in the inhumane conditions that prevail among so many millions of the world's population. Poverty, hunger, disease and the bitterness engendered by social injustice is their common lot. Embittered by the contrast between their own wretchedness and the wealth of the rich and powerful in their own lands, and between the nations, they are ripe for exploitation by both the communists and extreme nationalists.

Nor can we be unmindful of the plight of the millions of refugees whose present status is a challenge to all who believe in freedom and peace. Victims of totalitarian tyranny, deprived of family, of home

land, of liberty itself, they pose no threat to the peace and security of any land that may be their haven. But continued apathy to the problem of their resettlement is a reproach to the conscience of the free world.

Obstacles to Peace at Home

We must also recognize that conditions at home which threaten our moral integrity seriously threaten the cause of freedom and peace.

Our attention is directed to the subversive and evil forces that may undermine the moral strength of the nation. Chief among these currently are racial injustice, laxity in home life and discipline, preoccupation with the sensual, selfishness and self-seeking in economic life, and the excessive desire for wealth and ease.

The forces of religion in this country face no problem more pressing than the restoration within our people of respect for the moral law as God's law, and the inculcation of those virtues on which the soundness of family and civic life depends. Reverence for God's law, the keeping of His commandments, the practice of self-restraint, of justice and charity will contribute beyond measure to the strength and unity of our country, which are so essential for effective leadership in the cause of freedom and of peace.

Roads to Peace and Freedom

Although communism is the overriding danger to peace and freedom, our preoccupation with communism should not deter us from seeking to solve other problems that may endanger peace and freedom. The social and economic problems of the world, and particularly those of Asia, Africa, and some areas in Latin America pose a two-fold challenge that can be met. In the first place, our Christian sense of justice and mercy impels us to do all that we can to help those who suffer from avoidable poverty, ignorance, and disease. Secondly, we know that tensions engendered by these conditions tend to foment both military nationalism and communist infiltration. Hungry and desperate people may grasp at short range solutions in the effort to compress within a few decades a progress that elsewhere took centuries.

Our people have been generous in responding to the appeals of the afflicted victims of war and famine. But the needs of the world will not be met by charitable aid alone. The greater charity is to help people to help themselves. Programs of education, technical assistance, and developmental aid, now being carried out both by individual governments and by international bodies, can do much to build the

foundations for prosperity and peace in nations suffering from poverty and hunger.

In the long run, at least, the cause of peace and freedom so intimately connected with the independence of nations would be better served if we could rely less upon programs of governmental aid and more on private investment and international trade adequately regulated for the good of all nations. In view of such serious problems as the pressure of population in some areas upon resources, the world needs every element of cooperation and good will to step up production and distribution of food and fibers. The potential abundance made possible by modern technology should be made a reality, as a result of programs inspired by our love of our fellow man and the quest for peace and freedom.

In regard to communism, our goal is nothing less than the conversion of the communist world. Our moral judgment is absolute: communism is godless, it is aggressive and belligerent, it is unbelievably cruel. Witness the commune system in China! Hungary and Tibet are but the more recent manifestations of its total disregard for human rights and human dignity. Nevertheless, conscious of Christ's example and the infinite power of grace, we pray for the Red persecutors and for the persecuted. We wish no conquest except that of the spirit. We wish those who constructed the Iron Curtain to tear down the barbed wire and the machine gun posts and to join us in the enjoyment of God's freedom and peace.

Even today there are signs that the tyranny of communism is not the same in every nation under its sway. There are indications that the spirit of man will not stay crushed. We should storm heaven with prayer and penance, knowing that what to man seems impossible, God will grant to those who pray to Him with humble hearts, free of hatred and a spirit of revenge. As the early Christians converted their persecutors, we can seek to move those whose hearts seem hardened by blasphemous contempt for God and inhuman disregard for their fellow men.

In this spirit, statesmen of the world must continue their often disheartening quest for peace, reductions in armament, and the introduction of the rule of law into the society of nations. They must be firm in upholding principle and justice, knowing that appeasement in such matters leads only to the peace of the conquered. It is a delusion to place hope in seeking real understanding when the true problem is a conflict of essential principles, not lack of understanding.

While negotiating unceasingly for better relations with the communist regimes, we must never forget that their system and ours are as basically different as slavery and freedom. To palliate the difference is to subvert the cause of freedom and peace. Recently the communists have been cleverly veiling the sharp differences between the systems,

as witnessed by the statement of a member of the Russian press group, "Our systems are different but there is not a single obstacle which would deny us peace of friendship or cooperation." In other words, Red slavery is only different, not opposed to our system of peace and freedom under God.

Ultimately, the problem of communism as a threat to peace and freedom will be met only when we exemplify the principles that we proclaim as Christian members of a nation dedicated to God's law. There must be a searching reappraisal of our devotion to the principles we proclaim. We cannot live as materialists and expect to convert others to our system of freedom and peace under God.

Instead of upholding boldly the principles of peace and freedom under God we have emphasized the material fruits of our freedom, material wealth from industrialization and education. Instead of proclaiming freedom under God as we did in a more robust time in our history, we have so praised a program of supplying machines and calories and pleasures that these fruits of freedom and peace are made its substitutes. Today throughout the world, too often it is thought that when we speak of our American way of life we are speaking only of a high standard of living.

We have often acted in our international relations as if the products of industry and methods of production were our only contribution to the welfare of our neighbors. We have given the impression that material progress is our sovereign if not our exclusive concern. In particular, we have fostered industrialization and education as the ends and not the means of elevating nations. Insofar as we have done this, we have tacitly accepted the materialistic philosophy of communism as our way of life. We have aimed our efforts at satisfying the body, and, paradoxically, have allowed the communists to capture the minds of men.

We must convince the world that our industry, our education, our technology are made not only to serve the body but the free spirit of man, that the grandeur of our heritage and extent of our contribution to the world is not measured in dollars and machines, but in the spirit of God's freedom and the dignity of the human person. Our motive in gladly pouring out our resources is not simply a natural pity for the misery of our fellow man or a damper to conflict, but recognition of his dignity as an equal son of God endowed with freedom.

To accomplish this we must be totally dedicated to our beliefs in God, the source of freedom and peace. We must be ready to give our country's principles the same unlimited measure of devotion that led to the birth of our nation. Mankind will follow only those who give it a higher cause and the leadership of their dedication. It is up to us

to give that leadership to mankind in the cause of God's freedom and peace.

Signed by members of the Administrative Board, National Catholic Welfare Conference, in the name of the Bishops of the United States:

- ✠FRANCIS CARDINAL SPELLMAN, Archbishop of New York
- ✠JAMES FRANCIS CARDINAL McINTYRE, Archbishop of Los Angeles
- ✠JOHN CARDINAL O'HARA, C.S.C., Archbishop of Philadelphia
- ✠RICHARD CARDINAL CUSHING, Archbishop of Boston
- ✠ALOIS MUENCH, CARDINAL DESIGNATE, Bishop of Fargo, North Dakota
- ✠ALBERT MEYER, CARDINAL DESIGNATE, Archbishop of Chicago
- ✠KARL J. ALTER, Archbishop of Cincinnati
- ✠WILLIAM O. BRADY, Archbishop of St. Paul
- ✠PATRICK A. O'BOYLE, Archbishop of Washington
- ✠LEO BINZ, Archbishop of Dubuque
- ✠EMMET M. WALSH, Bishop of Youngstown
- ✠JOSEPH M. GILMORE, Bishop of Helena
- ✠ALBERT R. ZUROWESTE, Bishop of Belleville
- ✠JOSEPH T. MCGUCKEN, Bishop of Sacramento
- ✠ALLEN J. BABCOCK, Bishop of Grand Rapids
- ✠LAWRENCE J. SHEHAN, Bishop of Bridgeport

Peace and Vietnam

November 18, 1966

When 1966 ended, 375,000 U.S. troops were in Vietnam. American deaths numbered 4,800 that year. However, popular perception of the war had not yet undergone the broad shift that would eventually force U.S. withdrawal. While there were demonstrations, public protests still lay at the fringe of society, visible but not very respectable. In *Peace and Vietnam*, the bishops try to set forth a coherent analysis of the conflict's moral dimensions against this ambiguous background.

They draw heavily on the recently-published Vatican II document, *Gaudium et Spes*, quoting it on the right to defense, moral limits to conduct in warfare, the arms race, and conscientious objection. Reliance on this document also leads to a tonal shift from earlier statements on war and peace. After recognizing "the legitimate role of patriotism," the bishops repeat a passage from *Gaudium et Spes*. "Citizens should develop a generous and loyal devotion to their country, but without any narrowing of mind. In other words, they must always look simultaneously to the welfare of the whole human family. . . ."

Applying the principles they have enunciated to the conflict at hand, the bishops say "it is reasonable to argue that our presence in Vietnam is justified." However, they insist on the nation's duty to "pursue every possibility which offers even the slightest hope of a peaceful settlement." Protest against escalation in the war "beyond morally acceptable limits" is endorsed. Finally, the bishops glance apprehensively toward the future. "There is a grave danger that the circumstances of the present war in Vietnam may, in time, diminish our moral sensitivity to its evils. Every means at our disposal, therefore, must be used to create a climate of peace."

Our common humanity demands that all people live in peace and harmony with one another. This peace will exist only if the right order established by God is observed, an order which is based on the requirements of human dignity. Everyone, therefore, must be vitally and personally concerned about correcting the grave disorders which today threaten peace. As Catholics we are members of the Church that Pope Paul has called a "messenger of peace."

We, the Catholic Bishops of the United States, consider it our duty to help magnify the moral voice of our nation. This voice, fortunately, is becoming louder and clearer because it is the voice of all faiths. To the strong words of the National Council of Churches, the Synagogue Council of America, and other religious bodies, we add our own plea for peace. Our approaches may at times differ, but our starting point (justice) and our goal (peace) do not.

While we cannot resolve all the issues involved in the Vietnam conflict, it is clearly our duty to insist that they be kept under constant moral scrutiny. No one is free to evade his personal responsibility by leaving it entirely to others to make moral judgments. In this connection, the Vatican Council warns that "men should take heed not to entrust themselves only to the efforts of others, while remaining careless about their own attitudes. For government officials, who must simultaneously guarantee the good of their own people and promote the universal good, depend on public opinion and feeling to the greatest possible extent."¹

Peace and Modern Warfare

While it is not possible in this brief statement to give a detailed analysis of the Church's total teaching on war and peace, it seems necessary to review certain basic principles if the present crisis is to be put in its proper moral perspectives.

We reaffirmed at the Council the legitimate role of patriotism for the well-being of a nation, but a clear distinction was made between *true* and *false* patriotism: "Citizens should develop a generous and loyal devotion to their country, but without any narrowing of mind. In other words, they must always look simultaneously to the welfare of the whole human family, which is tied together by the manifold bonds linking races, peoples and nations."²

But these limits on patriotism do not rule out a country's right to legitimate self-defense. While making it clear that all means short of force must first be used, the Council restated the traditional teaching regarding the right of self-defense: "As long as the danger of war remains and there is no competent and sufficiently powerful authority at the international level, government cannot be denied the right to legitimate defense."³ And what a nation can do to defend itself, it may do to help another in its struggle against aggression.

1. *Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World* Part II, Chapter V, Section 1 (*The Documents of Vatican II*, Guild Press, New York, p. 296)

2. *Ibid*, Part II, Chapter IV, p. 286

3. *Ibid*, Part II, Chapter V, Section 1, p. 293

In the conduct of any war, there must be moral limits: "Any act of war aimed indiscriminately at the destruction of entire cities or of extensive areas along with their population is a crime against God and man himself. It merits univocal and unhesitating condemnation."⁴ Moreover, as the Council also reminded us, the fact that a war of self-defense has unhappily begun does not mean that any and all means may be employed by the warring parties.

While the stockpiling of scientific weapons serves, for the present, as a deterrent to aggression, the Council has warned us that "the arms race in which so many countries are engaged is not a safe way to preserve a steady peace."⁵ Indeed, it is a "treacherous trap for humanity." Far from promoting a sure and authentic peace, it actually fosters war by diverting resources which could be better used to alleviate the human misery which causes war. In their urgent plea for disarmament, however, the Council Fathers understood that it will be effective only if it is universal and if there are adequate means of enforcing it.

The Council commended those citizens who defend their nation against aggression. They are "instruments of security and freedom on behalf of their people. As long as they fulfill this role properly, they are making a genuine contribution to the establishment of peace."⁶

At the same time, however, it pointed out that some provision should be made for those who conscientiously object to bearing arms: "It seems right that laws make humane provisions for the care of those who for reasons of conscience refuse to bear arms; provided, however, that they accept some other form of service to the human community."⁷

Principles Put to Work

In the light of these principles, how are we as Americans to judge the involvement of the United States in Vietnam? What can we do to promote peace?

Americans can have confidence in the sincerity of their leaders as long as they work for a just peace in Vietnam. Their efforts to find a solution to the present impasse are well known. We realize that citizens of all faiths and of differing political loyalties honestly differ among themselves over the moral issues involved in this tragic conflict. While we do not claim to be able to resolve these issues authoritatively, in the light of the facts as they are known to us, it is

4. *Ibid*, Part II, Chapter V, Section 1, p. 294

5. *Ibid*, Part II, Chapter V, Section 1, p. 295

6. *Ibid*, Part II, Chapter V, Section 1, p. 293

7. *Ibid*, Part II, Chapter V, Section 1, p. 293

reasonable to argue that our presence in Vietnam is justified. We share the anguish of our government officials in their awesome responsibility of making life-and-death decisions about our national policy in Vietnam. We commend the valor of our men in the armed forces, and we express to them our debt of gratitude. In our time, thousands of men have given their lives in war. To those who loved them, we express our sorrow at their loss and promise our constant prayer.

But we cannot stop here. While we can conscientiously support the position of our country in the present circumstances, it is the duty of everyone to search for other alternatives. And everyone—government leaders and citizens alike—must be prepared to change our course whenever a change in circumstances warrants it.

This can be done effectively only if we know the facts and issues involved. Within the limits imposed by our national security, therefore, we must always insist that these facts and issues be made known to the public so that they can be considered in their moral context.

On the basis of our knowledge and understanding of the current situation, we are also bound always to make sure that our Government does, in fact, pursue every possibility which offers even the slightest hope of a peaceful settlement. And we must clearly protest whenever there is a danger that the conflict will be escalated beyond morally acceptable limits.

On a broader level, we must support our government in its efforts to negotiate a workable formula for disarmament. What we seek is not unilateral disarmament, but one proceeding in the words of the Council, "at an equal pace according to agreement, and backed up by authentic and workable safeguards."⁸ We commend the officials of our country and others for their contribution to the proposed Treaty against Nuclear Proliferation which, hopefully, will soon become a reality.

Moreover, we must use every resource available, as a nation, to help alleviate the basic causes of war. If the God-given human dignity of the people of poorer nations is not to become an illusion, these nations must be able to provide for the spiritual and material needs of their citizens. We must help them do this. The economically developed nations of the world, as Pope John insisted in his great encyclical, *Pacem in Terris*, must come to the aid of those which are in the process of developing so that every man, woman and child in the world may be able "to live in conditions more in keeping with their human dignity."⁹

8. Ibid, Part II, Chapter V, Section 1, p. 296

9. *Pacem in Terris* (NCWC, Washington, D.C., pp. 28, 29)

The Second Mile

There is a grave danger that the circumstances of the present war in Vietnam may, in time, diminish our moral sensitivity to its evils. Every means at our disposal, therefore, must be used to create a climate of peace. In this climate, prayer, personal example, study, discussion and lectures can strengthen the will for peace. We must advocate what we believe are the best methods of promoting peace: mutual agreements, safeguards and inspection; the creation of an international public authority to negotiate toward peace. Above all, in its peace-making efforts, we must support the work of the United Nations which, in the words of Pope Paul, marks "a stage in the development of mankind, from which retreat must never be admitted, but from which it is necessary that advance be made."¹⁰

We ask every person of good will to support with prayer the Holy Father's plea for a Christmas ceasefire. May it open the way to lasting peace. In the spirit of Christ, the Christian must be the persistent seeker in the Gospel, the man willing to walk the second mile (cf. Matt. 5:42). He walks prudently, but he walks generously and he asks that all men do the same.

As Catholics we walk in good company. Pope Paul, in his recent encyclical on peace, cried out, in God's name, to stop war. We pray God that the sacrifices of us all, our prayers as well as our faltering efforts toward peace, will hasten the day when the whole world will echo Pope Paul's historic words: "No more war, war never again!"¹¹

10. *Address to the United Nations Assembly, Oct. 4, 1965 (Pope Paul VI in New York, NCWC, Washington, D.C., p. 77)*

11. Ibid, p. 9

Resolution on Peace

November 16, 1967

This brief resolution quite literally takes up where *Peace and Vietnam* left off. Quoting their own words of a year earlier, the bishops respond to the gathering anti-war movement by adopting a less nuanced position in favor of peace. While gently chiding Americans who have expressed "extreme reactions for and against our presence in Vietnam," they refer to these protesters as "responsible segments of our society." The bishops urge the federal government to continue negotiations for peace "with even greater determination and action." The statement that U.S. involvement in Vietnam is justified is not repeated.

The National Conference of Catholic Bishops meeting in Washington last year said in their statement on Peace issued on November 18, 1966, "There is a grave danger that the circumstances of the present war in Vietnam may in time diminish our moral sensitivity to its evils." The intervening time and the reactions of responsible segments of our society have proved that the moral sensitivity of the American people has not diminished but in fact increased and intensified. We interpret this as a witness of the ever-deepening yearning of the American people for peace and an increasing horror of the evils of war.

This longing for peace has been expressed in extreme reactions for and against our presence in Vietnam. This has resulted in considerable division among our people. Our deep concern for our people on the battlefield as well as on the home front forces us to plead for more rational debate and greater solicitude for mutual understanding. In the longing for peace we ought not to forget our moral and civic responsibilities. We embrace with great compassion the peoples of the lands who suffer the hardships of prolonged war.

We acknowledge gratefully the repeated efforts of our government to negotiate a termination of conflict. Despite the rebuffs to these efforts, our government is urged to continue with even greater determination and action in the cause of negotiation. We extend this plea to the governments of the world and urge them to join earnestly in the search for a just and lasting peace.

We wish it understood that we are not pleading for peace at any price—we are pleading and praying for that peace recently described by Pope Paul as “never to be separated from justice for nations nor from freedom for citizens and peoples.”

Human Life in Our Day, Chapter II, “The Family of Nations”

November 15, 1968

Human Life in Our Day

is a fairly lengthy pastoral divided into two parts. The first chapter deals with family life and related issues. Chapter two, “The Family of Nations,” treats a number of questions connected with war and peace.

As in *Peace and Vietnam*, the bishops refer frequently to the teaching of *Gaudium et Spes*. Here, however, their focus is war in general rather than any one conflict; comments on Vietnam are confined to a short section. This broadened point of view probably derives from the conciliar document itself. It also reflects the debate current in this country, which went beyond Vietnam to encompass such large issues as the morality of war, the significance of the arms race, and the validity of individual dissent.

The bishops maintain a nation’s right to self-defense, but at the same time they appeal to all to evaluate war with the “entirely new attitude” the Council called for. They look to the day when war is outlawed and the world follows Pope Paul VI in adopting a “positive, dynamic concept” of peace. “Peace therefore presupposes the fraternal confidence which manifests itself in a firm determination to respect other persons and peoples, above all their human dignity, and to collaborate with them in the pursuit of the shared hopes of mankind.”

Human Life in Our Day is the first pastoral in which the American hierarchy addresses nuclear weapons in any detail. The bishops condemn the use of “weapons of mass destruction,” reserving judgment on the propriety of possessing these devices for the sake of deterrence. They also stress the ultimate futility of the arms race: “any effort to achieve superiority only leads to ever higher levels of armaments. . . .”

Considerable attention is paid to the building of world community. “It is the duty of our political leadership, of citizens and especially of believers who acknowledge the brotherhood of man, to promote and develop the spirit of international concern, cooperation and understanding.” This spirit can be expressed through generous programs of foreign aid, through support for the United Nations, through turning away from “the present international ‘war system,’” and eventually through the establishment of a universal public authority. The bishops note in passing that they oppose the peacetime draft since it contributes to tensions among nations.

In the section on Vietnam, the bishops recall their 1966 statement that U.S. involvement in the conflict is justified. While they do not repudiate this statement, they wonder if the cost of war has become too high. The tone of their discussion is perhaps best represented by the closing comment: "In addition, may we not hope that violence will be universally discredited as a means of remedying human ills. . .?"

The bishops then turn to general and selective conscientious objection. "If war is ever to be outlawed," they say, "it will be because the citizens of this and other nations have rejected the tenets of exaggerated nationalism and insisted on principles of non-violent political and civic action in both the domestic and international spheres." Individuals should follow their consciences regarding war and peace. The law should allow people both to reject all military service and to refuse "to serve in wars which they consider unjust or in branches of service (e.g., the strategic nuclear forces) which would subject them to the performance of actions contrary to deeply held moral convictions about indiscriminate killing."

The chapter ends with a call for inner conversion. "We must once again begin to think of man in a new way, and of human life with a new appreciation of its worth. . . ."

We share the deep concern of thoughtful people in our times, a concern voiced by Vatican Council II, that "the whole human family has reached an hour of supreme crisis" (*Gaudium et Spes*, 77). The crisis can ultimately offer great promise for a more abundant human life, but at the moment it portends grave threats to all life. The threats to life depend on urgent and difficult decisions concerning war and peace. In considering these we share the conviction of Vatican Council II that the horror and perversity of technological warfare "compel us to undertake an evaluation of war *with an entirely new attitude*" (n. 80, emphasis added).

This compelling obligation is the greater in our case since we are citizens of a nation in many ways the most powerful in the world. The responsibility of moral leadership is the greater in the local Church of a nation whose arsenals contain the greatest nuclear potential for both the harm that we would wish to impede or the help it is our obligation to encourage. We are acutely aware that our moral posture and comportment in this hour of supreme crisis will be assessed by the judgment of history and of God.

We renew the affirmation by the Council that "the loftier strivings and aspirations of the human race are in harmony with the message of the Gospel" (n. 77). We speak as witnesses to that Gospel, aware that the issues of war and peace test the relevancy of its message for

our generation, particularly in terms of the service of life and its dignity. We seek to speak in the spirit of that Gospel message, which is at heart a doctrine of nonviolence rather than violence, of peace understood as Jesus proclaimed it (cf. Jn. 14:27).

We call upon American Catholics to evaluate war with that "entirely new attitude" for which the Council appealed and which may rightly be expected of all who, calling themselves Christians, proclaim their identity with the Prince of Peace. We share with all men of good will the conviction that a more humane society will not come "unless each person devotes himself with renewed determination to the cause of peace" (n. 77). We appeal to policy makers and statesmen to reflect soberly on the Council teaching concerning peace and war, and vigorously to pursue the search for means by which at all times to limit and eventually to outlaw the destructiveness of war.

Vatican Council II noted that "war continues to produce daily devastation in one or another part of the world" (n. 79). The observation has lost none of its truth in the period since the Council ended; indeed, there have been further grievous outbreaks of war and aggression.

Of one mind with the Council, we condemn without qualification wars of aggression however their true character may sometimes be veiled. Whatever case there may have seemed to exist in other times for wars fought for the domination of another nation, such a case can no longer be imagined given the circumstances of modern warfare, the heightened sense of international mutuality and the increasingly available humane means to the realization of that mutuality.

We join wholeheartedly in the Council's condemnation of wars fought without limitation. We recognize the right of legitimate self-defense and, in a world society still unorganized, the necessity for recourse to armed defense and to collective security action in the absence of a competent authority on the international level and once peaceful means have been exhausted. But we seek to limit warfare and to humanize it, where it remains a last resort, in the maximum degree possible. Most of all, we urge the enlisting of the energies of all men of good will in forging the instruments of peace, to the end that war may at long last be outlawed.

Meanwhile, we are gratefully conscious that "those who are pledged to the service of their country as members of its armed forces should regard themselves as agents of security and freedom on behalf of their people. As long as they fulfill this role properly, they are making a genuine contribution to the establishment of peace" (*Gaudium et Spes*, 79).

In the Christian message peace is not merely the absence of war. Ultimately, of course, it presupposes that presence within and among men of a positive principle of life and unity which is none other than

the divine life to which the Church bears witness, of which Christ in His Church is the source. The soul, then of a peaceful society is divine charity. But justice, the great concern of the well-ordered state and the justification for its existence, is the foundation of the organized society.

Therefore, peace cannot be reduced solely to the maintenance of a balance of power between enemies; nor is it to be brought about by dictatorship, whether this be the imposition of the sheer will of a ruler, a party or even a majority. It is an enterprise of justice and must be built up ceaselessly in seeking to satisfy the all-embracing demands of the common good. This is the point of Pope Paul's positive, dynamic concept of peace: the modern word for peace is development. Peace therefore presupposes the fraternal confidence which manifests itself in firm determination to respect other persons and peoples, above all their human dignity, and to collaborate with them in the pursuit of the shared hopes of mankind.

Arms Control

It is in nuclear warfare, even in its "cold" phase or form, that mankind confronts the moral issue of modern war in its extreme case. This has become a situation in which two adversaries possess and deploy weapons which, if used against each other, could annihilate their respective civilizations and even threaten the survival of the human race. Nothing more dramatically suggests the anti-life direction of technological warfare than the neutron bomb; one philosopher declares that the manner in which it would leave entire cities intact, but totally without life, makes it, perhaps, the symbol of our civilization. It would be perverse indeed if the Christian conscience were to be unconcerned or mute in the face of the multiple moral aspects of these awesome prospects.

It is now a quarter century since Pope Pius XII summoned that conscience to a "War on War." He pointed out World War II's "unspeakable atrocities," the "image of hell upon which anyone who nourishes humane sentiments in his heart can have no more ardent wish than to close the door forever." He warned against the further progress of "human inventions . . . directed to destruction," and pleaded that to the recognition of the immorality of wars of aggression there be added "the threat of a judicial intervention of the nations and of a punishment inflicted on the aggressor by the United Nations, so that war may always feel itself proscribed, always under the watchful guard of a preventive action." He argued that then "humanity, issuing from the dark night in which it has been submerged for so great a length of time, will be able to greet the dawn of a new and better era in its history" (*Christmas broadcast, 1944*).

Vatican Council II, in a solemn declaration, endorsed "the condemnation of total warfare issued by recent popes" and stated:

"Every act of war directed to the indiscriminate destruction of whole cities or vast areas with their inhabitants is a crime against God and man which merits firm and unequivocal condemnation" (*Gaudium et Spes, 80*).

The Council explicitly condemned the use of weapons of mass destruction, but abstained from condemning the *possession* of such weapons to deter "possible enemy attack" (n. 81). Though not passing direct judgment on this strategy of deterrence, the Council did declare that "men should be convinced that the arms race in which so many countries are engaged is not a safe way to preserve a steady peace. Nor is the so-called 'balance' resulting from this race a pure and authentic peace. Rather than being eliminated thereby, the causes of war threaten to grow gradually stronger. . . . Therefore it must be said again: the arms race is an utterly treacherous trap for humanity, and one which ensnares the poor to an intolerable degree" (n. 81).

The Council did not call for unilateral disarmament; Christian morality is not lacking in realism. But it did call for reciprocal or collective disarmament "proceeding at an equal pace according to agreement and backed up by authentic and workable safeguards" (n. 82). There are hopeful signs that such a formula may be strengthened by the Partial Test Ban Treaty and that the commitment under the Non-Proliferation Treaty to proceed to a negotiation of balanced reductions of nuclear weapons—at the same time extending the use of nuclear power for peaceful development of the needy nations under adequate inspection safeguards—may provide a positive, sane pattern for the future. We earnestly pray so, commending the furtherance of these hopes to responsible political leaders and to the support of all citizens.

Meanwhile, it is greatly to be desired that such prospects not be dashed by irrational resolves to keep ahead in "assured destruction" capability. Rather it is to be hoped that the early ratification by the Senate of the Non-Proliferation Treaty—which in essence is a Treaty between the U.S.S.R. and the U.S. and other nations—will hasten discussion of across the board reductions by the big powers. Despite, and even because of the provocations in Eastern Europe and elsewhere, the United States should continue steps to create a better climate for these discussions, such as taking the lead in inviting the UN Atomic Energy Commission and other organizations and foreign states to visit its nuclear facilities, and scrupulously reviewing all commitments for the sale, loan or lease of armaments.

The Council's position on the arms race was clear. To recall it: "Therefore, we declare once again: the arms race is an utterly treach-

erous trip for humanity. . . . It is much to be feared that if this race persists, it will eventually spawn all the lethal ruin whose path it is now making ready" (n. 81).

Nonetheless, the nuclear race goes on. The latest act in the continuing nuclear arms race is no doubt the U.S. decision to build a "thin" anti-ballistic missile system to defend against possible nuclear attack by another world power. This decision has been widely interpreted as the prelude to a "thick" ABM system to defend against possible nuclear attack.

In themselves, such antiballistic missiles are purely defensive, designed to limit the damage to the United States from nuclear attack. Nevertheless, by upsetting the present strategic balance, the so-called balance of terror, there is grave danger that a United States ABM system will incite other nations to increase their offensive nuclear forces with the seeming excuse of a need to restore the balance.

Despite the danger of triggering an expanded escalation of the arms race the pressures for a "thick" ABM deployment persist.

We seriously question whether the present policy of maintaining nuclear superiority, however it is computed, when each side is admittedly capable of inflicting overwhelming damage on the other, even after being attacked first. Such effective parity has been operative for some years. Any effort to achieve superiority only leads to ever-higher levels of armaments as it forces the side with the lesser capability to seek to maintain its superiority. In the wake of this action-reaction phenomenon comes a decrease in both stability and security.

The National Conference of Catholic Bishops pledges its united effort toward forming a climate of public opinion for peace, mindful of the Council's advice that "government officials . . . depend on public opinion and feeling to the greatest possible extent" (n. 82). We will therefore, through existing and improved agencies, support national programs of education for Catholic Americans and for all Americans in collaboration with all religious groups and other organizations.

With *Gaudium et Spes*, we commend the arduous and unceasing efforts of statesmen and specialists in the field of arms control and disarmament, and to add our own encouragement of systematic studies in this field. As the Council appealed to Catholic scholars throughout the world to participate more fully in such studies, so we call upon intellectuals in the Church in our land to bring scholarly competence and their powers of persuasion to that "war on war" which the modern Popes have without exception pleaded that we wage.

We urge Catholics, and indeed all our countrymen, to make a ceaseless vigil of prayers for peace and for all those who are charged with the delicate and difficult negotiations of disarmament. Such prayers provide the most obvious and appropriate occasion for ecu-

menical services bringing together all in our communities who cherish the blessed vision of peace heralded by the Hebrew prophets and preached by Christ and His Apostles. We cannot but question the depth of the commitment to peace of people of religious background who no longer pray for peace. But those who only pray for peace, leaving to others the arduous work for peace, the dialogue for peace, have a defective theology concerning the relation between human action and the accomplishment of that will of God in which is our peace. So, too, those who, neglectful of the part of prayer, rely only on their own power, or on the pooling of merely human resources on intelligence, energy and even good will, forget the wisdom of Scripture: "If the Lord does not build the house, in vain the masons toil; if the Lord does not guard the city, in vain the sentries watch" (Psalm 127, 1-2).

The International Community

The Council Fathers recognized that not even ending the nuclear arms race, which itself cannot be accomplished without the full cooperation of the international community, would ensure the permanent removal of the awesome threat of modern war. Nor would disarmament alone, even assuming it to be complete and across the board, remove the causes of war. "This goal undoubtedly requires the establishment of some universal public authority acknowledged as such by all, and endowed with effective power to safeguard, on the behalf of all, security, regard for justice and respect for rights" (n. 82).

Such an authority, furthermore, is required by the growing, ever more explicit interdependence of all men and nations as a result of which the common good "today takes on an increasingly universal complexion and consequently involves rights and duties with respect to the whole human race" (n. 26).

Therefore political leaders should ". . . extend their thoughts and their spirit beyond the confines of their own nation, put aside national selfishness and ambition to dominate other nations, and nourish a profound reverence for the whole of humanity, which is already making its way so laboriously toward greater unity" (n. 82).

We commend the efforts of world statesmen, particularly those of our own nation, who seek to extend the spirit and practice of cooperation in international agencies and regional associations of nations, with the object not only of terminating or preventing war, and of building up a body of international law, but also of removing the causes of war through positive programs.

Since war remains a melancholy fact of life today, we believe the United States not only should insist on adherence to and the appli-

cation by all nations of existing international conventions or treaties on the laws of war, such as the revised Geneva Convention relative to the treatment of prisoners of war, but should take the lead in seeking to update them. Certain forms of warfare, new and old, should be outlawed, and practices in dealing with civilian populations, prisoners of war and refugees are always in need of review and reform.

Here, too, our dependence on responsible writers, informed speakers and competent critics is crucial to the cause of peace. Hence we encourage Catholic scholars to undertake systematic studies of new developments, theories and practices in warfare, including guerrilla warfare, revolution and "wars of liberation." Changing political patterns, improved techniques of communication, new methods of remote controls and of surveillance of individuals and communities alike made possible by science, as well as shifting ethical standards, make it the vocation of devout intellectuals, both as citizens of their own nations and servants of the common good of mankind, to bring informed competence to the illumination, discussion and resolution of the complex issues, many of them moral, arising from all these.

A Catholic position of opposition to compulsory peacetime military service, first formulated on the level of the Holy See by Pope Benedict XV, has had for its premise the fact that such service has been a contributing cause of the breeding of actual wars, a part of the "great armaments" and "armed peace" security concept, and in the words of Cardinal Gasparri in a letter to Lloyd George, the cause of such great evils for more than a century that the cure of these evils can only be found in the suppression of this system. In the spirit of this position, we welcome the voices lifted up among our political leaders which ask for a total review of the draft system and the establishment of voluntary military service in a professional army with democratic safeguards and for clear purposes of adequate defense. Our call for the end of any draft system at home which, in practice, amounts at times to compulsory peacetime military service is in direct line with previous resolutions of the hierarchy of the United States on compulsory military training (cf. *Our Bishops Speak*, pp. 234, 237).

Apart from the question of war itself, we deem it opportune here to reiterate the Council's condemnation of genocide, the methodical extermination of an entire people, nation or ethnic minority for reasons connected with race, religion or status such as that undertaken by the Nazis against the Jews among their own citizens and later against all the Jewish people, as well as so-called "gypsies." We would urge United States ratification of the United Nations Convention on this subject and of every other sound implementing instrument by which the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights can be translated from the level of ideal to that of actuality. Furthermore, we urge increased support by our own countrymen and citizens of all nations

of all international programs consistent with the protection and promotion of the sanctity of human life and the dignity of the human person in times of war and peace.

We earnestly appeal to our own government and to all governments to give the elimination of the present international "war system" a priority consistent with the damaging effect of massive armament programs on all the objectives of the good society to which enlightened governments give priorities: education, public health, a true sense of security, prosperity, maximum liberty, the flourishing of the humane arts and sciences, in a word the service of life itself. Thus can we strive to move away, as reason and religion demand, from the "war system" to an international system in which unilateral recourse to force is increasingly restricted.

This will require international peacemaking and peace-keeping machinery. To this end we urge all to support efforts for a stronger and more effective United Nations that it may become a true instrument of peace and justice among nations. In this respect the peace motivation of Pope Paul's public support of the United Nations by his moral authority and teaching office at the time of his visit to that body on its anniversary should be normative for Catholics.

We would welcome in official pronouncements of our own and other governments, as well as in the increased support given to the United Nations and associated agencies by the citizens of all nations, a greater interest in and direction toward the establishment of that universal public authority which the Council Fathers urged.

We recognize that any use of police action by such an international authority, or, in the meantime, by the UN as presently constituted, or by duly constituted regional agencies, must be carefully subject to covenants openly arrived at and freely accepted, covenants spelling out clear norms such as that of proportionate force; here, again, the work of qualified and conscientious specialists is indispensable.

Turning to the more positive aspects of the building of an international community and the duties of us as Americans in this matter, we deplore the lack of a stable, persevering national concern for the promotion of the international common good. This is reflected in the fickleness of public interest in and Congressional support of foreign aid. It is reflected also in a seeming insensitivity to the importance of trade agreements beneficial to developing nations. A like lack of generosity, dangerous to the fully human common good, is present in the increasingly bold linking of contraceptive programs, even when superficially voluntary, to needed aid programs. Future aid and trade assistance programs should become increasingly multilateral; they should never merely serve national self-interest except to the extent that national interest is genuinely part and parcel of the general good of the human community.

Because of the war in Vietnam, and the growing preoccupation with the social problems of our cities, there is the peril of an upsurge of exaggerated forms of nationalism and isolationism which the teachings of all churches reprove and the experiences of World War II had, we hoped, forever discredited.

It is the duty of our political leadership, of citizens and especially of believers who acknowledge the brotherhood of man, to promote and develop the spirit of international concern, cooperation and understanding.

As the council noted ". . . there arises a surpassing need for renewed education of attitudes and for new inspiration in the area of public opinion. Those who are dedicated to the work of education, particularly of the young, or who mold public opinion should regard as their most weighty task the effort to instruct all in fresh sentiments of peace" (n. 82).

To assist the agencies and institutions of the Catholic Church in the United States in their response to this "most weighty task," the Catholic bishops have recently established a Division of World Justice and Peace, corresponding to the newly established Vatican Commission. It is our desire that the Division will stimulate renewed efforts in this field, and coordinate whenever possible such efforts with those of other Christian bodies in an ecumenical framework. We call upon all men of conscience, all public spirited citizens, to dedicate themselves with fresh energy to this work.

We believe that the talents and resources of our land are so abundant that we may promote the common good of nations at no expense to the vitally necessary works of urban and rural reconstruction in our own country. The latter are the first order of domestic policy, just as the former should be the first order of foreign policy. Neither should be neglected, both being equally urgent; in the contemporary and developing world order their fortunes are intertwined.

Vietnam

In a previous statement we ventured a tentative judgment that, on balance, the U.S. presence in Vietnam was useful and justified.

Since then American Catholics have entered vigorously into the national debate on this question, which explicitly or implicitly, is going deeply into the moral aspects of our involvement in Vietnam. In this debate, opinions among Catholics appear as varied as in our society as a whole; one cannot accuse Catholics of either being partisans of any one point of view or of being unconcerned. In our democratic system the fundamental right of political dissent cannot be denied, nor is rational debate on public policy decisions of government in the light of moral and political principles to be discouraged. It is the duty

of the governed to analyze responsibly the concrete issues of public policy.

In assessing our country's involvement in Vietnam we must ask: Have we already reached, or passed, the point where the principle of proportionality becomes decisive? How much more of our resources in men and money should we commit to this struggle, assuming an acceptable cause or intention? Has the conflict in Vietnam provoked inhuman dimensions of suffering? Would not an untimely withdrawal be equally disastrous?

Granted that financial considerations are necessarily subordinate to ethical values in any moral question, nonetheless many wonder if perhaps a measure of the proportions in this, as in any modern war, may be reflected in the amounts inevitably lost to education, poverty-relief and positive works of social justice at home and abroad (including Southeast Asia) as a result of the mounting budgets for this and like military operations. This point has frequently been raised by the Popes, notably by Pope Pius XII who invoked the principle of proportionality in his analysis of the morality even of defensive wars, particularly when these involve A.B.C. elements (atomic, biological, chemical) and losses disproportionate to the "injustice tolerated" (*Address to Military Doctors*, Oct. 19, 1953).

While it would be beyond our competence to propose any technical formulas for bringing the Vietnam War to an end, we welcome the bombing halt and pray for the success of the negotiations now underway.

Meanwhile there are moral lessons to be learned from our involvement in Vietnam that will apply to future cases. One might be that military power and technology do not suffice, even with the strongest resolve, to restore order or accomplish peace. As a rule internal political conflicts are too complicated to be solved by the external application of force and technology.

Another might be the realization that some evils existing in the world, evils such as undernutrition, economic frustration, social stagnation and political injustices may be more readily attacked and corrected through non-military means, than by military efforts to counteract the subversive forces bent on their exploitation.

In addition, may we not hope that violence will be universally discredited as a means of remedying human ills, and that the spirit of love "may overcome the barriers that divide, cherish the bonds of mutual charity, understand others and pardon those who have done them wrong"? (*Pacem in Terris*, Article 171).

The Role of Conscience

The war in Vietnam typifies the issues which present and future generations will be less willing to leave entirely to the normal political

and bureaucratic processes of national decision-making. It is not surprising that those who are most critical, even intemperate in their discussion of war as an instrument of national policy or as a ready means to the settling even of wrongs, are among the young; the burden of killing and dying falls principally on them.

There is sometimes ground for question as to whether the attitudes of some toward military duty do not spring from cowardice. In this problem, as in all crises which test generosity and heroism, cases of moral as well as physical cowardice doubtless occur. But a blanket charge of this would be unfair to those young people who are clearly willing to suffer social ostracism and even prison terms because of their opposition to a particular war. One must conclude that for many of our youthful protestors, the motives spring honestly from a principled opposition to a given war as pointless or immoral.

Nor can it be said that such conscientious objection to war, as war is waged in our times, is entirely the result of subjective considerations and without reference to the message of the Gospel and the teaching of the Church; quite the contrary, frequently conscientious dissent reflects the influence of the principles which inform modern papal teaching, the *Pastoral Constitution* and a classical tradition of moral doctrine in the Church, including, in fact, the norms for the moral evaluation of a theoretically just war.

The enthusiasm of many young people for new programs of service to fellow humans in need may be proof that some traditional forms of patriotism are in the process of being supplemented by a new spirit of dedication to humanity and to the moral prestige of one's own nation. This new spirit must be taken seriously; it may not always match the heroism of the missionaries and the full measure of the life of faith, but it is not contradictory to these and may open up new forms of Christian apostolate.

As witnesses to a spiritual tradition which accepts enlightened conscience, even when honestly mistaken, as the immediate arbiter of moral decisions, we can only feel reassured by this evidence of individual responsibility and the decline of uncritical conformism to patterns some of which included strong moral elements, to be sure, but also included political, social, cultural and like controls not necessarily in conformity with the mind and heart of the Church.

If war is ever to be outlawed, and replaced by more humane and enlightened institutions to regulate conflicts among nations, institutions rooted in the notion of universal common good, it will be because the citizens of this and other nations have rejected the tenets of exaggerated nationalism and insisted on principles of nonviolent political and civic action in both the domestic and international spheres.

We therefore join with the Council Fathers in praising

“those who renounce the use of violence in the vindication of their rights and who resort to methods of defense which are otherwise available to weaker parties, provided that this can be done without injury to the rights and duties of others or of the community itself” (n. 78).

It is in this light that we seek to interpret and apply to our own situation the advice of Vatican Council II on the treatment of conscientious objectors. The Council endorsed laws that

“make humane provision for the care of those who for reasons of conscience refuse to bear arms, provided, however, that they accept some other form of service to the human community” (n. 79).

The present laws of this country, however, provide only for those whose reasons of conscience are grounded in a total rejection of the use of military force. This form of conscientious objection deserves the legal provision made for it, but we consider that the time has come to urge that similar consideration be given those whose reasons of conscience are more personal and specific.

We therefore recommend a modification of the Selective Service Act making it possible, although not easy for so-called selective conscientious objectors to refuse—without fear of imprisonment or loss of citizenship—to serve in wars which they consider unjust or in branches of service (e.g., the strategic nuclear forces) which would subject them to the performance of actions contrary to deeply held moral convictions about indiscriminate killing. Some other form of service to the human community should be required of those so exempted.

Whether or not such modifications in our laws are in fact made, we continue to hope that, in the all-important issue of war and peace, all men will follow their consciences. We can do no better than to recall, as did the Vatican Council, “the permanent binding force of universal natural law and its all embracing principles,” to which “man's conscience itself gives ever more emphatic voice.”

In calling so persistently in this Pastoral for studies on the application of sound moral principles to new dimensions of changes in the problems of war and peace, we are mindful of our own responsibility to proclaim the Gospel of peace and to teach the precepts of both natural and revealed divine law concerning the establishing of peace everywhere on earth (n. 79). We therefore make our own the Council's judgment on the “deeper causes of war,” sins like envy,

mistrust and egoism. We echo the warning given by Pope Paul at the United Nations:

"Today as never before, in an era marked by such human progress, there is need for an appeal to the moral conscience of man. For the danger comes not from progress, nor from science—on the contrary, if properly utilized these could resolve many of the grave problems which beset mankind. The real danger comes from man himself, who has at his disposal ever more powerful instruments, which can be used as well for destruction as for the loftiest conquests."

The hour has indeed struck for "conversion," for personal transformation, for interior renewal. We must once again begin to think of man in a new way, and of human life with a new appreciation of its worth, its dignity and its call to elevation to the level of the life of God Himself. All this requires that, with refreshed purpose and deepened faith, we follow the urging of St. Paul that we "put on the new man, which has been created according to God in justice and holiness of truth" (Eph. 4:23).

Conclusion

Christians believe God to be the "source of life" (cf. Jn. 5,26) and love since "love comes from God" (cf. 1 Jn. 4,7). "God is love" (cf. 1 Jn. 4,8) and man has been made in His image and likeness (Gen. 1,26). Thus, man is most himself when he honors life and lives by love. Then he is most like to God.

The doctrine and defense of life require a renewed spirituality in the Church. Such a spirituality will reaffirm the sacred character of married love through which life is begun, the dignity of the family within which love brings life to maturity, and the blessed vision of peace in which life is shared by men and nations in a world community of love.

These themes, all of which touch on life, we have explored in terms of the family, the commonwealth of nations and some of the anti-life forces which threaten these.

In Her defense of human life the Church in our day makes her own, as did Moses, the words by which God Himself reduces our perplexities to a clear, inescapable choice:

"I call heaven and earth to witness against you this day, that I have set before you life and death . . . therefore, choose life that you and your descendants may live . . ." (Deut. 30,19).

Human Solidarity

April, 1970

As the text indicates, *Human Solidarity* was issued to mark the twenty-fifth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations. The bishops reflect on the organization's early history and call for rededication to its original goals. The statement is urgent in tone, in part, perhaps, because the anti-war movement, now very strong, was keeping the issues of nationalism and international responsibility before the public eye.

The United Nations was established in 1945 to maintain peace "This is a fitting occasion," the bishops say, "for an examination of conscience and a renewed resolve to unite, as both the Gospel and the times demand, to banish war and to make of the earth a peaceable kingdom." Although the U.N. has accomplished much in twenty-five years, much remains to be done. States "must emerge from the anachronistic structures which enshrine old concepts of unlimited national sovereignty," and must "experience a limitation of the power to act unilaterally. . . ."

The bishops level criticism at the United States for failure to take the lead in giving foreign aid, for trade policies that harm underdeveloped countries, and for not supporting important U.N. initiatives. In stark contrast to the anti-communist rhetoric of the 1959 statement, *Freedom and Peace*, they commend the Nixon administration for its conciliatory approach to the People's Republic of China.

The reasoning underlying this view of international relations is articulated toward the end of the statement. "We must ask ourselves whether our schools, organizations and institutions are ministering to the formation of a global mentality or whether they are reinforcing outmoded nationalistic, and even chauvinistic, attitudes of the past." The road to peace is the road to world citizenship, through such agencies as the United Nations.

Twenty-five years ago this month, while World War II was still an agonizing reality, representatives of fifty-one nations gathered in San Francisco. In the name of "the Peoples of the United Nations," they pledged to unite their strength within a comprehensive new juridical and political world organization "to save succeeding generations from

the scourge of war" in accordance with principles of justice and international law.

The American Bishops declared a few months later that our country acted wisely in deciding to participate in this world organization. Concerned that the great powers were placed in a position "above the law" in matters relating to the maintenance of peace and security, they expressed the hope that a sound institution would develop from the recognition of the rights and duties of international society.

As the American Bishops meet now in 1970 in San Francisco, a city which bears the name of the patron of peace, we deem it appropriate to welcome the twenty-fifth anniversary year of the United Nations. Even more important, however, this is a fitting occasion for an examination of conscience and a renewed resolve to unite, as both the Gospel and the times demand, to banish war and to make of the earth a peaceable kingdom.

We call upon American Catholics to join with us in appreciation of the noble purposes of the United Nations and of its innovative efforts and achievements in behalf of human solidarity, human development and peace, and we urge them to increase their knowledge and understanding of these efforts and achievements. At the same time we recognize, as the United Nations itself is doing, how far it still is from meeting contemporary threats to and demands for that peace, justice and true human progress which are the theme of the anniversary year.

Achievements

Common endeavors of the Member States of the United Nations, harmonizing national interests, have indeed deepened and broadened awareness of the reciprocal rights and obligations of states in international life. Some conflicts have been averted, contained or halted by its efforts. The horrendous character of nuclear, chemical and biological warfare has been universally acknowledged, and treaties to limit or abolish the respective weapons have been concluded or initiated. Numerous new states, formerly under colonial rule, have been assisted in the transition to independence and the new responsibilities thereof, and they have been welcomed to United Nations membership on terms of juridical equality. The dignity and fundamental equality of all members of the human family, without regard to sex, race, color, religion or any other distinction, have been repeatedly affirmed and enhanced through formal declarations and treaties, through various educational campaigns and through positive action of a social nature. Worldwide technical cooperation and other forms of mutual assistance are feeding the hungry, healing the sick, instructing the ignorant and sheltering the homeless. A body of in-

ternational law to cover existing and expanding relations in international life, which otherwise might lead to conflict, is being progressively developed. Agreements to preserve outer space, the ocean bed and an uncontaminated environment as the peaceful patrimony of all mankind have been concluded or are in the making.

Possibilities

There can be no doubt that the United Nations could move to that higher dimension of community and authority demanded by the contemporary crises of peoples, which are, in fact, world crises, if men and states would take seriously the injunction of Pope Paul to the United Nations: "We must get used to thinking of man in a new way, of men's life in common in a new way, in a new way, too, of the paths of history and the destiny of the world." In a world made one by the evolution of communications and transportation, this new way requires States to emerge from the anachronistic structures which enshrine old concepts of unlimited national sovereignty.

As Christians and as American citizens, we have a special responsibility to cherish and protect the life of men in community and to assist the United Nations to help us do so. As Americans we must acknowledge the reality of our massive power and take the lead in sharing it through strengthening the world organization. This calls for acceleration in the delicate exchange in which the United States and other nations experience a limitation of the power to act unilaterally and an expansion of the obligation to share the responsibility of global peace and development.

This limitation of unilateral power occurs notably in the area of arms control which can effectively curb the power of any State to make war and the concomitant establishment of a UN peacekeeping system capable of speedy action to guarantee security. The success of the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks between the United States and the USSR is a first and necessary step.

As to possibilities of peacekeeping, without which there will be no real or lasting arms control, in the words of Charles Yost, U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations: "We have only to glance at some of the key provisions of the Charter to see how far we have fallen short of making them living realities, how substantially we have failed to develop the institution and the sort of international society which the authors of the Charter had in mind. . . . The United Nations is still waiting for its members to give it the authority to settle disputes and to live up to its promise of peace."

The United States should not only take the lead in the new efforts to institutionalize a standby UN peacekeeping force and to set up fact

finding, arbitration, mediation and conciliation mechanisms for settling political disputes, it should also take bold steps to substitute for the rule of force a rule of law. In the light of changed world conditions we encourage and shall promote wide public discussion of greater use by the United States of the long established but practically unemployed International Court of Justice for the settlement of disputes.

The compelling needs of mankind no less than the growing dangers to peace are an indictment of the untrammelled pursuit of national self-interest. There is evidence that our great country and its generous people hold not the first but the eleventh place among the nations in percentage of our gross national product allotted to help in the development of poorer nations and peoples. We welcome the new directions, outlined by the President's Task Force on International Development, which call for the reversal of the downward trend of such contributions and for greater use of international rather than national channels in distributing such aid. Only in this way can we share effectively in the promotion of global solidarity and increase the common stake of all nations in a strengthened United Nations. Sympathetic exploration in the United Nations of an International Volunteer Corps should be given every encouragement.

The patterns and practices of international trade in which we are engaged also call for a serious assessment in light of the present needs and the future well-being of the world. Our country should provide a far more adequate response to those nations which suffer from the injustices of the present system in which we play a powerful role; the structures which support these injustices must be examined with a view to change.

All of our strivings for true human progress will be frustrated if we cannot honestly regard each of our brothers as another self, whose true vocation, like ours, is to love and to seek and embrace the good and the true, and thus attain that higher level of life which is his destiny. This regard must be expressed, also in laws and institutions. Of the many Conventions drafted since 1945 by the United Nations with the object of securing reciprocal commitment by all nations to protect and promote particular human rights, the United States has ratified but one. We urge again, as we did in 1968, U.S. ratification of the Convention on Genocide and pledge ourselves to assist in the promotion of wide public dialogue, not only on those Conventions which have already been submitted to Congress, e.g., on forced labor and women's political rights, but also on others which should be so submitted, including those on racial discrimination and discrimination in education.

In any global approach to the problems of peace and human welfare, the real and potential magnitude of the People's Republic of China cannot be ignored. We commend the present Administration for continuing the efforts to develop workable relationships with the

people of mainland China and encourage wide public discussion of this subject.

Informed and conscientious participation in forming national policies is the surest way to promote change looking to greater international cooperation. The exercise of this right and duty should be ensured by continuing education. We must ask ourselves whether our schools, organizations and institutions are ministering to the formation of a global mentality or whether they are reinforcing outmoded nationalistic, and even chauvinistic, attitudes of the past.

In the development of a world public opinion, we would urge study of the possibilities inherent in the common interests and actions of the many international non-governmental organizations. Their experience is a contribution to the growth of world community and is so recognized in the consultative status granted to many of them by the UN Economic and Social Council.

In concluding, we recall the words of Pope Paul VI to the General Assembly of the United Nations in 1965: "This Organization represents the obligatory path of modern civilization and of world peace . . . Go forward." The path is obligatory because the world can no longer afford the luxury of completely autonomous and self-sustaining nation states. In the United Nations, therefore, we see the beginnings of a new international order to replace the jealous sovereignty of States and the fragmenting forces of nationalism—a new international order in which mutual cooperation and respect for rights and duties will lead to that human solidarity which may be said to reflect the plan of the Creator who made mankind one that they might seek Him.¹

1. This statement was approved by the bishops assembled in San Francisco April, 1970 to be published at a later suitable date.

Declaration on Conscientious Objection and Selective Conscientious Objection

October 21, 1971

Resistance to the draft gained momentum as the war in Vietnam became more and more a subject of public controversy. By 1971, thousands of young men had emigrated to Canada to avoid conscription. Many more were in hiding in this country; some were in jail. The Vietnam draft resisters differed from traditional conscientious objectors in one important respect. Most of them were not opposed to all use of military force. They simply objected to the present war; their dissent was "selective."

The bishops first address general conscientious objection. They begin by saying that each person is bound to observe the dictates of conscience. It is true that when a nation must defend itself, "the Church has traditionally upheld the obligation of Christians to serve in military defensive forces." However, according to Vatican II, "the common good is also served by the conscientious choice of those who renounce violence and war. . . ."

Noting that Catholics have sometimes been rejected for CO status because they are not members of a pacifist church, the bishops declare that "in the light of the Gospel and from an analysis of the Church's teaching on conscience, it is clear that a Catholic can be a conscientious objector to war in general or to a particular war. . . ." They then make several recommendations. Church agencies should assist Catholic COs, both general and selective. The Selective Service Act should be amended to allow selective COs to accept alternative service to the community. Finally, amnesty should be offered to COs who are in prison or who have left the United States.

For many of our Catholic people, especially the young, the question of participation in military service has become a serious moral problem. They properly look to their spiritual leaders for guidance in this area of moral decision and for support when they judge their sentiments to be in keeping with Catholic Christian tradition. For this reason, we wish to express ourselves on the following principles.

The traditional teaching of the Church regarding the importance of individual conscience is crucial in this issue of conscientious objection and selective conscientious objection. The obligation to seek

the truth in order to form right and true judgments of conscience and the obligation to follow conscience was put in positive terms by Pope Paul VI and the Fathers at the Second Vatican Council:

Further light is shed on the subject if one considers that the highest norm of human life is the divine law—eternal, objective, and universal—whereby God orders, directs, and governs the entire universe and all the ways of the human community, by a plan conceived in wisdom and love. Man has been made by God to participate in this law, with the result that, under the gentle disposition of divine Providence, he can come to perceive ever increasingly the unchanging truth. Hence every man has the duty, and therefore the right, to seek the truth in matters religious, in order that he may with prudence form for himself right and true judgments of conscience, with the use of all suitable means.

Truth, however, is to be sought after in a manner proper to the dignity of the human person and his social nature. The inquiry is to be free, carried on with the aid of teaching or instruction, communication, and dialogue. In the course of these, men explain to one another the truth they have discovered, or think they have discovered, in order thus to assist one another in the quest for truth. Moreover, as the truth is discovered, it is by a personal assent that men are to adhere to it.

On his part, man perceives and acknowledges the imperatives of the divine law through the mediation of conscience. In all his activity a man is bound to follow his conscience faithfully, in order that he may come to God, for whom he was created. ("Declaration on Religious Freedom," n.3)

Addressing the question in the "Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World," Our Holy Father and the Bishops at the Second Vatican Council wrote:

In the depths of his conscience, man detects a law which he does not impose upon himself, but which holds him to obedience. Always summoning him to love good and avoid evil, the voice of conscience can when necessary speak to his heart more specifically: do this, shun that. For man has in his heart a law written by God.

To obey it is the very dignity of man; according to it he will be judged.

Conscience is the most secret core and sanctuary of a man. There he is alone with God, whose voice echoes in his depths. In a wonderful way conscience reveals that law which is fulfilled by love of God and neighbor. In fidelity to conscience, Christians are joined with the rest of men in the search for truth, and for the genuine solution to the numerous problems which arise in the life of individuals and from social relationships.

Hence the more that a correct conscience holds sway, the more persons and groups turn aside from blind choice and strive to be guided by objective norms and morality. ("The Church in the Modern World" n. 16)

In addition, the Church has always affirmed the obligation of individuals to contribute to the common good and the general welfare of the larger community. This is the basis for the participation of Christians in the legitimate defense of their nation.

The Council Fathers, recognizing the absence of adequate authority at the international level to resolve all disputes among nations, acknowledged that "governments cannot be denied the right to legitimate defense once every means of peaceful settlement has been exhausted" ("The Church in the Modern World," n. 79).

When survival of the wider community has been threatened by external force, the Church has traditionally upheld the obligation of Christians to serve in military defensive forces. Such community-oriented service, that is, soldiers devoted to the authentic purposes of securing peace and justice, has merited the Church's commendation.

The Catholic Bishops of the United States are gratefully conscious of the sacrifices and valor of those men who are serving and who have served in the armed forces and especially those who have given their lives in service to their country. Their courage in the defense of the common good must not be underestimated or forgotten. In the words of the Second Vatican Council, "As long as they (members of the arms forces) fulfill this role properly, they are making a genuine contribution to the establishment of peace" ("The Church in the Modern World," n. 79).

It was also recognized by the Second Vatican Council that the common good is also served by the conscientious choice of those who renounce violence and war, choosing the means of nonviolence instead:

. . . we cannot fail to praise those who renounce the use of violence in the vindication of their rights and

who resort to methods of defense which are otherwise available to weaker parties too, provided that this can be done without injury to the rights and duties of others or of the community itself. ("The Church in the Modern World," n. 78)

Furthermore, the Council Fathers, addressing themselves more specifically to the rights of the conscientious objector to war, stated:

. . . it seems right that laws make humane provisions for those who for reasons of conscience refuse to bear arms, provided however, that they accept some other form of service to the human community. ("The Church in the Modern World," n. 79)

Although a Catholic may take advantage of the law providing exemption from military service because of conscientious opposition to all war, there often arises a practical problem at the local level when those who exercise civil authority are of the opinion that a Catholic cannot under any circumstances be a conscientious objector because of religious training and belief. This confusion, in some cases, is the result of a mistaken notion that a person cannot be a conscientious objector unless the individual is a member of one of the traditional pacifist churches (for example; a Quaker).

In the light of the Gospel and from an analysis of the Church's teaching on conscience it is clear that a Catholic can be a conscientious objector to war in general or to a particular war "because of religious training and belief." It is not enough, however, simply to declare that a Catholic can be a conscientious objector or a selective conscientious objector. Efforts must be made to help Catholics form a correct conscience in the matter, to discuss with them the duties of citizenship, and to provide them with adequate draft counseling and information services in order to give them the full advantage of the law protecting their rights. Catholic organizations which could qualify as alternative service agencies should be encouraged to support and provide meaningful employment for the conscientious objector. As we hold individuals in high esteem who conscientiously serve in the armed forces, so also we should regard conscientious objection and selective conscientious objection as positive indicators within the Church of a sound moral awareness and respect for human life.

The status of the selective conscientious objector is complicated by the fact that the present law does not provide an exemption for this type of conscientious objection. We recognize the very complex procedural problems which selective conscientious objection poses for the civil community; we call upon moralists, lawyers and civil servants to work cooperatively toward moral and civil order concerning this

issue. We reaffirm the recommendation on this subject contained in our November 1968 pastoral letter, "Human Life in Our Day":

- 1) a modification of the Selective Service Act making it possible for selective conscientious objectors to refuse to serve in wars they consider unjust, without fear of imprisonment or loss of citizenship, provided they perform some other service to the human community; and
- 2) an end to peacetime conscription.

In restating these recommendations, we are aware that a number of young men have left the country or have been imprisoned because of their opposition to compulsory military conscription. It is possible that in some cases this was done for unworthy motives, but in general we must presume sincere objections of conscience, especially on the part of those ready to suffer for their convictions. Since we have a pastoral concern for their welfare, we urge civil officials in revising the law to consider granting amnesty to those who have been imprisoned as selective conscientious objectors, and giving those who have emigrated an opportunity to return to the country to show responsibility for their conduct and to be ready to serve in other ways to show that they are sincere objectors.

Resolution on Southeast Asia

November, 1971

The truce that ended America's war in Vietnam was fourteen months away when the hierarchy issued *On Southeast Asia* late in 1971. A combination of military frustration abroad and turmoil at home led many Americans to see the conflict as both futile and immoral. The pressure for peace was becoming irresistible.

Intervening statements suggest that the bishops had long been uncomfortable with their 1966 position on the U.S. presence in Vietnam. Citing changed circumstances, they reverse that position. "At this point in history it seems clear to us that whatever good we hope to achieve through continued involvement in this war is now outweighed by the destruction of human life and of moral values which it inflicts." They call upon government to "bring the war to an end with no further delay."

Abstracting from the present conflict, the bishops insist that war is not an acceptable way to settle disputes. International cooperation holds the only prospect for building a better world. "Only by strengthening the United Nations as an international forum for peace and as a multilateral instrument for peace-keeping can future Vietnams be averted."

Americans must adopt "a spirit of forgiveness and reconciliation" once the war and the domestic strife it has caused are over. Veterans deserve help in readjusting to civilian life, while conscientious objectors should be given amnesty. Putting aside all rancor, we must look to the future with hope.

In light of the urgent appeal for justice in the world pronounced by the recent Synod in Rome, we Bishops of the United States address ourselves again to the agonizing issue of the American involvement in Southeast Asia. And we feel compelled to make some positive recommendations concerning the long journey ahead to peace with justice in our world.

I. The American Involvement in Southeast Asia

Three years ago, in our Pastoral Letter "Human Life in Our Day," we raised some basic moral questions concerning the Vietnam War:

In assessing our country's involvement in Vietnam we must ask: Have we already reached, or passed, the point where the principle of proportionality becomes decisive? How much more of our resources of men and money should we commit to this struggle, assuming an acceptable cause and intention? Has the conflict in Vietnam provoked inhuman dimensions of suffering?

At this point in history it seems clear to us that whatever good we hope to achieve through continued involvement in this war is now outweighed by the destruction of human life and of moral values which it inflicts. It is our firm conviction, therefore, that the speedy ending of this war is a moral imperative of the highest priority. Hence, we feel a moral obligation to appeal urgently to our nation's leaders and indeed to the leaders of all the nations involved in this tragic conflict to bring the war to an end with no further delay.

II. The Journey Ahead to Peace with Justice in Our World

It is our prayerful hope that we in America will have learned from the tragedy of Vietnam important lessons for reconstructing a world with justice and a world at peace.

First, we must be determined as never before to "undertake an evaluation of war with an entirely new attitude" (Vatican II, Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the World, No. 80). And we reach this new attitude by attending more carefully to the spirit of the Gospel and by heeding the pleas of recent Popes: "Nothing is lost by peace; everything may be lost by war" (Pius XII, Radio Broadcast of 24 August 1939); "In this age of ours which prides itself on atomic power, it is irrational to believe that war is still an apt means of vindicating violated rights" (John XXIII, *Pacem in Terris*, No. 127); "No more war, war never again" (Paul VI, Address to the United Nations, 4 October 1965).

Secondly, we realize that "peace is not merely the absence of war, but an enterprise of justice" (Vatican II, Past. Const. on the Church in the World, No. 78). In this vein we recognize our nation's moral obligation, together with other nations, to contribute mightily to the restoration and development of Southeast Asia. After World War II our country launched an unprecedented program of economic assistance and social reconstruction of war-torn countries. Certainly we can do no less now.

Thirdly, we are convinced that the United Nations must become more effective in the promotion of world justice and peace. In saying this, we echo the words of Pope Paul VI that "the people of the earth turn to the United Nations as the last hope of concord and peace"

and we recognize with the Holy Father that the United Nations "must be perfected and made equal to the needs which world history will present" (Address to the United Nations, 4 October 1965). Only by strengthening the United Nations as an international forum for peace and as a multilateral instrument for peace-keeping can future Vietnams be averted.

Finally, we recognize a clear need at this point in history to urge upon all Americans a spirit of forgiveness and reconciliation. We recall that at a similarly critical moment in American history, Abraham Lincoln urged his countrymen to act "with malice towards none, with charity towards all." We invite our fellow Americans to let these words guide new efforts to heal wounds in our divided society and to unite our country in the years after the war in Southeast Asia.

We speak with special concern for those who have borne the heaviest burden of this war: the young men who chose conscientiously to serve in the Armed Forces, many of whom lost life or limb in this conflict. We wish to express our profound sympathy to the wives and families of the soldiers who have died in Southeast Asia. We express our profound concern for our prisoners of war and their families and promise our prayers for the prisoners' welfare and release. And on behalf of the returning veterans we urge strongly that the Government increase the present benefits and educational opportunities afforded by the GI Bill, and that it create new programs of drug rehabilitation, vocational training and job placement wherever necessary.

Those who in good conscience resisted this war are also subjects of our genuine pastoral concern. They too must be reintegrated as fully as possible into our society and invited to share the opportunities and responsibilities of building a better nation. Hence we repeat our plea of October 21, 1971 that the civil authorities grant generous pardon of convictions incurred under the Selective Service Act, with the understanding that sincere conscientious objectors should remain open in principle to some form of service to the community. Surely a country which showed compassion by offering amnesty after the Civil War will want to exercise no less compassion today.

Conclusion

In setting forth our position at this time, we realize that the task of constructing a just social order and a world genuinely at peace will never be an easy one. But we must reaffirm that followers of Christ and all men of good will must redouble their efforts to achieve this task so worthy of our best efforts.

Otherwise, for all its marvelous knowledge, humanity, which is already in the middle of a grave crisis, will perhaps be brought to that mournful hour in which it will experience no peace other than the dreadful peace of death. But while we say this, the Church of Christ takes her stand in the midst of the anxiety of this age, and does not cease to hope with the utmost confidence. She intends to propose to our age over and over again, in season and out of season this apostolic message: "Behold, now is the acceptable time" for a change of heart: "Behold, now is the day of salvation!" (Vatican II, Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the World, No. 82).

To Live in Christ Jesus, "The Community of Nations"

November 11, 1976

To Live in Christ Jesus is a lengthy pastoral on the moral life. Its first section discusses this life in mostly abstract terms, while the second applies moral principle to the family, the nation, and the community of nations. The pastoral reflects on American society and America's place in the world during the bicentennial year, when this country was reviewing its past and seeking direction for the future.

The section entitled "The Community of Nations" begins with the assertion that "our allegiance must extend beyond the family and the nation to the entire human family." Two goals are especially urgent for a united humanity: peace and the development of peoples. For the United States, attaining the latter goal means using its vast power for the common good. "The powerful must therefore work for the liberation of the oppressed and powerless." The bishops mention that a call has been sounded for a New International Economic Order. While in the past the richer nations have thought of foreign aid in terms of charity, the new order would stress justice. The rules by which nations relate—trade policies, for example—would be adjusted to make them more fair to developing countries.

America's duty regarding war and peace is to restrain its power. The bishops note once again that war may be waged in self-defense. However, they immediately add: "But modern warfare, in both its technology and in its execution, is so savage that one must ask whether war as it is actually waged today can be morally justified." Certain acts of war, like targeting civilian populations, are clearly wrong, and all citizens should have the right under law to exercise general or selective conscientious objection.

The bishops speak of the need to control rigorously nuclear weapons, with an eye toward eventually eliminating them. Even their possession for the sake of deterrence is subject to limitation. The experience of Vietnam has also made the bishops wary of conventional warfare. "The moral reasons and the political purposes said to call for even conventional force of arms, besides being valid, must be clear and convincing before any commitment is made to a policy of force."

The pastoral closes with a few words on human rights in foreign policy. "This nation's traditional commitment to human rights may be its most significant contribution to world politics." The United

States should use its influence to promote the basic rights of the citizens of other countries, thus demonstrating American solidarity with the rest of the human family.

Our allegiance must extend beyond the family and the nation to the entire human family. In Christ we are brothers and sisters of people whose faces we never see, whose names we cannot spell, whose customs are unfamiliar to us, but whose Father is our Father.

Human interdependence is constantly increasing in today's world, so that many issues which pertain to human dignity call for the collaboration of a true community of nations.⁷⁰ Perhaps the central global issue of our day is how to create such a community out of a world of states. Pope John grasped the meaning of this challenge when he described the structural defect in the present situation: the lack of authority and institutions adequate to address the problems humanity faces.⁷¹ Most people agree about the problems and their seriousness: hunger, environmental pollution, population growth, glaring disparities of wealth, and the persistent danger of war, to mention only a few. But agreement is lacking on ways to cooperate in dealing with them.

Believing that the human family is called to live in unity, we speak of two goals for the community of nations which will also help bring it into being: the development of peoples and peace on earth. From the perspective of the United States, both are best addressed in the context of power. Our nation's enormous military and economic power make it essential that we understand how power should be used in the pursuit of these goals.

The Development of Peoples

All power is from God⁷² and is an expression of His being. God uses His power on our behalf: by creating us and sustaining us in existence, by bestowing His gifts upon us, by enabling us to grow in likeness to Him. As His creatures and children, we are to use the power He grants us for the good of others.

Power may never be used to attach the dignity of persons, to subjugate them, to prevent them from seeking and realizing the goods to which their humanity gives them a claim. Beyond this, the powerful have a duty to work positively for the empowerment of the weak and

70. Cf. *Vatican Council II, The Church in the Modern World*, 26

71. *Pacem in Terris*, 132-135

72. Cf. *Jn. 19:11*; *Rom. 13:1*

powerless: to help others gain control over their own lives, so that as free and responsible persons they can participate in a self-determining manner in the goods proper to human beings.

The powerful must therefore work for the liberation of the oppressed and powerless. Though liberation in the fullest sense is what "Christ Himself announced and gave to man by His sacrifice," it is not possible to foster such liberation in oneself and others without also "promoting in justice and peace the true, authentic advancement" of humankind.⁷³

Our nation's power, wealth, and position of leadership in the world impose special obligations upon us. Americans have always responded generously to foreign crises involving immediate human suffering: to floods and droughts, earthquakes and famines and the ravages of war. This is to our credit. But the obligations of which we now speak extend further. We must work creatively for a just international order based on recognition of interdependence. We must live by the principle that all nations and peoples are entitled to an equitable share of the world's goods as well as respect for their right of self-determination.

The values which comprise the international common good are threatened by existing patterns of international political and economic relations. Our lives, policies, and patterns of consumption and production should be examined in light of their impact on other nations and peoples. Pope Paul has urged such examination: When so many people are hungry, so many families are destitute, so many enchained by ignorance, so many schools, hospitals and homes worthy of the name have yet to be built, all public or private squandering of wealth, all expenditure prompted by national or personal ostentation, and the exhausting arms race become intolerable scandals.⁷⁴

The discussion of international justice and of institutions for its realization has become more specific as a result of the call at the United Nations for a New International Economic Order. Its significance lies in its effort to change the language of the debate from that of aid and charity to that of obligation and justice. The traditional question about foreign aid has been how much we of the industrial nations would choose to give others within the framework of the existing international order. By contrast, a discussion cast in terms of justice would examine the rules by which the system works—such things as trade treaties, commodity prices, corporate practices and monetary agreements—with a view to making them more just. New rules would clarify obligations among the parties. Politically, they would be de-

73. *Pope Paul VI, Evangelii Nuntiandi*, 38, 31

74. *Populorum Progressio*, 53

signed to improve the bargaining position of the developing nations in relation to the industrialized countries.

Such discussion of rules for relationships and the distribution of power on the international level may be new to us as Americans but the themes are familiar to our experience. The American tradition emphasizes that rules of fairness are central to a just political system. The developing countries argue that it is precisely rules of fairness in economic relations which do not now exist. Similarly, their quest for a new and more equitable form of bargaining power in relation to us echoes the drive for bargaining power by American workers over the last century.

Peace

We are also obliged as Americans and especially as Christians to reflect profoundly upon war and, more importantly, upon peace and the means of building it.⁷⁵

The Church has traditionally recognized that, under stringent conditions, engaging in war can be a form of legitimate defense.⁷⁶ But modern warfare, in both its technology and in its execution, is so savage that one must ask whether war as it is actually waged today can be morally justified.

At the very least all nations have a duty to work to curb the savagery of war and seek the peaceful settlement of disputes. The right of legitimate defense is not a moral justification for unleashing every form of destruction. For example, acts of war deliberately directed against innocent noncombatants are gravely wrong, and no one may participate in such an act.⁷⁷ In weighing the morality of warfare today, one must also take into consideration not only its immediate impact but also its potential for harm to future generations: for instance, through pollution of the soil or the atmosphere or damage to the human gene pool.

A citizen entering the military service is fulfilling a conscientious duty to his or her country. He or she may not casually disregard the nation's conscientious decision to go to war in self-defense. At the same time, no nation, our own included, may demand blind obedience. No members of the armed forces, above all no Christians who bear arms as "agents of security and freedom,"⁷⁸ can rightfully carry out orders or policies requiring direct force against noncombatants or

75. Cf. *National Conference of Catholic Bishops, Human Life in Our Day*, II, November 15, 1968

76. Cf. *Vatican Council II, The Church in the Modern World*, 79

77. Cf. *Ibid.*, 80

78. *Ibid.*, 79

the violation of some other moral norm. The right to object conscientiously to war in general and the right of selective conscientious objection to a particular war should be acknowledged by government and protected by law.⁷⁹

With respect to nuclear weapons, at least those with massive destructive capability, the first imperative is to prevent their use. As possessors of a vast nuclear arsenal, we must also be aware that not only is it wrong to attack civilian populations but it is also wrong to threaten to attack them as part of a strategy of deterrence. We urge the continued development and implementation of policies which seek to bring these weapons more securely under control, progressively reduce their presence in the world, and ultimately remove them entirely.

The experience of the last fifteen years shows clearly that it is not only nuclear weapons which pose grave dangers and dilemmas. We must learn from the moral and political costs, to ourselves and others, of conventional war as it was waged in Vietnam. With much of the world undergoing or approaching a period of deep and sometimes drastic change, there is need for restraint and for clear reflection about the purposes which can justify the use of force. The moral reasons and political purposes said to call for even conventional force of arms, besides being valid, must be clear and convincing before any commitment is made to a policy of force.

Today, however, the human family longs for peace which is more than the mere absence of war, peace rooted in justice and brought alive by charity. Such peace truly reflects Christ's vision of human life. Why is it so difficult to achieve?

Peace depends upon both the policies of states and the attitudes of peoples. A policy of peace can only be conceived and supported where a commitment to peace prevails. Cultivating this commitment and carrying forward this policy are intricate, delicate tasks. It is not that some among us desire war, but that those who speak of the risks of weakness are likely to dominate public debate. So the race to accumulate ever more destructive weapons continues in this and other nations.

Human Rights

There are considerable differences between what is required internationally and what is required domestically to preserve the peace and promote justice. On another broad issue, however, the protection

79. Cf. *United States Catholic Conference, Declaration on Conscientious Objection and Selective Conscientious Objection. October 21, 1971*

and promotion of human rights,⁸⁰ the values sought in our domestic political life and our foreign policy converge.

This nation's traditional commitment to human rights may be its most significant contribution to world politics. Today, when rights are violated on the left and the right of the international political spectrum, the pervasive presence of our nation's political power and influence in the world provides a further opportunity and obligation to promote human rights. How this should be done will vary from case to case; at the very least, however, national policy and our personal consciences are challenged when not only enemies but close allies use torture, imprisonment, and systematic repression as measures of governance.

The issue of human rights in foreign policy is ultimately a question of values. There is a direct, decisive bond between the values we espouse in our nation and the world we seek to build internationally. When human rights are violated anywhere without protest, they are threatened everywhere. Our own rights are less secure if we condone or contribute even by passive silence to the repression of human rights in other countries.

80. Cf. *Second General Assembly of the Synod of Bishops, 1971, Justice in the World*

The Gospel of Peace and the Danger of War

February 15, 1978

The war in Vietnam was fought under the banner of anti-communism. Yet even as the guns fell silent, the word of the hour became "detente." East and West would thaw their icy relations and cooperate, however warily, in the solution of common problems. This attitude, reinforced by a growing awareness of the real possibility of nuclear holocaust, led to serious arms negotiations in the 1970s. *The Gospel of Peace* was issued during the second round of the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT II).

Quoting Pope Paul VI, the bishops inveigh against the arms race. The United States bears a special responsibility here. "It is [a] dangerous deception not to recognize the potential for peace that our position in the world offers to us." Noting the SALT II negotiations and the upcoming U.N. Special Session on Disarmament, the bishops say, "the primary moral objective is that the arms race must be stopped and the reduction of armaments must be achieved." In order to carry out this imperative, the superpowers must control their arms buildup, restrain the proliferation of nuclear weapons, and restrict conventional arms sales.

Gaudium et Spes and *Pacem in Terris* teach that the way of non-violence and the use of force in defense can both be legitimate. "Both of these moral positions are rooted in the Gospel and provide for Catholics and others a reasonable and sound means of evaluating questions of war and peace in the modern world." However, the Church must go beyond mere analysis. "As the Church in this nation we seek to be a moral voice placing restraints on war, a prophetic voice calling for peace and a prayerful community which has the courage to work for peace."

In his Day of Peace Message for 1978, Pope Paul VI again called upon the community of the Church and the entire human community to reflect upon the meaning of peace in a world still marked by multiple forms of violence. Among these the spectre of technological warfare is the unique menace of the age. Listen to the Holy Father:

We would like to be able to dispel this threatening and terrible nightmare by proclaiming at the top of our voice

the absurdity of modern war and the absolute necessity of Peace—Peace not founded on the power of arms that today are endowed with an infernal destructive capacity (let us recall the tragedy of Japan), nor founded on the structural violence of some political regimes, but founded on the patient, rational and loyal method of justice and freedom, such as the great international institutions of today are promoting and defending. We trust that the magisterial teachings of our great predecessors Pius XII and John XXIII will continue to inspire on this fundamental theme the wisdom of modern teachers and contemporary politicians. (Paul VI, *No to Violence, Yes to Peace*, January 1, 1978).

As teachers in the Church these words of Pope Paul speak to us with a special resonance. His annual messages on the Day of Peace constitute a striking fulfillment of the mandate of Vatican Council II: "to undertake an evaluation of war with an entirely new attitude" (*Gaudium et Spes*, para. 80). Such a new attitude was clearly evident in the 1976 intervention of The Holy See at the United Nations when it said that the arms race is "to be condemned unreservedly" as a danger, an injustice and a mistake ("A Plea for Disarmament," *Osservatore Romano*, June, 1976).

The dangers of the arms race are a concern and a challenge to the whole human family. Moreover, all the members of the universal Church are called to witness to the Gospel of Peace. For the Church in the United States, however, the prophetic words of the Holy Father have a special significance. No nation has a more critical role in determining the delicate balance between the dangers of war and the possibilities of peace. It is an illusion to think the U.S. bears this responsibility alone; but it is a more dangerous deception not to recognize the potential for peace that our position in the world offers to us.

In 1978 two events will highlight the U.S. role and responsibility in the arms race. The first is the forthcoming VIII Special Session of the United Nations on Disarmament. The second is the continuing debate in the U.S. about a SALT II agreement with the Soviet Union designed to place new limits on nuclear weapons. It is not our purpose in this statement to engage in a detailed analysis of either of these topics, but to identify them as two instances of political debate in which the moral issues of the arms race can be articulated along with its technical dimensions.

The primary moral imperative is that the arms race must be stopped and the reduction of armaments must be achieved ("A Plea for Disarmament"). In pursuit of these objectives several specific choices

must be made to bring the superpower arms race under control quantitatively and qualitatively, to restrain the proliferation of nuclear weapons, and to place restrictions on the rapid growth of conventional arms sales in the world.

Each of these complex issues requires separate treatment so that the relationship of moral and technical factors can be articulated and weighed. The evaluation must occur within the policy process and in the wider ambit of informed public discussion. Catholic teaching on the morality of war has traditionally been designed to speak to both of these audiences. The teaching seeks to establish a moral framework for policy debate and to provide pastoral guidance for individuals. It is incumbent upon us as bishops and other members of the Church, especially lay Catholics with particular competencies relevant to preserving peace, to fulfill this task today.

The contemporary resources of Catholic teaching on war and peace are rich. The doctrine of *Pacem in Terris* (1963) and *Gaudium et Spes* (1965) supplies new and fresh religious and moral perspectives to support those who in conscience choose the way of nonviolence as a witness to the Gospel. These same documents affirm, as Catholic teaching traditionally has acknowledged, that some uses of force in defense of the common good are legitimate. Both of these moral positions are rooted in the Gospel and provide for Catholics and others a reasonable and sound means of evaluating questions of war and peace in the modern world. In an effort to contribute to the policy and public debate in the months to come, we will draw from both of these moral positions to speak to specific issues in the arms debate.

Beyond this important task of moral analysis, however, the Church has another role. The Church must be a prophetic voice for peace. In the tradition of the last three popes the Church in our land must explain the meaning of peace, call people and governments to pursue peace and stand against those forces and elements which prevent the coming of true peace. To pursue peace in the political process requires courage; at times it means taking risks for peace. The Church in a competent and careful manner must encourage reasonable risks for peace. To risk requires a degree of faith and faith in turn is based on the hope that comes from prayer. As the Church in this nation we seek to be a moral voice placing restraints on war, a prophetic voice calling for peace and a prayerful community which has the courage to work for peace.

SALT II ***A Statement of*** ***Support***

September 6, 1979

This testimony was delivered to the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee. It offers carefully qualified support for the SALT II treaty, which had been signed in June and lay before the Senate for ratification. President Carter withdrew the treaty shortly thereafter as a result of renewed international tension in the wake of the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan.

After quoting from recent popes and the Second Vatican Council, Cardinal Krol strikes the keynote of his presentation. "The Catholic bishops of this country believe that too long have we Americans been preoccupied with preparations for war. . . . Is it not time that we concentrate our efforts on peace rather than war? Is it not time that we take that first step toward peace: gradual, bilateral, negotiated disarmament?"

As usual, the testimony refers to a nation's right to defend itself. The bishops, however, speaking through Cardinal Krol, insist that nuclear war is qualitatively different. "The perspective which shapes this testimony, therefore, recognizes that some forms of war can be morally legitimate, but judges that nuclear war surpasses the boundaries of legitimate self-defense." Following Vatican II, the use of strategic nuclear weapons is condemned.

Cardinal Krol's 1979 testimony rendered a more extended evaluation of the nuclear question. It made three interrelated moral judgments. First, the primary moral imperative is to prevent any use of nuclear weapons under any conditions. Second, the testimony judged that the possession of nuclear weapons in our policy of deterrence cannot be justified in principle, but can be tolerated only if the deterrent framework is used to make progress on arms limitation and reductions. The third principle, a corollary of the second, is the imperative for the superpowers to pursue meaningful arms limitation aimed at substantial reductions and real disarmament. Indeed, as Cardinal Krol stated, the phasing out altogether of nuclear deterrence and the threat of mutual assured destruction must always be the goal of our efforts.

Cardinal Krol describes the treaty itself as part of a process. He speaks of future negotiations in which the goal will be "real, demonstrable reductions in both weapons and delivery systems." The superpowers must take some risks to end an arms race that absorbs

funds important for meeting human needs and that poses the ultimate risk to survival. Referring to the newly-elected John Paul II, Cardinal Krol declares, "the pope asked for prayers 'to bring progress to the great cause of laying down weapons and pursuing honest, stable and effective agreements' of peace and concord."

I am Cardinal John Krol, archbishop of Philadelphia. I speak on behalf of the U.S. Catholic Conference comprising more than 350 bishops of the United States, serving more than 50 million Catholics.

I express the sincere gratitude of the USCC for the opportunity to present the views of the Catholic bishops of the United States on the moral aspects of the nuclear arms race.

I. Perspective of the Testimony

The moral principles underlying my testimony have been enunciated clearly in papal documents and speeches and in Vatican Council II. Pius XII pleaded on the eve of World War II: "Nothing is lost by peace, everything may be lost by war" (Aug. 24, 1939). Paul VI, speaking to the General Assembly of the United Nations, said: "No more war, war never again. Peace must guide the destinies of all peoples and of all mankind. . . . Disarmament is the first step toward peace. . . . As long as man remains the weak, changeable and even wicked being he often shows himself to be, defensive armaments will also be necessary" (Oct. 4, 1965).

Vatican Council II, in its Constitution on the Church in the Modern World, declared:

"The arms race is one of the most grievous plagues of the human race, and it inflicts an intolerable injury upon the world" (n. 81);

"The arms race is not a secure way of maintaining the true peace, and the resulting balance of power is no sure and genuine path to achieving it" (n. 80);

"Since peace must be born of mutual trust between peoples, instead of being forced on nations through dread of arms, all must work to put an end to the arms race and make a real beginning of disarmament, not unilaterally indeed, but at an equal rate on all sides, on the basis of agreements and backed up by genuine and effective guarantees" (n. 82).

These principles reflect the authentic position of the Catholic Church and of faithful Catholics. The manner and degree to which these principles are reflected in a particular proposal, such as the

Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty II, admits a divergence of views. For this reason I recognize, and I want this committee to know, that while the principles to which we subscribe are clear and generally accepted, the position I present here today is the view of the majority of the Administrative Board of the bishops' conference; it is not a unanimous position within the conference of bishops nor is it the unanimous position of all Catholics in the United States. It is however the official policy of the U.S. Catholic Conference, and in expressing it, we bishops seek to fulfill a role of responsible citizenship as well as religious leadership.

This role requires me to speak the truth plainly. The Catholic bishops of this country believe that too long have we Americans been preoccupied with preparations for war; too long have we been guided by the false criterion of equivalence or superiority of armaments; too long have we allowed other nations to virtually dictate how much we should spend on stockpiling weapons of destruction. Is it not time that we concentrate our efforts on peace rather than war? Is it not time we take the first step toward peace: gradual, bilateral, negotiated disarmament?

It is impossible to regard this treaty as a spectacular achievement in the field of arms control. But we support its ratification as a partial and imperfect step in the direction of halting the proliferation of nuclear weapons and as part of the ongoing process, begun in 1972, to negotiate actual reductions in nuclear arms. Our support is, however, heavily qualified precisely because of the moral principles which govern our view of arms control.

No question of foreign affairs surpasses the arms race in terms of moral complexity and moral content. Along with the correlative issue of world poverty, the arms race forms the heart of the moral agenda of foreign policy.

The massive technical complexity of the arms race in its political and strategic dimensions is something that people in our government grapple with daily. We respect that technical complexity and have tried to assimilate it in this testimony. At the same time, for the church the arms race is principally a problem defined in religious and moral categories.

The specter of war in any form raises for Christian ethics the central question of the taking of human life. Since the life of every single human person bears the sacred dignity of the image of God, the question of the religious and moral significance of warfare has received more sustained reflection in Roman Catholic theology than almost any other moral problem. From St. Augustine's masterful treatment of war in Chapter 19 of *The City of God* to the Vatican Council II's injunction to the church that it should "undertake a completely fresh appraisal of war," there has been present in Catholic tradition

an abiding determination to limit the impact of war on the human family.

In a nuclear age, the moral sanctions against war have taken on a qualitatively new character. From Pius XII to John Paul II, the moral argument is clear: The nuclear arms race is to be unreservedly condemned and the political process of arms control and disarmament is to be supported by the Christian community.

This pursuit of peace is not based on a naive utopian view of the world. The Christian tradition is eloquent about the vision of peace; it is also realistic about the fact of war. Hence, Vatican Council II, recognizing the inadequate nature of the political structure of the international community, stated that "governments cannot be denied the right of legitimate self-defense once every means of peaceful settlement has been exhausted" (Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World, n. 79).

The perspective which shapes this testimony, therefore, recognizes that some forms of war can be morally legitimate, but judges that nuclear war surpasses the boundaries of legitimate self-defense. The application of this basic moral principle to our present situation requires that we distinguish two problems of the nuclear age: the use of nuclear weapons and the strategy of deterrence. Both are pertinent to our assessment of SALT II.

Prohibition of Use

The primary moral imperative of the nuclear age is to prevent any use of strategic nuclear weapons. This prohibition is expressed in the following passage of Vatican Council II: "Any act of war aimed indiscriminately at the destruction of entire cities or of extensive areas along with their population is a crime against God and man himself. It merits unequivocal and unhesitating condemnation" (Church in the Modern World, n. 80).

This was the only formal condemnation of the council and indicates the seriousness with which the bishops of the world viewed the possible use of what they called "modern scientific weapons." Our first purpose in supporting SALT II is to illustrate our support for any reasonable effort which is designed to make nuclear war in any form less likely. I have said that our support of the treaty is qualified; one reason for this is the paradox of nuclear deterrence.

The Moral Dilemma of Deterrence

The moral paradox of deterrence is that its purpose is to prevent the use of nuclear weapons, but it does so by an expressed threat to attack the civilian population of one's adversary. Such a threat runs directly counter to the central moral affirmation of the Christian teaching on war: that innocent lives are not open to direct attack. The

complexity of the moral dilemma is reflected in the statement on deterrence of the American bishops in 1976:

"With respect to nuclear weapons, at least those with massive destructive capability, the first imperative is to prevent their use. As possessors of a vast nuclear arsenal, we must also be aware that not only is it wrong to attack civilian populations but it is also wrong to threaten to attack them as part of a strategy of deterrence. We urge the continued development and implementation of policies which seek to bring these weapons more securely under control, progressively reduce their presence in the world, and ultimately remove them entirely" ("To Live in Christ Jesus," 1976).

The moral judgment of this statement is that not only the use of strategic nuclear weapons, but also the *declared intent* to use them involved in our deterrence policy is wrong. This explains the Catholic dissatisfaction with nuclear deterrence and the urgency of the Catholic demand that the nuclear arms race be reversed. It is of the utmost importance that negotiations proceed to meaningful and continuing reductions in nuclear stockpiles, and eventually, to the phasing out altogether of nuclear deterrence and the threat of mutual-assured destruction.

As long as there is hope of this occurring, Catholic moral teaching is willing, while negotiations proceed, to tolerate the possession of nuclear weapons for deterrence as the lesser of two evils. If that hope were to disappear, the moral attitude of the Catholic Church would almost certainly have to shift to one of uncompromising condemnation of both use and possession of such weapons.

With this in mind, the Catholic bishops of this country ask the Senate of the United States to ratify this treaty because the negotiations which produced it, and the further round of negotiations which it permits, offer the promise of escape from the danger of a nuclear holocaust and from the ethical dilemma of nuclear deterrence.

II. SALT II

Nevertheless, we have serious reservations about this treaty. SALT I had created a hope among people that SALT II would require real reductions on both sides. This hope has not been fulfilled and there is no clear indication that SALT II can revive that hope. That is why some of my fellow bishops and many more concerned Catholics refuse to support SALT II.

The U.S. proposals of 1977 had significant reductions in view but these were rejected by the Soviet Union. The present treaty limits

strategic nuclear delivery systems to 2,250 (after 1981) on both sides and this will require the dismantling of about 250 Soviet launchers. Such a reduction is not very significant considering the destructive power (3,550 megatons for the United States and 7,868 megatons for the Soviet Union) that will remain and continue to increase on each side.

Second, the treaty does not preclude either side from proceeding to replace its present land-based ICBMs with a new system, or modifying existing systems within limits, it is true, as to size and number of warheads but obviously embodying significant improvements in accuracy. These systems will obviously be more destructive.

On the other hand it cannot be argued, as do some critics, that the treaty does not constrain Soviet strategic weapons expansion. Under the treaty, the Soviet Union will not be permitted to deploy an already-tested mobile missile (SS-16); it must count all SS-18 missiles as having multiple warheads though some may not; it must stop its current program of deploying additional missiles with multiple warheads by about 1982 and may not increase the number of warheads in existing missiles.

SALT II is thus basically a deceleration, not a reversal, of the nuclear arms race. While the weight of this testimony comes to the conclusion that the quantitative and qualitative limits on delivery systems and weapons constitute an arms control achievement worthy of support, that conclusion becomes harder to defend if one assumes SALT II to be the end of the process. Much more remains to be done.

By far the most numerous opponents of ratification are those who reject the treaty as failing to protect U.S. security. In particular, there are those who argue that this treaty will permit the Soviet Union to achieve a first-strike capability against our land-based ICBMs, and that they will use this threat to challenge and change the strategic balance in various parts of the world. Can this really be reliably predicted? With the United States in possession of a large nuclear arsenal and varied means of delivery would not the leaders of the Soviet Union be insane to start, or threaten to start, a nuclear war even in possession of a first-strike capability vis-à-vis our land-based ICBMs? Can we gainsay the tragic reality that deterrence is still based on the posture and policy of mutual-assured destruction? Even if the Soviet Union were to acquire the capability to neutralize the U.S. Minuteman force of ICBMs, is it not clear that the other legs of the TRIAD will continue to deter a Soviet first strike, if indeed that were the Soviet intention?

Some critics of the treaty, however, do not base their opposition mainly on the premise that the Soviet Union would risk a first strike. Rather they argue that the perception in the world of the Soviet Union having first-strike capability will lead to an adverse shift in the global

political balance. I do not pose as a political or technical expert, but I must ask whether in the nuclear age it can be argued that an increment of strategic power can so easily be translated into an effective instrument of political influence. This translation from the strategic balance to specific political conflicts seems particularly complex precisely in those situations in the developing world where forces of nationalism and a plethora of ideological positions are vying for control. The cost of using nuclear weapons on the part of those who employ them has deprived them of much of their strategic utility and has made their political usefulness equally problematical. For example, the Soviet Union has not been able to achieve a decisive political advantage vis-à-vis China, despite the former's admitted military superiority.

On balance, we are satisfied that while the treaty does not require a reduction in nuclear weaponry on either side, at the same time it will not substantially endanger U.S. security. Whatever risks may be involved are worth taking for the sake of ensuring that the SALT II negotiations will be followed quickly by a third round aimed at more significant reductions.

III. Beyond SALT II

By itself SALT II is no more than a beginning. It creates a certain momentum which should make possible more impressive arms-control achievements. If not, our confidence may have been misplaced. What are the prospects?

It is our hope that the U.S. agenda for future negotiations will be bold and imaginative and the aim of the negotiators should be real, demonstrable reductions in both weapons and delivery systems. Our negotiating posture should not sacrifice long-term possibilities for real disarmament in the name of short-term tactical advantages in the strategic competition.

It can hardly be a source of satisfaction or pride that the ratification of this treaty may be in doubt or that an arms-control agreement can only be purchased in conjunction with substantially increased expenditures for other arms. There is a prevalent belief in this country that our national security can only be preserved by the dynamic of technological development and investment in new and ever more destructive weapon systems. One reads that the decision to deploy the MX missile is a response to such perceptions but perhaps still not sufficient to reconcile opponents of the treaty.

We have already referred to the opportunities which the treaty affords for further escalation of nuclear weaponry by both sides. It has been argued during these hearings that ratification of the treaty should be linked to a new and massive program for expanding and

improving U.S. strategic nuclear as well as conventional forces. If the Congress accepts this advice, the hope which I referred to earlier for a reversal of the nuclear arms race will grow even dimmer.

Many of us remember being told by the then Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara in the late '60s that U.S. security depended on U.S. strategic forces being maintained at a level two or three times greater than that of the U.S.S.R. in terms of deliverable warheads. The United States now has 9,200 strategic nuclear weapons (re-entry vehicles and aerial bombs) compared to 5,000 for the Soviet Union; yet we are told we are no longer superior, in fact, are facing strategic inferiority and must exert ourselves to maintain or recover "equivalence." Where McNamara once was confident that neither side would be able to acquire a first-strike capability, we are now told that the Soviet Union is acquiring a first-strike capability and that the United States must hasten to do likewise. Witness after witness has told this committee that SALT II is acceptable precisely because it does not prevent the United States from meeting this challenge. Strategic "equivalence" is the new name for the nuclear arms race!

At the time of SALT I, Dr. Kissinger was quoted as asking, "What good is strategic superiority at these levels of numbers?" Are we not justified in asking today if strategic equivalence is an absolute necessity? Is this doctrine not an infallible recipe for continuing the strategic arms race? Are we not moving inexorably toward a situation in which each side has a first-strike capability, a posture and a policy, not of deterrence by mutual-assured destruction, but of readiness for and reliance on the capability for fighting a nuclear war?

We, the Catholic bishops, find ourselves under the obligation of questioning fundamentally the logic of the pattern of events implied by determined pursuit of strategic equivalence. Our purpose in coming before this distinguished committee is to speak on moral-religious grounds in support of arms control designed to be a step toward real measures of disarmament. It would radically distort our intention and purpose if our support of SALT II were in any way coupled with plans for new military expenditures. The treaty should be approved as an arms-control measure, not as a maneuver to increase the strategic budget.

These proposed new strategic systems will require a massive outlay of funds at a time of increasing fiscal stringency. The Constitution of the United States calls upon the executive and legislative branches of our government not only to provide for the common defense but also to establish justice, to promote the general welfare of the nation and to secure the blessings of liberty for ourselves and our posterity. Estimates for the MX missile run from \$30 billion upward during the next decade; with the existing national debt at \$805 billion and pressure being exerted on legislative bodies at all levels to reduce

expenditures, the investment of \$30 billion in one weapons system inevitably will result in new limits on spending for essential human services here and abroad.

This topic of the competition of arms for scarce resources has been an abiding concern for me. Speaking at the Synod of Bishops in 1971, I argued then and still believe now that:

"The armaments race violates the rights of the world's poor in a way that is fruitless and intolerable. The reason is that it is not the way to protect human life nor foster peace, but on the contrary the causes of war are thereby aggravated little by little."

It is our recommendation that systems like the MX, as well as Trident II, should be considered as negotiable in return for equivalent concessions by the Soviet Union in SALT III. We have been told that the aim of SALT III will be "deep cuts" in the strategic arsenals of both superpowers; we fervently hope this will be true.

As we consider the future of the U.S. defense policy, it might be well to review one dimension of the SALT I negotiations. At that time the possibility existed of excluding the deployment of MIRVs; we did not take that option. Now we find that one of the major objections of those opposing SALT II is the threat posed by the Soviets to our land-based ICBMs. The Soviet MIRV capability is a central element of the threat to our ICBMs, a threat which we might have obviated by a different negotiating posture in SALT I. Our hope is that we will carefully consider the MX and related decisions in the light of their impact on the negotiating process of SALT III. Perhaps the most important single strategic arms-control step would be the elimination of MIRVs from the respective ICBM forces. Unrealistic as it may seem to hardheaded defense planners, the question should be raised now whether the United States could try immediately to negotiate a lower MIRV level for ICBMs.

IV. Summary

The foregoing testimony may be summarized in the following propositions:

1. Catholics reject means of waging or even deterring war which could result in destruction beyond control and possibly a final holocaust of humanity.
2. In particular, strategic nuclear weapons of massive destructiveness and poisonous regional or global aftereffects must never be used.
3. Consequently, the reduction through negotiated agreements and, eventually, the elimination of such weapons, must be the ov-

erriding aim of policy. Without it, there can be only one alternative: the indefinite continuation and escalation of the strategic competition. The doctrine of strategic equality, by itself, does not ensure against such competition; rather it almost guarantees it. Some risks must be taken in the direction of control, both to avoid nuclear war and to rescue us from the moral dilemma of nuclear deterrence.

4. SALT II, the result of seven years of negotiation, represents a limited but acceptable agreement which constrains the nuclear forces of both the United States and the Soviet Union, does not jeopardize U.S. security, and can be the beginning of a continuing and necessary process for obtaining meaningful and progressive reductions. The treaty should be ratified by the Senate.

5. This process must not be sacrificed to a narrow and technologically oriented insistence upon exploitation of new nuclear options, including counterforce options. In particular, final decisions regarding deployment of the MX and Trident II should be deferred until the utility of those options for negotiation in SALT III can be explored.

6. Failure by the United States to take full advantage of the possibilities for further restraints and reductions will eventually rob U.S. foreign and defense policy of moral legitimacy.

Mr. Chairman, the attention of the whole world has been captured by the new pope, John Paul II. He has already taken note of the significance of SALT II for world peace. The pope's remarks came in his weekly Sunday talk before leading the noon Angelus in St. Peter's Square. The SALT accord, he said, "is not yet a reduction of weaponry or, as could be hoped, a provision for disarmament. But that does not mean that the foreseen measures are not a sign, which we ought to greet with pleasure, of the desire to pursue a dialogue, without which every hope of working effectively for peace could vanish.

"Believers and men of good will who feel themselves so impelled by conscience to pledge themselves as 'artisans of peace' cannot ignore the importance of anything that favors a climate of alleviating tensions. This helps to encourage other indispensable progress on the road to limitation and reduction of armaments."

The pope asked for prayers "to bring progress to the great cause of laying down weapons and pursuing honest, stable and effective agreements" of peace and concord. It is with such sentiments that the U.S. Catholic Conference submits this testimony to the Foreign Relations Committee.

Statement on Registration and Conscription for Military Service

February 14, 1980

The debate over draft registration took place against the backdrop of an election year. Candidates Reagan and Carter agreed on the need for a strong defense, but differed on registration. This, coupled with still-fresh memories of the agony the draft had caused in the Vietnam era, gave the issue prominence. As they had with conscientious objection nine years before, the bishops felt a responsibility to help Catholics form their consciences on this concrete and current question.

The hierarchy notes the Church's commitment to peace, then affirms the right of the state to legitimate defense. "To this right there corresponds the duty each citizen has to contribute to the common good of society, including, as an essential element, the defense of society." This does not mean, however, that the individual must blindly heed his country's call to arms. On the contrary, "we also affirm the Catholic teaching that the state's decision to use force should always be morally scrutinized by citizens. . . ." Such a scrutiny "can produce a position of responsible participation in the government's decision, or conscientious objection to some *reasons* for using force, some *methods* of using force, or even some specific branches of the service because of the missions they may be asked to perform."

Having stated these principles, the bishops grant the legitimacy of draft registration, oppose conscription "except in the case of a national defense emergency," approve both general and selective conscientious objection, and oppose the registration and conscription of women. In closing, they ask Catholic schools, religious educators, and agencies to help young people deal with the prospect of military service and the broad issues of war and peace.

We have followed closely the public debate on the reinstatement of registration for military service with the possible renewal of military conscription to follow. The questions of registration and conscription for military service are part of the broader political-moral issue of war and peace in the nuclear age. But registration and conscription bear so directly on the moral decision-making of citizens that they require specific attention.

The U.S. Catholic Conference (USCC), and its predecessor the National Catholic Welfare Conference (NCWC), have spoken to the question of peacetime military conscription five times since 1944. The present debate in Congress and the media raises both old and new questions; we offer in this statement a body of principles and a series of positions in response to the public debate.

We recognize, of course, that the questions of registration and conscription arise, as Vatican II said, because "war has not been rooted out of human affairs." In the face of the sad truth of this statement, our response as teachers in the Church must be the same as that of all the popes of this century. We call in season and out of season for the international community to turn from war and to do the works of peace. The primary obligation of the nuclear age is to banish resort to force from the daily affairs of nations and peoples. From Pius XII to John Paul II the cry of the Church and the prayer of all believers is a reiteration of the words of Paul VI: "No more war, war never again!" This must remain our primary response to war today.

Only in the context of this statement can we consider the question of what is the legitimate role of governments and the responsibilities of citizens regarding military conscription. We see registration, conscription and participation in military service as moral questions as well as political issues. Our perspective on these issues is shaped by Catholic moral teaching on the role of the state, and the rights and responsibilities of citizens, when both citizen and state are confronted by questions of war and peace.

With Vatican II we recognize that: "As long as the danger of war remains and there is no competent and sufficiently powerful authority at the international level, governments cannot be denied the right to legitimate defense once every means of peaceful settlement has been exhausted." This principle acknowledges the right of the state to call citizens to acts of "legitimate defense." To this right there corresponds the duty each citizen has to contribute to the common good of society, including, as an essential element, the defense of society. Both the right of the state and the responsibility of the citizen are governed by moral principles which seek to protect the welfare of society and to preserve inviolate the conscience of the citizen.

The moral right of the state to use force is severely limited both in terms of the reasons for which force is employed and the means to be used. While acknowledging the duty of the state to defend society and its correlative right to use force in certain circumstances, we also affirm the Catholic teaching that the state's decision to use force should always be morally scrutinized by citizens asked to support the decision or to participate in war. From the perspective of the citizen the moral scrutiny of every use of force can produce a posture of responsible participation in the government's decision, or conscientious objection

to some *reasons* for using force, some *methods* of using force, or even some specific branches of the service because of the missions they may be asked to perform (*Cf. Human Life In Our Day*).

In light of these general principles, we are led to the following specific positions:

1. *Registration*: We acknowledge the right of the state to register citizens, for the purpose of military conscription, both in peacetime and in times of national emergency. Therefore, we find no objection *in principle* to this action by the government. However, we believe it necessary to present convincing reasons for this at any particular time.

2. *Military Conscription*: We are opposed to any reinstatement of military conscription except in the case of a national defense emergency. We support the present standby draft system which requires the chief executive to obtain a new authorization to induct a specific number of men into the armed forces if clear purposes of adequate defense demand conscription.

3. *Conscientious Objection*: We regard this question in all its dimensions as a central element in Catholic teaching on the morality of war. First, we support the right of conscientious objection as a valid moral position, derived from the Gospel and Catholic teaching, and recognized as well in U.S. civil law. The legal protection provided conscientious objectors is a commendable part of our political system which must be preserved in any policy of conscription.

Secondly, we support the right of selective conscientious objection (SCO) as a moral conclusion which can be validly derived from the classical moral teaching of Just-War theory. The position of SCO has not yet found expression in our legal system, but a means should be found to give this legitimate moral position a secure legal status. The experience of the Vietnam war highlighted the moral and political significance of precisely this question. We are sure of the moral validity of SCO; we would welcome a dialogue with legislators, lawyers, ethicists and other religious leaders about how to transpose this moral position into effective legal language.

4. *Universal National Service*: We continue to oppose, as we have in the past, a universal or national service corps; our opposition rests upon its compulsory character when a proportionate threat to the nation or need for it is not clearly evident.

5. *Women and Military Conscription*: One of the new questions in the public debate about registration and conscription is whether women should be registered and conscripted on the same basis as men. This is a complex question which touches several issues. It is our position that the past practice of making military service an option for women but not an obligation has served us well as a society. We do not see good reasons for changing this practice and so we oppose both the registration and the conscription of women.

APPENDIX

6. *Methods of Registration*: While we acknowledge the right of the state to register citizens, we are disturbed by proposals to use methods of registration which would require schools to provide information for registration. Such direct access by public authorities to records for this sensitive moral issue could raise serious issues of church and state. We express our opposition to this method of registration; we support methods which do not directly involve the private or religious sector in the registration process.

In light of these principles and policy considerations there is a final point to be made directly to the community of the Church. The primary relationship of the Church to questions of war and peace is as a moral teacher. With Vatican II we affirm that: "All those who enter the military service in loyalty to their country should look upon themselves as the custodians of the security and freedom of their fellow countrymen; and when they carry out their duty properly, they are contributing to the maintenance of peace." We also affirm that the decision to enter military service and subsequent decisions in the line of military duty involve moral questions of great importance. Hence, the issues of registration and conscription raise questions of the kind and quality of moral education that takes place in our educational system. Specifically, it raises the question of what educational and counseling resources are available to a person facing registration or conscription. In adopting this statement of public policy on registration and conscription we call upon schools and religious educators to include systematic formation of conscience on questions of war and peace in their curricula and we pledge the assistance of appropriate diocesan agencies in counseling any of those who face questions of military service.

The Just-War Ethic and Catholic Theology Dynamics of Change and Continuity

J. Bryan Hehir

Director, Department of International Justice and Peace,
United States Catholic Conference

Historical surveys of Christian teaching on war conventionally employ Roland H. Bainton's *Christian Attitudes toward War and Peace* as a convenient, if not definitive, classification of positions.¹ Bainton portrays a direct and continuing relationship between the just-war doctrine and the Catholic Church. The relationship is historical rather than doctrinal; the just-war ethic is not exclusively a Christian preserve, but it has been most extensively cultivated within the Roman Catholic moral tradition. In the face of this relationship Gordon Zahn has provided an alternative Catholic posture. In his personal witness and his professional research, Zahn has defined and exemplified the meaning of Catholic pacifism.

It is of some significance to record and examine the implications of the fact that in recent Catholic teaching Zahn's personal position has received substantial support. The purpose of this chapter is to revisit the just-war doctrine in light of the emergence of pacifist themes in contemporary Catholic teaching. The analysis will first review the historical linkage of the just-war ethic and the Church, then explore the content of contemporary Catholic teaching, and finally, probe the future directions in which Catholic theology and witness may move.

The Classical Case: Just-War Doctrine and Catholic Theology

LeRoy B. Walters concludes his illuminating study of five just-war authors with the observation that there exist several just-war theories within a single just-war tradition.² While acknowledging this doctrinal pluralism, the focus in this section is to specify the relationship between the just-war tradition and the Catholic tradition. This relationship can be illustrated with new clarity and precision

1. R. H. Bainton, *Christian Attitudes toward War and Peace* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1960).

2. LeRoy B. Walters, Jr., "Five Classic Just-War Theories: A Study in the Thought of Thomas Aquinas, Vitoria, Suarez, Gentili, and Grotius," (Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1971), pp. 419-20.

today thanks to a series of excellent historical studies on just-war theories which have appeared in the last decade.³ On the basis of these studies it is possible to distinguish four stages of development of just-war thought in the Catholic tradition. The four stages are associated with distinctive personalities: Augustine (d.430), Aquinas (d.1274), the Spanish Scholastics (Vitoria [d.1546] and Suarez [d.1617]), and twentieth-century papal teaching. In the context of this article it is possible only to identify the broad lines of development within the just-war tradition and to summarize the conceptual product of just-war norms as they exist today.

Augustine provided the basic rationale for other just-war theorists by utilizing a moral argument which legitimized the use of force as a means of implementing the gospel command of love in the political order.⁴ Augustine's argument is political in the sense that his moral judgment on warfare emerged from an assessment of the possibilities and requirements of order in the political community. Augustine's theological anthropology is marked by an abiding consciousness of the effect of sin in human affairs. War is both the product of sin and a remedy for it; in a world marked by sin, the use of force by public authorities is a legitimate means of avenging evil. In the face of the New Testament ethic, most powerfully evident in the Sermon on the Mount, the use of force was problematical for Christians but not impossible to reconcile with the gospel. Augustine combined an ethic of intention with a powerful sense of the needs of public order in constructing a position which prohibited killing in self-defense, but acknowledged its possibility in social relations.⁵

Thomas Aquinas inherited the Augustinian position, accepted its basic rationale, and provided the just-war theory with a systematic set of criteria; just cause, legitimate authority, and right intention.⁶

Following Augustine, Thomas located his analysis of just war within the framework of an ethic of charity and tied it directly to the needs of the common good. The taking of human life remained a major moral problem for those committed to the message and life of Jesus; it could be justified only by referring it to the defense of the common good. The purpose of the just-war ethic was not to rationalize violence, but to limit its scope and methods in a world where force was a tragic but necessary instrument of the political process.

The ambivalence of legitimizing even a limited use of force within an evangelical ethic appears in Thomas' discussion of the right of self-defense. Augustine has prohibited the killing of another in the name of self-defense. Aquinas accepted the measure, but only by using the principle of double effect: public authorities could directly will the taking of life, but private persons could *intend* only the deterring of aggression, not the death of the aggressor.⁷ The principal role of Aquinas in the just-war tradition was that he systematized the limiting criteria which had developed since Augustine, and he added his immense authority in Catholic theological tradition to the just-war concept.

Aquinas did theology in the context of a unified Christian commonwealth with the Church established as the recognized moral authority. By the time Vitoria and Suarez addressed the problem of war two decisive changes had occurred. First, the emergence of the nation-state produced a qualitatively new center of secular political authority which challenged both the idea of a wider Christian commonwealth and the binding power of any universal moral authority higher than the state. Second, the impact of the Reformation eroded the spiritual and moral bonds of the Christian community which Augustine and Aquinas had taken for granted. Faced with a new political and religious context, the Spanish Scholastics labored to save the substance of the just-war ethic by revising its structure.⁸ The emphasis of the normative teaching shifted from Aquinas' strong stress on just cause toward a concentration on questions of means used in warfare. The category of just-cause war was modified to allow for the possibility that both sides subjectively perceived themselves to have justifiable reasons for war. In the face of this principle, itself an accommodation to the secular nation-state, the moralists made a tactical retreat to the

3. In addition to Walters, cf. F. H. Russell, *The Just War in the Middle Ages* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1977); J. Johnson, *Ideology, Reason, and the Limitation of War: Religious and Secular Concepts, 1200-1740* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1975).

4. Russell, *Just War in the Middle Ages* (pp. 16-39) provides a synthetic statement of the theological and moral reasoning supporting Augustine's position.

5. Russell's argument is that Augustine provided theological grounding for Christian participation in war by "spiritualizing" the content of the Sermon on the Mount: it referred to the inner disposition or intention of the Christian, not principally to external actions, pp. 16-18. Walters makes a similar observation about Aquinas' use of the biblical data: "In answering the apparent biblical objections to war, Thomas' tactic was to limit severely the application of the biblical texts. Such limitations gave Thomas 'space' to develop his own thought in a way which did not contradict the Scriptures." Walters, "Five Just-War Theories," pp. 61-62.

6. Walters has taken the three criteria of Thomas and placed them within the larger framework of his ethical theory; none of the earlier commentators has provided such an extensive analysis of Aquinas' thought, pp. 60-199.

7. The treatment of self-defense by Thomas provided the first formulation of the rule of double-effect, which then became a permanent feature of Catholic moral thought: *Summa Theologiae*, II-III, q. 64, a. 7.

8. For the changing context in which Vitoria and Suarez wrote see: J. T. Delos, "The Sociology of Modern War and the Theory of Just War," *Cross Currents* 8 (1958): 248-265. For internal changes wrought in the ethical argument, see Walters, "Five Just-War Theories," pp. 201-409 and Johnson, *Ideology*, pp. 150-203.

position of seeking to limit the scope of violence among states. In recasting the content of the just-cause category and in enhancing the status of judgments about the means of warfare, the Spanish Scholastics, and to an even greater degree the Protestant theologian Hugo Grotius (d. 1645), provided the foundation for the secular science of international law.⁹

Between the seventeenth and twentieth centuries the only innovative contribution to just-war thinking in the Catholic tradition was the work of Taparelli d'Azeglio (d. 1862) in the nineteenth century. His efforts to think about the international community as a subject of moral law provided the conceptual foundation for themes in twentieth-century papal teaching. For the purposes of this survey, it is more useful to examine the product of the papal teaching rather than its roots. The principal link in the relationship of the just-war tradition and papal teaching is Pius XII. In a detailed analysis of Pius XII's teaching on modern warfare, John Courtney Murray illustrates how Pius XII both affirmed the just-war ethic and modified its content.¹⁰

On the one hand, Pius XII's approach to war acknowledged the possibility that force could be used as an instrument of justice, although he consistently tried to place this question within the framework of the need for creating a more adequate political and legal structure for the international community.¹¹ On the other hand, Pius XII was sufficiently impressed, on both moral and political grounds, with the destructive capacity of modern warfare that he reduced the legitimate causes of war from three (defense, avenging evil, and restoring violated rights) to one: defense of one's nation or of others being unjustly attacked.¹² This marginal justification of the legitimacy of force in international relations foreshadowed the increasing discomfort which papal teaching would have reconciling modern weaponry with standards of reason and faith. At the same time Pius XII was vividly clear that pacifism as a moral posture was unacceptable.¹³

9. For Grotius' contribution to just-war and international law, see Walters, "Five Just-War Theories"; H. Lanterpacht, "The Grotian Tradition in International Law," *British Yearbook of International Law* 23 (1946).

10. J. C. Murray, "Remarks on the Moral Problem of War," *Theological Studies* 20 (1959): 40-61.

11. The theme of international order was a consistent dimension of Pius XII's teaching; see Christmas Address 1941, 1951, 1952, 1953 in V. Yzermans, ed., *Major Addresses of Pius XII*, vol. 2 (St. Paul: North Central Publishing Co., 1961).

12. Murray, "Remarks," pp. 45-46; esp. fn. 12.

13. Murray makes the point that Pius XII was speaking to a particular situation, but the statement on conscientious objection seemed to have the force of a general principle for Pius XII; the text is the *Christmas Message* 1956, cited in Murray, p. 53.

As the Catholic Church entered the pontificate of John XXIII, the just-war doctrine was solidly in possession.

The Contemporary Development: Catholic Teaching 1958-1978

Thus far the description of the just-war ethic has been cast in historical terms, specifying the close and continuing relationship between it and the public position of the Catholic Church. Prior to examining the specific characteristics of contemporary Catholic teaching on war it is necessary to summarize the constitutive principles and categories of the just-war tradition as it stands today.

The Content of the Just-War Ethic

Two excellent essays by Ralph B. Potter and James F. Childress simplify the task of analysis and provide a means of summarizing the tradition.¹⁴ Both Potter and Childress find in the just-war ethic an understanding of war as a rule-governed activity. Potter states the case synthetically:

The logic generally applied by wise critics in thinking about right and wrong in the use of force is admirably simple in its basic structure. First, there is a strong presumption against the use of force. The burden of proof rests heavily upon anyone who would take arms against his neighbor. But secondly, it is conceded that certain exceptions must be made for the sake of the common good.¹⁵

As Childress observes, evaluating war as a rule-governed activity sets the just-war ethic apart from both the pacifist posture (all war is unlimited violence and unacceptable) and the realist position (war is too central to security to be restrained by moral categories). To explore the meaning of "rule-governed activity" takes us into the categories and questions which reason poses about the use of force and the taking of human life. Both Childress and Potter locate the origin of the just-war argument in "a strong moral and legal presumption against the use of force."¹⁶ This presumption against war is reflected in the way Aquinas poses his *quaestio* regarding war: "Is fighting in war

14. R. B. Potter, *The Moral Logic of War* (Philadelphia: United Presbyterian Church, n.d.); J. F. Childress, "Just-War Theories," *Theological Studies* 39 (1978):427-445.

15. Potter, *The Moral Logic*, p. 9.

16. *Ibid.*, p.7.

always a sin?"¹⁷ In the pacifist tradition this "strong presumption" becomes in effect an absolute rule admitting no exceptions. The just-war ethic retains the presumption, but acknowledges exceptions to the rule.

Childress analyzes the structure of just-war moral reasoning by invoking W. D. Ross' distinction between a "*prima facie* duty" and an "actual duty." As Childress states the distinction:

When two or more *prima facie* obligations appear to come into conflict, we have to assess the total situation including various possible courses of action with all their features of *prima facie* rightness and wrongness to determine what we actually ought to do. The phrase "*prima facie*" indicates that certain features of acts that have a tendency to make an act right or wrong claim our attention; insofar as an act has those features it is right or wrong. But our actual obligation depends on the act in its wholeness or entirety.¹⁸

In the moral problem of war, our *prima facie* obligation not to do harm to others is balanced against the fact that failure to use force will leave the innocent open to unjust attack or will leave centrally important societal values (justice, freedom of conscience, etc.) at the mercy of those who neither reverence nor honor them. The moral decision to use force in the just-war ethic arises, therefore, from a conflict of *prima facie* obligations. When the just-war ethic is legitimately invoked, the conclusion is that our actual moral duty is the need to use force as a last resort in defense of human life and the values which provide life with meaning and dignity. The just-war ethic, with its stringent tests and structured moral vocabulary, is designed not to legitimate war as an acceptable activity in society, but to limit war to those cases, and only those, where supremely important values are at stake. In such instances the obligation to defend such values overrides the presumption not to use force.

The content of the just-war ethic is comprised by the criteria and questions designed to assess when the *prima facie* obligation to do no harm or to abstain from using force can be overridden. In the development of the just-war tradition Aquinas' three basic categories of proper authority, just cause, and right intention have been expanded into a complex set of criteria usually classified in terms of *jus ad bellum* and *jus in bello*. The first set of tests involves: (1) legitimate authority; (2) just cause; (3) last resort; (4) need for a declaration of war;

(5) reasonable hope of success; (6) proportionality (of the whole enterprise of the war in question); and (7) right intention. The second set of principles involves: (1) the immunity of noncombatants from direct attack; and (2) proportionality (of specific tactics).

Both Potter and Childress have examined the content of each of these criteria, and Childress has carried forward the essential inquiry of how the criteria should be weighed and related to each other. It is important to note that this articulated framework of moral analysis is the background in terms of which the just-war ethic has been invoked in Catholic teaching. Often the use of the principles, and even their meaning, was not clearly exposed, but the basic structure of moral reasoning was assumed. As a system of rational analysis open to explication and implementation it is open to use by all. Given the history of the ethic, however, its contemporary status in Catholic teaching is an issue of some significance. The rest of this chapter is devoted to specifying its status and speculating upon its future in Catholic theology.

Pacifism within Catholicism

In the twenty years since John XXIII took up the papal ministry, Catholic teaching on war has been in a state of movement. The principal development has been the legitimization of a pacifist perspective as a method for evaluating modern warfare. This has occurred as one piece of a larger pattern, so the pacifist orientation in contemporary teaching should not be seen as an isolated phenomenon. The task here is to assess both its meaning and its status in relationship to just-war thinking within Catholicism. The relevant texts which have produced the pacifist option are John XXIII's *Pacem in Terris* (1963), Vatican II's *Gaudium et Spes* (1965), and a series of statements by Paul VI during his pontificate (1963-1978).¹⁹

Both *Pacem in Terris* and *Gaudium et Spes* have contributed to the articulation of a pacifist position within Catholicism, but they have done so in different ways. The analysis of modern war in *Pacem in Terris* is notable for three reasons. First, the strong criticism of the arms race, and the balance of terror upon which it rests, is linked directly to positive proposals much like those of Pius XII, calling for structural reform of the international political and legal system. In Pope John's view the control of the arms race is one of several questions which exhibit the structural defect in international relations to-

19. The encyclicals of John XXIII, the conciliar text, and Pope Paul's Address to the United Nations are found in J. Gremillion, *The Gospel of Peace and Justice: Catholic Social Teaching Since Pope John* (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1976). Pope Paul has also made a major statement each year on the occasion of the Day of Peace—an observance he initiated within the Church.

17. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, II-II, q. 40.

18. Childress, "Just-War Theories," p. 430.

day. Second, *Pacem in Terris*, alone in the documents of contemporary papal teaching, provides no explicit endorsement of the right of self-defense for peoples and states. Third, the most explicit moral judgment asserted in the section on war seems to call into question the very rationale of just-war teaching. The rendition of the text has itself been the subject of extensive controversy. The most widely used version asserts:

Therefore, in this age of ours, which prides itself on its atomic power, it is irrational to think that war is a proper way to obtain justice for violated rights.²⁰

Some commentators, like James Douglass, have read this statement to mean that the conditions of modern war are such that no form of warfare can be justified.²¹ The passage is, therefore, a pure pacifist assertion. Others, like Paul Ramsey, contend that such an interpretation cannot be sustained. Ramsey sees *Pacem in Terris* simply reaffirming the position of Pius XII: that defensive war is the only permissible recourse to force in the nuclear age.²² This dispute over the "literal sense" of *Pacem in Terris* remains unresolved and may not be open to definitive resolution. In the face of contending views, the approach taken here is to place *Pacem in Terris* in the line of what preceded it and followed it in papal teaching. Since later documents consistently assert the right of legitimate defense for states, and yet make no attempt to reform, correct, or reinterpret *Pacem in Terris*, it seems reasonable to assume that the encyclical is not understood in Catholic teaching as proscribing the defensive use of force under very restricted conditions. Even if this reading of the text is accepted, it amounts to toleration of the use of force, not a moral endorsement. Both the tenor and the text of *Pacem in Terris* signaled a changing atmosphere in the Catholic evaluation of modern war.

In spite of his devastating critique of war, John XXIII provided no explicit endorsement of a pacifist position. This occurred for the first time in Catholic teaching in *Gaudium et Spes*. The tone of this conciliar reflection on war and peace is set by its expressed intention "to undertake an evaluation of war with an entirely new attitude." Two products of this new attitude are the endorsement of nonviolent

philosophy and support for conscientious objection. The first occurs in the context of the conciliar reflection on the nature and meaning of peace; "We cannot fail to praise those who renounce the use of violence in the vindication of their rights, and who resort to methods of defense which are otherwise available to weaker parties too, provided that this can be done without injury to the rights and duties of others or of the community itself."²³ From the perspective of ethical analysis, an endorsement *in principle* of a nonviolent position would have been conceptually more clear. As the text stands in *Gaudium et Spes*, it is closer to being a pastoral commendation of those practicing nonviolence than it is a statement of moral principle. In spite of this ambiguity, it does not distort the text to find in this passage support for a pacifist position as a legitimate option for the Catholic conscience.

Such an interpretation is confirmed in the next paragraph by the discussion in *Gaudium et Spes* of the obligation of conscience in the face of policy directives. In language noticeably stronger than earlier authors had used, the council calls upon Christians to resist orders which violate the natural law. In this context *Gaudium et Spes* addresses conscientious objection:

It seems right that laws make humane provisions for the case of those who for reasons of conscience refuse to bear arms, provided however, that they accept some other form of service to the human community.²⁴

No distinction is made here between universal and selective conscientious objection. While this omission leaves some issues unresolved, the thrust of the statement as it stands makes clear that in supporting universal conscientious objection, the council has placed the Church in support of those who affirm a clear-cut pacifist position.

Both statements in *Gaudium et Spes* are strikingly different from a just-war position, and the statement on conscientious objection reversed the position taken by Pius XII a decade earlier. In the years after the council, Paul VI contributed to the direction taken in these statements by praising nonviolent methods of social change.²⁵ Taken together, a series of statements from *Pacem in Terris* through the speeches of Paul VI have established a new position from which Catholics can evaluate the moral problem of war. The question which inevitably arises in light of these statements is whether Catholic teaching has simply become pacifist. Such an impression can be garnered from

20. This version is the way the text is translated in A. Flannery, *Vatican II: The Conciliar and Post-Conciliar Documents* (Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1975). Flannery is translating the *Pacem in Terris* paragraph as it is used in *Gaudium et Spes*, fn. to n. 80.

21. James Douglass, *The Nonviolent Cross: A Theology of Revolution and Peace* (New York: Macmillan, 1966), p. 84.

22. Paul Ramsey, *The Just War: Force and Political Responsibility* (New York: Scribner's, 1968), p. 78.

23. *Gaudium et Spes*, n. 78., in D. J. O'Brien and T. A. Shannon, *Renewing the Earth: Catholic Documents on Peace, Justice and Liberation* (New York: Doubleday, Image Books, 1977), p. 260.

24. *Gaudium et Spes*, n. 79, *ibid*, p. 262.

25. Paul VI, *Message for Day of Peace*, 1976.

some of the commentaries on recent Church teaching. James Douglass's position that *Pacem in Terris* is a pacifist document has already been cited.²⁶ John Yoder, in his work, *Nevertheless: The Varieties of Religious Pacifism*, classifies *Pacem in Terris* and Pope Paul's *Address to the United Nations* (1965) as examples of cosmopolitan pacifism.²⁷ In a statement submitted to the U.N. Special Session on Disarmament (1978), Pax Christi, an International Catholic Movement for Peace, made the following judgment about the state of mind of Catholics:

Concerned Catholics, in finding the traditional conditions for organizing violence inapplicable, are concentrating on the theology of peace, a theology based on the centrality of love and on seeing the imprint of the divine in every human creature.²⁸

The difficulty with these statements is that they push the texts too far. The total content of recent Catholic teaching does not support a judgment that the Church has moved from a just-war ethic to a pacifist position. The reality is both more complex, less clear, and perhaps morally richer than such an absolute "conversion" would be. There has been a dimension of change in the normative doctrine on war; its significance can be evaluated from the texts examined above, and from others which support and complement these. But there has also been affirmed a significant line of continuity with the teaching of Pius XII, and with the moral tradition of the just-war ethic.

Catholic Teaching and Legitimate Defense

The central theme which ties contemporary Catholic teaching to earlier just-war teaching is the repeated assertion of the right of states to legitimate defense. The relevant texts, in addition to Pius XII, are *Gaudium et Spes*, Pope Paul's U.N. Address (1965), and the Vatican statement, *The Holy See and Disarmament* (1976).²⁹ The substance of these assertions is basically the same: in a world of states, still devoid of an effective political-legal international authority, "governments cannot be denied the right to legitimate defense once every means of peaceful settlement has been exhausted."³⁰ Implied in this statement,

26. Douglass asserts the nonviolent content of *Pacem in Terris* several times in his chapter "The Nonviolent Power of *Pacem in Terris*," *Nonviolent Cross*, pp. 86, 94, 95.

27. J. Yoder, *Nevertheless: The Varieties of Religious Pacifism* (Scottsdale, Pa.: Herald Press, 1971).

28. Pax Christi, "Some Moral Aspects of Disarmament," statement submitted to the Special Session of the U.N. on Disarmament, May-June 1978, p. 3.

29. *The Holy See and Disarmament* (Vatican City: Tipografia Poliglotta Vaticana, 1976).

30. *Gaudium et Spes*, n. 79; O'Brien and Shannon, *Renewing the Earth*, p. 262.

and others like it, is a structure of moral argument which we have already examined.

The term "just war" does not appear in recent papal teaching, but if the right of legitimate defense is affirmed, then just below the surface of the affirmation lies what Ralph B. Potter has called the "moral logic" of just-war theory. This moral logic is the set of questions used to determine when recourse to arms is a "legitimate" act of defense and when it is not. To assert the right of states to defend themselves without providing a moral framework for the assertion is to leave the road open to indiscriminate uses of force. The assertion requires an ethical calculus defining both the legitimate ends and limited means which keep the use of force within the moral universe.

In fact *Gaudium et Spes* uses the traditional ethical calculus but does not identify it as such. The categories which legitimize some forms of force and prohibit others invoke terms like just defense, rely upon the principle of proportionality, and use the rule of noncombatant immunity as the key concept in the council's condemnation of weapons of mass destruction. The prominent use of the traditional categories illustrates that, even in the document which formulated a pacifist option, Catholic moral theology retained the conviction that war is possible, may be necessary in the name of justice, and, if necessary, must be a rule-governed activity pursued within a fabric of moral restraints.

The use of the traditional ethical calculus is also reflected in the way the arms race is treated in recent Catholic teaching. At one level the statements, from *Pacem in Terris* through *Gaudium et Spes* to *The Holy See and Disarmament*, are a relentless condemnation of the arms race. The passage from *Gaudium et Spes* is representative: "The arms race is an utterly treacherous trap for humanity, and one which injures the poor to an intolerable degree."³¹ The judgment is reiterated with qualitatively new strength a decade after Vatican II. In an intervention at the United Nations, the Holy See urged that the arms race "be condemned unreservedly" because it is "a danger, an injustice, a theft from the poor and a folly."³² Given the dimensions and danger of the nuclear arms race, the power of these statements establishes for the Holy See a position which is morally prophetic and politically important.

Equally significant, however, is the difference in tone and style in the papal discourse when it moves from condemnation of the arms race to constructive political change. The approach to arms control and disarmament is cautious and carefully drawn. It reflects awareness:

31. *Gaudium et Spes*, n. 81; *ibid.*, p. 264.

32. *The Holy See and Disarmament*, pp. 1, 2.

of the complexity of negotiating an agreement between sovereign states on an issue central to their security. The passage which typifies the recent teaching on disarmament is found in *Gaudium et Spes*:

Hence everyone must labor to put an end at last to the arms race, and to make a true beginning of disarmament, not indeed a unilateral disarmament, but one proceeding at an equal pace according to agreement, and backed up by authentic and workable safeguards.³³

The statements in Catholic teaching call for a fundamental change in the psychology and politics of interstate relations, from fear to mutual trust; understandably, they provide little guidance about which specific policy measures should be pursued to control the arms race. They do, however, offer a set of procedural criteria which reflect the approach just cited from *Gaudium et Spes*. The process of disarmament must be "gradual," "controlled," and "backed up by genuine and effective guarantees."³⁴ These operational guidelines are the product of a measured political realism in the face of a situation which urgently requires transformation, but which does not yield to simple solutions. The papal appeals for disarmament carefully try to incorporate both dimensions of the dilemma, prophetic vision and political wisdom.³⁵

The Question of Coherence

Sufficient exegesis of Catholic teaching on war since 1958 has been done here to illustrate the new state of the question. Whereas Bainton, and to some degree Pius XII, depicted an exclusive relationship between Catholic moral thought and the just-war ethic, the new situation is more complex. Today there are two moral responses offered to the Catholic conscience confronted by the moral dilemma of war. The first is the just-war ethic; the second is Christian pacifism. In a volume devoted to moral analysis it is not sufficient simply to describe the new factual situation. Moral positions must be submitted to the tests of consistency and coherence. The question for Catholic theology is whether the existing teaching forms a viable moral posture. In the new state of the question do we have moral complexity or simply contradiction in the two positions?

33. *Gaudium et Spes*, n. 82; O'Brien and Shannon, *Renewing the Earth*, p. 264.

34. *The Holy See and Disarmament*, p. 7; cf. *Pacem in Terris*, n. 112, Gremillion, *Gospel of Peace and Justice*, p. 225.

35. The message of Paul VI to the U.N. Special Session on Disarmament exemplifies this balance; speaking of disarmament it said: "It seems to be a problem situated at the level of a prophetic vision, open to the hopes of the future. And yet one cannot really face this problem without remaining solidly based upon the hard and concrete reality of the present" (May 24, 1978).

To assess the moral quality of contemporary teaching, it is necessary to begin with a recognition that pluralism is both a fact and a desired characteristic in Catholic moral theology today.³⁶ Yet, affirming pluralism as the context for moral teaching does not settle the questions of internal consistency and coherence. Pluralism cannot legitimize anarchy; for the concept to be analytically useful, there must be definite limits to pluralism. The limits define a framework of ethical perspective and discourse within which different methodologies and distinct moral judgments can be affirmed. The search for coherence begins with an assessment of whether the divergent conclusions of pacifism and the just-war ethic are rooted in some shared moral vision.

At the level of a general moral vision there are a number of perceptions and premises held in common by the pacifist and just-war positions. Both begin with a religious and moral conviction about the sacredness of life. This yields a positive responsibility to foster and preserve its sacred character, and a conviction that any taking of human life is a moral problem of the highest order. For both positions, therefore, war can never be explained as a purely technical or political problem. Nor will either position admit the "realist" view that once we pass from peace to war, we move from a world of moral restraint to a wasteland in which "anything goes."

As we have already seen in this chapter, the difference between the pacifist and just-war ethic surfaces when the presumption against using force is tested in a variety of conflict situations. The pacifist moral conviction about the inviolability of human life is so absolute and the pacifist religious belief about the ministry and message of Jesus is so tied to a nonviolent meaning, that no conflict of values even the defense of innocent life, can legitimize overriding the presumption. In the just-war ethic, as we have seen, the *prima facie* duty yields to an actual duty in which force is used in the name of justice. Briefly, the pacifist ethic has a single rule and it is absolute: force is never to be used; it is incompatible with the Christian vocation. The just-war ethic has a multiplicity of rules; it begins with the pacifist presumption, but it acknowledges the possibility of the presumption yielding to a rule-governed use of force, shaped by a multiplicity of

36. Among others, Charles E Curran has addressed the dimensions and implications of pluralism in Catholic moral theology: "Today there exists a plurality of methodologies which are employed by Catholic moral theologians, so that it is much more accurate to admit the existence of Catholic moral theologies when speaking in a strict sense about the methodological approaches to questions of moral theology or Christian ethics"; in *Catholic Moral Theology in Dialogue* (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1976), pp. 254-255. Curran specifically notes that pluralism extends beyond questions of method to particular moral issues.

criteria. Common premises yield diverse conclusions. The journey from premise to conclusion is shaped not only by different patterns of moral reasoning, but also by positions on theological anthropology and diverse readings of the empirical data of history.

An analogous relationship exists between the two forms of moral reasoning, however, and it is exemplified in the question of conscientious objection. The position of conscientious objection is a pacifist position: Gordon Zahn has described its moral significance in his writings, and has witnessed to its political significance in World War II. The position of selective conscientious objection is a product of just-war reasoning;³⁷ one arrives at the position by an application of the just-war criteria to a specific conflict. For the pacifist conscience, selective conscientious objection is not an option, since it implies that some uses of force would be legitimate. The new state of the question in Catholic moral thought is illustrated by the fact that during the Vietnam War the bishops of the United States placed the institutional Church in support of both conscientious objection and selective conscientious objection.³⁸ The two positions cannot logically be held by the same person; they are products of distinct patterns of moral reasoning. The initial question of coherence put to contemporary Catholic teaching is whether the positions can be held by different persons within the same faith community. It is not sufficient simply to say that both positions have been supported in Catholic teaching. The teaching must be tested by standards of theological discourse. The new state of the question requires systematic inquiry which will examine what the internal logic of each position is, how they are related, and whether they can be held in tandem.

The systematic inquiry will have to go beyond the initial question of personal conscience and test the coherence of the existing teaching at two levels of church life. John Courtney Murray has pointed out that the just-war teaching always had a dual purpose: to set the right terms for public debate on war, and to inform the Christian conscience.³⁹ The first level involves the Church as an institution in policy debate in society; the second level is a pastoral function directed at the conscience of each believer. The ethical coherence of the new state

37. For an analysis of selective conscientious objection, see R. Potter, "Conscientious Objection to Particular Wars," in D. Giannella, ed., *Religion and the Public Order* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1968), pp. 44-99; P. Ramsey, *The Just War*, pp. 91-140; J. Finn, ed., *Conflict of Loyalties: The Case for Selective Conscientious Objection* (Indianapolis, Ind.: Pegasus, 1968).

38. U.S. Catholic Conference: *The Catholic Conscientious Objector*, October 15, 1969; *Declaration on Conscientious Objection and Selective Conscientious Objection*, October 21, 1971, (Washington: U.S. Catholic Conference).

39. Murray, "Remarks on the Moral Problem of War," pp. 56-57.

of the question must be tested in terms of the Church's institutional and pastoral functions. Hence, the question of coherence is not only whether there can be pacifist and just-war Christians in the same faith community. It is also the question of what the public position of the Church shall be. At this level, participating in the policy debate of society, the moral pluralism within the community becomes more problematical. The implications for public policy of a pacifist and a just-war position are significantly different. The distance which pacifist churches keep from the policy questions is testimony to this fact. Since the Catholic conception of Church teaching includes the policy dimension as an integral element, one level of the inquiry about coherence is how to project a policy position out of a pluralist setting within the Church. These are challenges which arise from the internal logic of the new state of the question; as theological inquiry responds to them, it will have to confront one other factor, a sign of the times, at both the policy and pastoral level: the moral dilemma of the nuclear age.

The Nuclear Issues

The onset of nuclear weapons had a dual impact on the ethics of warfare: it created a new moral category and it posed a qualitatively new moral problem. The new category emerged as the professional and popular understanding of the destructive capacity of nuclear weapons increased. The empirical data pushed the debate on the morality of war beyond Bainton's distinction of pacifism and just-war ethics. Between these categories moralists posited a position of nuclear pacifism. The position is grounded in just-war premises (some uses of force are legitimate) but terminates in a pacifist conclusion (nuclear weapons cannot be used). Nuclear pacifists agree with the conclusion of Professor Michael Walzer in *Just and Unjust Wars*:

Nuclear weapons explode the theory of just-war. They are the first of mankind's technological innovations that are simply not encompassable within the familiar moral world.⁴⁰

While some commentators, like James Douglass, have used this conclusion to argue that the just-war ethic itself is no longer viable,⁴¹

40. Michael Walzer, *Just and Unjust Wars: A Moral Argument with Historical Illustrations* (New York: Basic Books, 1977), p. 282.

41. Douglass opens his chapter on "The Anatomy of the Just War" with the judgment that "the state of just-war doctrine in contemporary Catholic thought is roughly equivalent to that of the prohibition against contraception: it has lost its cogency in terms of current theological thought and continues in use primarily as a point of reference for those who wish to go beyond it," *Nonviolent Cross*, p. 155.

it can be argued with equal cogency that its viability is demonstrated precisely in the guidance it provides for affirming a position of nuclear pacifism. Catholic teaching has in fact used the just-war categories to assess the morality of nuclear weaponry, and the magisterial statements illustrate a development of moral perspective within the framework of the traditional criteria. Pius XII made the first official response to the question of the morality of nuclear weapons in 1954. John Courtney Murray correctly concluded that it is not possible to find in Pius XII's position an absolute proscription of nuclear weapons.⁴² The logic of Pius XII's argument was to classify nuclear weapons as simply another use of force, then to employ the traditional criteria. His key category of judgment was the principle of proportionality:

In any case, when the employment of this means entails such an extension of the evil that it entirely escapes the control of man, its use ought to be rejected as immoral.⁴³

The document of Vatican II, twelve years later, has a different tone and a broader moral conclusion. While not identifying nuclear weapons by name, the strongest moral statement of the council declares:

Any act of war aimed indiscriminately at the destruction of entire cities or of extensive areas along with their population is a crime against God and man himself. It merits unequivocal and unhesitating condemnation.⁴⁴

This condemnation is preceded and followed by commentary on "modern scientific weapons." After making the judgment just cited, the conciliar text continues: "The unique hazard of modern warfare consists in this: it provides those who possess modern scientific weapons with a kind of occasion for perpetrating just such abominations."⁴⁵ The source of the moral judgment in the conciliar text is the principle of noncombatant immunity. It certainly is a prohibition of the use of strategic nuclear weapons. Whether it can be said to be a definitive position of nuclear pacifism, condemning all use of nuclear weapons, is less certain. It is undoubtedly closer, however, to that position, in tone and substance, than Pius XII's statement.

Paradoxically, the unique moral problem posed by nuclear weapons is not the use of them but the threat to use them in a policy of deterrence. Nuclear pacifists, clear on the question of use, are them-

42. Murray, "Remarks," p. 49.

43. Pius XII: *Allocution to the World Medical Congress*, 1954; cited in Murray, "Remarks," p. 51.

44. *Gaudium et Spes*, n. 80; O'Brien and Shannon, *Renewing the Earth*, p. 263.

45. *Ibid.*

selves divided on the morality of deterrence policy. Deterrence is the hard case for policy and the limit case for the ethics of policy. Pius XII did not have to face the problem, and Vatican II's response is less than precise. *Gaudium et Spes* reflects the inherent complexity of the problem in the contrast between its ringing condemnation of total war and indiscriminate acts of war, and its nuanced and cautious evaluation of deterrence: "Whatever be the case with this method of deterrence, men should be convinced that the arms race in which so many countries are engaged is not a safe way to preserve a steady peace."⁴⁶ In this passage at least, no clear moral judgment is made about deterrence *in se*; rather the emphasis is placed on the arms race *in toto*, and the moral imperative is directed at moving the world away from the balance of terror. On the basis of his personal knowledge of the positions held by key bishops in the conciliar debate, James Douglass has argued persuasively that they believed they were passing judgment on both the act of waging war and on the intent to wage it.⁴⁷ In this reading the words of *Gaudium et Spes* would reach beyond acts to the preparation for such acts of total war. Only a hesitancy to judge the actual intentions of statesmen prevented the council from condemning deterrence policy.

Since no other analyst has had access to the material used by Douglass, his interpretation must be accorded significant weight in evaluating the meaning of the conciliar statement. His reading does not, however, go beyond the text of the statement.⁴⁸ It is not the purpose here to dispute his view, but simply to indicate that the hesitancy of the council to condemn deterrence pure and simple has an objective foundation. The caution in the conciliar text should not be attributed to a failure of moral courage. The complexity of the politico-moral problem of deterrence demands caution. The point is not that a moralist finds the paradox of deterrence acceptable; it is rather the paucity of alternatives which are both morally acceptable and politically viable.

The limit case of deterrence is shaped by a series of interlocking elements. First, the fundamental moral issue is the relationship between an intention to act and the execution of an action. Classic moral theology asserts that a formed intention to do evil carries the same degree of culpability as the doing of evil. The would-be assassin is morally guilty of murder even if his plan is frustrated. The policy of deterrence today is based upon a declared intention to do what just-war ethics could never legitimize.

46. *Gaudium et Spes*, n. 81; *ibid.*

47. Douglass, *Nonviolent Cross*, pp. 112-123, esp. p. 122.

48. Douglass acknowledges that *Gaudium et Spes* "is silent on the morality of deterrence," *Nonviolent Cross*, p. 119.

A second issue involved in deterrence policy, however, requires that an ethic of intention be fused with an ethic of consequences. As *Gaudium et Spes* observed in its description of deterrence: "Many regard this state of affairs as the most effective way by which peace of a sort can be maintained between nations at the present time."⁴⁹ This sentence captures the complexity and the uniqueness of the problem of deterrence. It is precisely this judgment, that the *threat* of nuclear retaliation may in fact be preventing the *use* of nuclear weapons, which gives some moralists pause before simply condemning deterrence policy because of the evil intent involved. If the intention to retaliate and the actual use of nuclear weapons both violate the ethics of war, is there a lesser evil in a threat which remains unfulfilled?

A third question which makes the calculation of consequences intractably difficult is the way in which the intent to act, the perception of that intention by one's adversary, and the possibility of moving from intention to action are related in deterrence policy. Specifically, a perceived wavering of intention to act may tempt one's adversary to act; a threatening, overbearing intention may frighten one's adversary into action. A radical or unilateral move, taken with the best of motives, but having as a consequence a "destabilizing" effect on the strategic balance, may increase the chance that deterrence will fail and the *use* of nuclear weapons will become the moral problem.

These literally insoluble dilemmas have produced a variety of responses to the morality of deterrence policy. One position, the ideal-type of nuclear pacifism, moves from a prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons to condemnation of deterrence policy because of the intent to use.⁵⁰ A second position, refusing to classify nuclear weapons in a unique moral category, argues that some uses of nuclear weapons are conceivably legitimate; on that basis it legitimizes some forms of deterrence policy.⁵¹ A third position prohibits any use of nuclear weapons, but tolerates the deterrent,⁵² employing some variant of Michael Walzer's position:

Supreme emergency has become a permanent condition. Deterrence is a way of coping with that condition, and though it is a bad way, there may well be no other

49. *Gaudium et Spes*, n. 81; O'Brien and Shannon, *Renewing the Earth*, p. 263.

50. W. Stein, ed., *Nuclear Weapons and the Christian Conscience* (London: Merlin Press, 1961).

51. Ramsey, *The Just War*, cf. chapters 13, 14, 15.

52. J. B. Hehir, "The New Nuclear Debate: Political and Ethical Considerations," in R. A. Gessert and J. B. Hehir, *The New Nuclear Debate* (New York: CRIA Special Studies, 1976), pp. 35-76. Cf. also P. S. Corden, "Moving Beyond the Just-War Tradition," in H. P. Ford and F. X. Winters, eds., *Ethics and Nuclear Strategy* (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1977), pp. 157-180.

that is practical in a world of sovereign and suspicious states. We threaten evil in order not to do it, and the doing of it would be so terrible that the threat seems in comparison to be morally defensible.⁵³

The Catholic bishops of the United States implicitly adopted this first position in a statement made in 1976. Going significantly beyond *Gaudium et Spes*, they declared: "With respect to nuclear weapons, at least those with massive destructive capability, the first imperative is to prevent their use. As possessors of a vast nuclear arsenal, we must also be aware that not only is it wrong to attack civilian populations, but it is also wrong to threaten to attack them as part of a strategy of deterrence."⁵⁴ This cryptic passage cries out for exposition.

To specify the contribution of the statement to the wider debate it is helpful to situate it in the categories already employed in this chapter. The passage has some affinity with nuclear pacifism in placing primary importance on the non-use of nuclear weapons. At the same time it stops short of an absolute prohibition on nuclear weapons by the qualifying phrase "those with massive destructive capability." Does this mean that tactical nuclear weapons are to be treated as indistinguishable from large-scale conventional weapons? If so, the statement is not one of nuclear pacifism.

Paradoxically, the caution in the judgment on the use of nuclear weapons is matched by a startling clarity of judgment about deterrence policy. The bishops' statement acknowledges none of the ambiguity inherent in the linkage between intention and use in deterrence theory. The statement simply applies the classical theory of intention to condemn deterrence policy. In summary, the surprising character of the bishops' declaration is that it has more of an absolute character concerning deterrence than it has about use.

Finally, the statement stops noticeably short of specifying the implications for policy and personal conscience of its condemnation of deterrence. Instead, it shifts its concern to the imperative to work for arms control and disarmament. In doing this the statement reflects a relationship with both Walzer's position and *Gaudium et Spes*.

This survey of magisterial texts from 1954 to 1976 shows Catholic moral theory struggling with the same "rationality of irrationality" which nuclear policy has posed for analysts in many disciplines. At one level it is possible to draw from the theory a strong tone of condemnation of the whole enterprise of nuclear strategy. At a second

53. Walzer, *Just and Unjust Wars*, p. 274.

54. National Conference of Catholic Bishops, *To Live in Christ Jesus: A Pastoral Reflection on the Moral Life* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Catholic Conference, 1976), p. 34.

level there are sufficient qualifications in the statements, as well as concessions to the complexity of the nuclear issues, that a final judgment on Catholic teaching remains an open question.

Future Directions: Ethics and Ecclesiology

In this concluding section the focus of the chapter shifts from a retrospective inquiry of tracing recent developments in Catholic theology of war and peace to a prospective attempt to identify emerging issues in the debate. The purpose is not to predict the future, but to place the new state of the question in a broad theological context. As Walters, Russell, and others have shown, the analysis of war fits into the larger framework of Catholic moral theology. In addition to the moral context, as students of Roland Bainton and Ernst Troeltsch know,⁵⁵ the Christian moral response to war and peace has always been related to an ecclesiological analysis of the Church's role in society. The future direction of Catholic teaching and witness about war and peace will derive in part from developments in ethics and ecclesiology.

Ethics: Moral Norms and Human Life

One area of inquiry, as yet not systematically examined, is the way in which some of the themes which have produced both pacifist witness and pacifist theory among Catholics have moved in a distinctly different direction from some key questions presently being examined by moral theologians in the Catholic tradition. Implicit in the pacifist position is the conviction that human life has an absolute value; it has such intrinsic worth that no conflict of values justifies taking human life.

It is important to observe two characteristics about this moral posture. First, it applies to other issues besides warfare, most notably opposition to abortion, capital punishment, and euthanasia. Second, the moral sensitivity of Catholics to the value of life has undoubtedly been catalyzed by increasing dangers to life in contemporary society, as evidenced by the threat of total war, widespread resort to abortion, and the often murky debate about "death with dignity." Gordon Zahn makes explicit the basis of his position on both war and abortion in the following response to those advocating liberal abortion policies:

There is that matter of "absolutizing" the right to life, and to this I am ready to plead guilty. At a time when moral absolutes of any kind are suspect and the fashions

55. Ernst Troeltsch, *The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches*, 2 vols. (New York: Harper and Row, 1960).

in theological and ethical discourse seem to have moved from situationalism to relativism and now to something approaching indifferentism, it strikes me as not only proper but imperative that we proclaim the value of every human life as well as the obligation to respect that life wherever it exists.⁵⁶

In support of this position, Zahn and others in the Catholic community seek to eliminate the exceptions which have legitimized the taking of human life (e.g., the just war or capital punishment). In the wider Catholic theological community there is a substantial support for the attitude of enhancing the value and protection given human life. At the same time it is clear that Zahn and many theologians would divide over questions of method and, in virtue of this difference, over specific moral decisions. To illustrate the difference in method, it is useful to take the principle from the just-war ethic which serves as a point of contact with the pacifist perspective: the principle of noncombatant immunity.

In traditional just-war teaching the principle prohibits the direct taking of civilian (innocent) life. Within the just-war ethic the principle of noncombatant immunity functions in a deontological manner, admitting no exceptions. The application of the principle by just-war theorists, however, invoked the distinction between direct and indirect killing. This meant that while "absolute value" was given to civilian life by noncombatant immunity, the just war also had a means to deal with conflict situations in which civilians would knowingly be killed in a legitimate military attack.⁵⁷

Within the past decade, moral theologians have begun a systematic re-examination of the direct-indirect voluntary⁵⁸ (i.e., the double effect) which has been the basis for the distinction between direct and indirect killing. The research has arisen in response to a sense of dissatisfaction with the method of resolving "conflict situations" across a range of moral questions (war, abortion, sexual and medical ethics).

56. Gordon Zahn, "A Religious Pacifist Looks at Abortion," *Commonweal* 94 (May 28, 1971): 282.

57. Charles E. Curran makes a similar point about Catholic moral teaching on abortion: "It is not exact to say that in the past Catholic theology condemned abortion. Catholic theology realized the possibility of some conflict situations and tried to solve these conflict situations by the application of the principle of the direct and indirect effects." Curran, *Catholic Moral Theology in Dialogue*, p. 258.

58. The most comprehensive survey of the research is to be found in R. McCormick and R. Ramsey, *Doing Evil to Achieve Good* (Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1978). The first chapter is McCormick's Père Marquette Lecture (1973), "Ambiguity in Moral Choice," which presents, with relentless virtuosity, a thorough, fair, and incisive survey of the literature.

The tenor of the movement is revisionist, not revolutionary; Richard McCormick conveys the spirit of the enterprise while concluding a painstakingly careful review of the literature: "This study would very tentatively conclude, therefore, that the traditional distinction between direct and indirect is neither as exclusively decisive as we previously thought nor as widely dispensable as some recent studies suggest."⁵⁹

The essence of the revisionist effort is to recast the moral calculus for decision making in conflict situations. The principle move is to devalue the role of direct vs. indirect intentionality and to place at the center of the calculus the concept of proportionate reason. Again, to use McCormick, who has both contributed original insights to the revisionist effort and has interpreted much of its early work for the American Catholic community:

If one examines carefully all the instances where the occurrence of evil is judged acceptable in human action, a single decisive element is at the heart of the moral analysis: proportionate reason as here described.⁶⁰

The arguments which lead to and support the revisionist case, as well as the various forms the argument assumes, are beyond the scope of this chapter, but its implications for the evaluation of war and peace are legitimate concerns. The revisionist position means a rejection of the notion of intrinsic evil in the sense of determining the morality of an action apart from its circumstances and consequences. In placing the notion of proportionate reason at the center of moral evaluation, the revisionist argument contextualizes moral decision-making and seeks to move Catholic moral thought more decisively in the direction of a sophisticated teleological approach.⁶¹ All of the classical conflict-cases, including war, are influenced by the revisionist argument. It is not possible to trace the consequences here, but it is possible to indicate the difference in orientation between the revisionist method and the perspective of a Catholic pacifist like Gordon Zahn. The significant difference for the purpose of this essay lies in a style of moral reasoning which produces divergent answers to specific moral problems. The revisionist position introduces a dimension of flexibility into the decision-making process precisely because of its teleological character. The concept of proportionate reason pushes the ethical calculus in the direction of assessing all the factors of a problem, of not giving one aspect of an action a unique weight, and it explicitly

59. McCormick and Ramsey, *Doing Evil*, p. 50.

60. *Ibid.*, p. 45.

61. *Ibid.*, p. 261.

acknowledges that "the basic analytic structure in conflict situation is the lesser-evil or morally avoidable-unavoidable evil."⁶² The revisionist position does entail the prospects of "doing evil to achieve good." The distance of this position from Zahn's is indicated by contrast which Zahn drew between the classical just-war ethic and the spirit of contemporary Catholic pacifism:

All the old calculations aimed at determining "proportionality," weighing "good" effects against "bad," and making possible the choice of the "lesser" evil are rendered meaningless by the simple refusal to accept any degree of evil as an appropriate Christian objective.⁶³

This critique of just-war reasoning was made prior to the debate about moral norms initiated by the revisionists. If anything the new questions would intensify Zahn's critique. The reason is that the style of the pacifist case is designed to foreclose the possibilities of exception to the rule of not taking human life. Flexibility, a broadly based moral calculus, and an ethic which tries to find its way through conflict situations by a process of negotiating the lesser evil are all inimical to the dike the pacifist would build against the threat of life posed by modern war. The style of the revisionist case involves a willingness to re-examine even those principles within the double-effect calculus which provide the kind of absolute judgments the pacifist sees as necessary when dealing with human life. The two positions, therefore, are grounded in basically different conceptions of moral reasoning. This does not mean they are devoid of common ground. Among the conflict situations which have come under the revisionist critique none has been handled with such delicacy and caution as the question of civilian life in warfare. Richard McCormick has taken up the subject on three distinct occasions in order to demonstrate that one can use the revisionist approach and still preserve "virtually exceptionless rules like noncombatant immunity."⁶⁴ The pacifist position would be satisfied by this conclusion but not by the process of reasoning which supports it.

The purpose of raising the complex and far-reaching debate about moral norms in an essay on war and peace is to illustrate how broad theological themes can influence the specific conclusions on the ethics of force. Seen in light of the work of McCormick and other revisionists the new state of the question on war and peace is only one dimension

62. *Ibid.*, p. 38.

63. G. Zahn, "The Great Catholic Upheaval," *Saturday Review* 54 (September 11, 1971): 54.

64. McCormick and Ramsey, *Doing Evil*, pp. 42-44, 264-65; cf. also "Notes on Moral Theology," *Theological Studies* 39 (1978): 113-116.

of a larger debate between those who see an imperative to draw distinct lines with little or no qualification on issues of human life, and those who find the life issues precisely the kind of "conflict-case" which require a rethinking of key concepts in Catholic moral theology. Obviously the issue of ethical methodology is not exhausted by the war-peace debate, but it will undoubtedly affect the direction that debate will take.

Ecclesiology: The Moral Posture of the Church in Society

A second way in which the contending positions about the morality of war lead to a larger theological debate is the intersection between ethics and ecclesiology. The pacifist position has historically been related to a conception of the Church which Troeltsch and others have designated as sectarian. The term implies a counter-cultural posture for the Church, confirmed in the view that the ethics of discipline and the obligations of citizenship are normally in tension and often in opposition. The sectarian position has been most clearly exemplified in the peace churches where the ethical imperative of pacifism has produced an ecclesiological position. Stanley Hauerwas has crystallized the ecclesiological premise of a pacifist commitment:

It is the duty of the church to be a society which through the way its members deal with one another demonstrates to the world what love means in social relations. So understood the church fulfills its social responsibility by being an example, a witness, a creative minority formed by its obedience to nonresistant love.⁶⁵

Hauerwas recognizes that in contrast to this conception of the Church in society, the just-war ethic has been tied, theologically and historically, to another understanding of the Church's role. This view, prominently present in papal social encyclicals, assumes that the Church has a positive responsibility to participate in the process of building a more just and peaceful human society. To use the formulation of Vatican Council II, although the Church has no specific political mission as it pursues its religious ministry, it contributes to the protection of human rights, the promotion of human dignity, and the unity of the human family.⁶⁶ A corollary to this conception that the church and state should collaborate in promoting human welfare has been

the notion "that the Christian must be willing to employ force a violence to secure the good."⁶⁷ In Troeltsch's terms the just-war ethic presupposed a "church" model of presence in society, most vividly exemplified in medieval Catholicism, but open to other forms of implementation. Such a "church" position was based on premises about the relationship of nature and grace, faith and reason, and the proper form and purpose of Christian social ethics.

The relevance of these two conceptions of the role of the Church in society with their correlative forms of an ethic of war, is that they place in perspective the new state of the question of Catholic life. Hauerwas' essay the classical case for pacifism and sectarian ecclesiology is reaffirmed. A pacifist conception of Christian witness assumes "that the church will be composed of a relatively small minority" of Christians who have accepted nonresistance as a way of life.⁶⁸ It is not clear that contemporary Catholic pacifists presume that "the nonresistant Church" has either a sectarian or minority character. Gordon Zahn speaks of the need for the Catholic peace movement to reach "that great majority of Catholics, lay and clergy, who are nevertheless yet alert to the pacifist implications of their religious tradition."⁶⁹ This statement reflects a consistent theme of Zahn's persistent witness to peace: his determination to build a pacifist constituency solidly within the institutional Church. The analytical question, raised earlier in this essay, is not whether such a constituency is compatible with a Catholic conception of faith—it clearly is—but whether the institutional Church should take this position. Zahn is clear about his view; he speaks of making "the Catholic Church" the principal focus of pacifist witness by "converting it into the effective vehicle for peace it ought to be."

In examining the future of the war-peace debate within Catholicism, questions will undoubtedly be raised, on both historical and analytical grounds, about this mix of pacifism and what has been the Catholic conception of social ethics and the place of the Church in society. To cite one example which points toward deeper theoretical questions, Zahn understandably is both supported and gratified by the continuing cry for peace of the Holy See in recent years. The premises of the Church's relationship to the state upon which many of these statements (e.g., *Pacem in Terris*; Paul VI at the U.N.; Paul VI to Special Session on Disarmament, 1978) rest, however, is not the conception which traditionally sustained the sectarian witness of p

65. Stanley Hauerwas, *Vision and Virtue: Essays in Christian Ethical Reflection* (Notre Dame, Ind.: Fides Publishers, 1974), pp. 211-212.

66. *Gaudium et Spes*, n. 42; Gremillion, *Gospel of Peace and Justice*, pp. 276-277; cf. also J. C. Murray, "The Issue of Church and State at Vatican II," *Theological Studies* 27 (1966): 580-606.

67. Hauerwas, *Vision and Virtue*, p. 198.

68. *Ibid.*, p. 212.

69. G. Zahn, "The Future of the Catholic Peace Movement," *Commonweal* 99 (December 28, 1973): 340.

70. G. Zahn, "Carrying Our Weight in The Catholic Peace Movement," *American* 10 (September 20, 1975): 145.

ifism. The acceptance of the state is theologically and politically more positive and the expectations of the capacity of the state are higher than in a sectarian position. Zahn speaks of a "redefinition of the proper relationship between church and state" which has occurred in Catholicism as the result of a new approach to questions of war and peace.⁷¹ Such a redefinition occurred at Vatican II and is embodied in the documents *Dignitatis Humanae* and *Gaudium et Spes*,⁷² but it would be difficult to show that the new formulation substantively resembles the view of church-state relations that has traditionally sustained a pacifist option for an *ecclesial community*.

Another form of the ecclesiological question is raised by Charles E. Curran in an article arguing for a greater recognition of theological pluralism in the Church. Central to his case is the need for consistency: pluralism needs to be acknowledged and legitimized in both personal and social ethics. Previously, Curran argues, such pluralism was recognized by the magisterium in social issues, but not in personal moral questions. Today there are two adversaries of pluralism: some still deny its legitimacy in the personal realm, while others expect the community to be of one mind on social questions. In cautioning against such a position Curran acknowledges:

There is no doubt that the model of the church proposed here will not be as prophetic as some people in the church think it should be. For many reasons we all want the church to be prophetic, but we must understand this in terms of a broader ecclesiology. There will always be a tension between the prophetic aspect of the community and the freedom of the individual believer.⁷³

The classical peace churches have not been shaped ecclesiologically on the basis of expecting a tension between prophetic witness and the individual believer. The expected tension is between the prophetic ecclesial community and the wider society. As Hauerwas puts the case: "The Christian is dependent for his knowing and doing the good on the forgiveness and regeneration of the gospel, but not all men share this knowledge and experience. Because of this the Christian cannot speak to society as if it were capable of acting in terms of the demands of the gospel."⁷⁴ The theological and ecclesiological premises of Hauerwas' statement are qualitatively different

from those of John XXIII in the opening paragraphs of *Pacem in Terris*. He argues that the moral law governing all social relations, from the interpersonal to the international, is inscribed in the nature of the person and is accessible to reason.

Zahn's theology and social ethic seems to be designed to combine a pacifist ethic with a church-type ecclesiology. One of the open issues in the new state of the question is whether this mix is logically a theological possibility.

The question is implicit in a recent essay by Professor George Lindbeck, who argues that the future of the Christian church may be in a model which is sociologically sectarian but theologically Catholic. Lindbeck's focus is somewhat different from the church-sect relationship which has been examined here, but it offers categories which can be applied to this question. To some degree the mix Lindbeck proposes is analogous to the ecclesiological strategy Zahn has been proposing for Catholics in the peace movement. Lindbeck has not addressed, however, the question of whether a sociologically sectarian church could tolerate the kind of pluralism in social ethics advocated by Curran.

Neither the ethical nor the ecclesiological questions which have been raised in this concluding section can be settled in this essay. The state of the question on war is precisely the pluralist position Curran has advocated. Such a position has displaced the just-war ethic as the exclusive Catholic response to war and peace, but it has not divorced just-war ethics and Catholic teaching. The pluralism clearly legitimizes a pacifist option for Christians within the Catholic community, but has not produced a pacifist position for the Catholic Church in society. Some commentators seem to feel that the present state of the question is or should be a transitory formulation on the way to a more clear-cut pacifist option for Catholicism. This essay raises questions about that possibility because its author is not of the view that this would be the optimal ecclesiological or ethical road for Catholicism to take. But clearly we are in the midst of extended debate on precisely this point. George Zahn has helped bring us this far, and undoubtedly will continue to be one of the preeminent voices in the continuing conversation.

75. George Lindbeck, "The Sectarian Future of the Church," in J. P. Whalen, S.J., ed., *The God Experience: Essays in Hope* (Westminster, Md.: Newman Press, 1977), pp. 226-243.

71. Zahn, "The Great Catholic Upheaval," p. 25.

72. Cf. Murray, "The Issue of Church and State at Vatican II."

73. C. E. Curran, "Ten Years Later: Reflections on *Humanae Vitae*," *Commonweal* 105 (July 7, 1978): 428.

74. Hauerwas, *Vision and Virtue*, p. 206.

Index

- Address to Military Doctors*, 43
Aggression, defense against, 26
American people, destiny of, 3
 obligations of, 65
 responsibility of, 49
Amnesty, 53, 57
Anti-ballistic missile system, 38
Anti-war movement, 31
Aquinas, St. Thomas, and just-war theory, 90-91, 93, 94
Armaments, excessive cost of, 80-81
 limitation and reduction of, 82
Armed forces, as agents of security and freedom, 35
 burden borne by, 61
 expectations of, 66
 gratitude for, 8
 sacrifices and valor of, 28, 55
Arms control, 49, 67
 studies, Catholic participation in, 38
 race, 27, 37-38, 65, 74
 as deterrent, 37
 condemnation of, 99
 control of, 95
 dangers of, 70
 futility of, 33
Atlantic Charter, 13
Augustine, St., and just-war theory, 90

Bainton, Roland H., 89, 100, 103

Catholic Attitudes toward War and Peace, 89
Childress, James F., 93, 95
Christian democratic traditions, 12
Christianity, spirit of, 7, 9
Church as messenger of peace, 25
 as prophetic voice for peace, 71
 in society, 112
 moral posture in, 112-115
 pastoral functions of, 103
 responsibility for moral leadership, 34, 112
 theological pluralism of, 114, 115
Church's teaching on war and peace, 26, 108
 complexity of, 100
 continuity of, 98
 moral quality of, 101
Civilian populations, 40, 63, 104, 109
Common good, 93
 war as defense of, 91
Communism, 17, 19, 47
 as threat to peace, 19
Communist world, conversion of, 17, 21
Community of nations, 63, 64
Community, welfare of, 55
Compulsory peacetime military service, Catholic opposition to, 40
Conflict, acceptable limits of, 28
 of principles, 7
Conscience, formation of, 54-55, 83
 role of, 43-44, 54
Conscientious objection, 34, 53-57, 63, 67, 83, 85
 Church teaching on, 44, 56
 laws relating to, 45, 56
 selective, 85, 102
 theological standards for, 102
Conscientious objectors, 27, 61
 alternative employment for, 56
Contemporary philosophy, role of scholars in creation of, 12
 teaching, moral quality of, 101
Conventional war, costs of, 67
Convention on Genocide, 50
Curran, Charles E., 101n, 114, 115

d'Azeglio, Taparelli, and just-war theory, 92
Declaration on Religious Freedom, 54
Democratic principles, reappraisal of, 22
Destruction, indiscriminate, 104
Deterrence, as lesser of two evils, 77
 moral dilemma of, 76
 policy, 107
Development of peoples, 64-66
 programs, 20-21
Dignitatis Humanae, 114
Disarmament, 39, 73, 100, 107
 formula, search for, 28
 long-term possibilities for, 79

moral principles underlying, 74
 reciprocal or collective, 37
 unilateral, 37
 Dissent, selective, 53
 Divine law, 54
 Division of World Justice and Peace, USCC, 42
 Douglass, James, 96, 98, 103, 105
 Draft registration, 83, 85-86
 resistance, 53
 system, 40
 Dumbarton Oaks, 12
 Duty to wage war, 7

 Ecclesiology and ethics, 112, 115
 future directions of, 108
 Education for peace, 42
 Evil, avenging of, 92
 Exploitation, 8

 Fairness, rules of, 66
 Families of soldiers who died, 61
 Final holocaust, 81
 Force, as last resort, 94
 limited use of, 91
 presumptions against, 93
 Foreign aid, 65
 policy, 68
 moral agenda of, 75
 Freedom as American ideal, 18
 as birthright, 18
 blessings of, 4
 Future generations, potential harm to, 66

 Gasparri, Cardinal, 40
Gaudium et Spes, 25, 33, 34, 37, 38, 69, 70, 71, 95, 96-97, 98, 99, 100, 105, 106, 107, 114
 Geneva Convention, 39
 Genocide, 40
 Global mentality, formation of, 51
 God as source of freedom and peace, 22
 Gospel message, 34-35
Gospel of Peace and the Danger of War, 1
 Government efforts to end conflict, 31
 Grotius, Hugo, and just-war theory, 92

 Hauerwas, Stanley, 112, 113, 114
 Hierarchy, central public policy of, 1
Holy See and Disarmament, 98, 99
 Human dignity, 22
 interdependence, 64
 life, dignity and sacredness of, 75, 101, 105, 109

race, oneness of, 13
 rights, 11, 63, 67-68
 restoration of, 92
 violation of, 68
 Hungarian uprising 1956, 17

 ICBMs, 78, 81
 Ideals, sharing of, 18
 Ideology of nations, 15
 Innocent, protection of, 94
 International common good, 65
 community, building of, 41
 community of nations, 13
 cooperation, 59
 Court of Justice, 50
 disputes, arbitration of, 15
 justice, 65
 law, 48-49
 peace and security, maintenance of, 14
 peace-keeping, 41
 trade, 50
 treaties, 39
 Volunteer Corps, 50
 Isolationism, 42

 Just and lasting peace, 11, 12
Just and Unjust Wars, 103
 Justice, 63
 as foundation of organized society, 36
 in international community, 14
 of World War II, 7
 Just political system, 66
 Just-War ethic, 89-115
 Just-War theory, 85
 critique of, 111
 historical studies on, 90
 moral logic of, 99
 papal teaching on, 92-93, 96
 principles of today, 93, 95

 Kissinger, Henry, 80
 Krol, Cardinal, 73-74

 Language, differences in understanding of, 18
 Lasting peace, requirements for, 9
 League of Nations, 11, 13
 Legitimate defense, 26, 35, 55, 66, 84, 92
 Catholic teaching on, 98-100
 Liberation of oppressed and powerless, 63
 Lincoln, Abraham, 61
 Lindbeck, George, 115

Mass destruction, 37
 Material aid, 18
 Materialistic philosophy, 22
 Material wealth, undue emphasis on, 22
 McCormick, Richard, 110, 111
 McNamara, Robert, Secretary of Defense, 80
 Military capability of United Nations, 11
 conscripted, 85, 86
 in peacetime, 83, 84
 service, moral problems of, 53
 opposition to, 44
 voluntary, 40
 Moral and civic responsibilities, 31
 evaluation, 110
 evil, 4
 Morality of war, Catholic teaching on, 71
 Moral law, 13, 20
 life, 63
 limits in conduct of war, 26-27
 sensitivity to evils of war, 29, 31
 teaching on role of state, 84
 theology, 105, 107
 pluralism in, 101
 tradition, 89
 voice of the Church, 1
 voice of the nation, 26
 Murray, John Courtney, 102, 104
 Mutual-assured destruction, 80
 MX missiles, 79, 80, 81, 82

 National education programs, 38
 Nationalism, 17
 excessive, 19, 42
 Nations, interdependence of, 11
 right to self-defense, 33
 sovereignty of, 15
 Neutron bomb as symbol, 36
Nevertheless: The Varieties of Religious Pacifism, 98
 New Testament teaching, 90
 Noncombatant immunity, 109
 Non-Proliferation Treaty, 37
 Nonviolent action, 44-45
 Nuclear arms race, 39
 pacifism, 103, 106
 power, peaceful use of, 37
 war, 36
 evaluation of, 73
 weapons, 1, 33, 63, 67
 as deterrent, 77
 consequences of possession of, 106
 destabilizing effect of, 106

morality of, 104
 prevention of use, 107
 questionable strategic utility, 79
 strategic, 76, 104

 Obstacles to peace, 17, 19-20
 Outlaw nations, 14, 16

Pacem in Terris, 28, 43, 69, 71, 95-96, 113, 115
 analysis of war in, 95
 Pacifism, Catholic, 89, 95-98, 111, 11
 legitimization of, 95
 nuclear, 103
 Pacifist churches, 56, 103, 114
 ethic, 101, 108, 115
 Partial Test Ban Treaty, 37
Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World, 54, 55, 56, 60, 62
 Patriotism, 26
 Pax Christi, 98
 Peace, building of, 66-67
 challenge of, 11
 Christian hope for, 16
 creation of climate for, 29
 dynamic concept of, 33
 education for, 42
 foundations of, 18
 historical context for, 17
 —keeping, 1
 more than absence of war, 67
 not to be separated from justice
 freedom, 32
 obstacles to, 17, 19-20
 prayers for, 38
 pursuit of, 76
 restoration of, 5
 stress on, 7
 theology of, 98
 work for, 39
 yearning of American people for
 People's Republic of China, 47, 50-51
 Political change, 99-100
 dissent, 42
 idealism, 17
 Poor nations, economic opportunities
 14
 spiritual and material needs of, 1
 Pope Benedict XV, 3, 5, 40
 John XXIII, 28, 60, 64, 95, 115
 John Paul II, 74
 Leo XIII, 18
 Paul VI, 29, 32, 33, 36, 41, 45-46

51, 54, 60, 65, 69, 70, 84, 95
 concept of peace, 36
 support of U.N., 41
 Pius XII, 36, 43, 60, 74, 98, 100, 104, 105
 and just-war theory, 92-93
 pacifism unacceptable to, 93
 Potter, Ralph B., 93, 95, 99
 Poverty, 17, 19
 Power politics, 12, 13
 use of, 64-65
 Prayers for peace, 38
 for victory, 8
 President's Task Force on International Development, 50
Prima facie obligations, 94
 Prisoners of war, 40, 61
 Private development, 21
 Property, ownership of, 14
 Proportionality, principle of, 104, 110
 Prostrate nations, assistance to, 13
 Protective legislation, 14
 Public opinion, influence of, 12
 role of, 26
 Ramsey, Paul, 96
 Reconstruction programs, 60
 Reformation, impact of, 91
 Refugees, 19-20, 40
 Renewed spirituality, call to, 46
 Responsibility, individual, 44
 moral and civic, 31
 of leadership, 5
 Rights of man, 15
 Role of the state, moral teaching on, 84
 Rules governing war, 93, 99
 SALT II, 73-83
 opponents of, 78
 qualified support for, 75
 reservations concerning, 77-78
 Second Vatican Council—see Vatican II
 Secularism, 8
 Security Council, U.N., 14
 Selective Service Act, 45, 53, 57, 61
 Service, new programs of, 44
 to community, 45
 Sin as cause of war, 90
 Slave world, 7
 Southeast Asia, 59-62
 see also Vietnam
 Sovereignty of nations, 15
 Soviet Union, requirements of SALT II, 78
 Statesmen, role of, 21

Strategic Arms Limitation Talks, 49, 69, 70
 see also SALT II
 equivalence, 80
 nuclear weapons, see Nuclear weapons, strategic
 Suarez, Francesco, and just-war theory, 91-92
 Technological warfare, 34, 69
 Theology, Catholic, 89-115
 Third world war, threat of, 19
 Totalitarianism, 8
 Trade agreements, 41
 Treaty against Nuclear Proliferation, 28
 Trident II, 81, 82
 Tyranny as menace to world peace, 15
 United Nations, 29, 33, 36, 41, 45-46, 59, 60-61, 65
 achievements of, 48
 Atomic Energy Commission, 37
 Economic and Social Council, 51
 establishment of, 11, 12
 Declaration of Human Rights, 40
 military capability of, 11
 peacekeeping force, 49
 Special Session on Disarmament, 69, 70
 25th anniversary of, 47-51
 Universal law, 45
 National Service, 85
 public authority, 39
 U.S. aims in World War II, 8
 civil law, 85
 participation in World War II defended, 7
 Senate Foreign Relations Committee, 73
 Vatican II, 1, 26, 34, 35, 39, 45, 53, 54, 55, 74, 76, 84, 86
 Veterans, benefits for, 61
 Victims of war, 20
 Vietnam, 1, 25-29, 31, 33, 34, 41, 42-43, 53, 59, 63, 67, 83
 lessons of, 43, 60
 reactions to American presence, 31
 search for just peace in, 27
 Violence, renunciation of, 97
 Vitoria, and just-war theory, 91-92
 Walters, LeRoy B., 89
 Walzer, Michael, 103, 106, 107
 War, abnormality of, 9

as result of sin, 90
 Catholic teaching on morality of, 71
 costs of, 3, 4, 43
 defensive, 96
 duty to wage, 7
 evaluation of, 96
 historical Catholic attitude on, 89
 legitimacy of some forms of, 76
 lessons of, 3, 4
 —making, 1
 morality of, 103
 moral justification for, 66
 new evaluation of, 35, 70
 outlawing of certain forms of, 40
 preoccupation with preparation for, 75
 prisoners of, 40, 61
 protest against escalation of, 25
 rules governing, 93, 99
 subjective perceptions of, 92
 victims of, 20
 Wars of aggression, unqualified condem-

nation of, 35
 "War system", 41
 Women and military conscription,
 World commerce, 14
 communication 14
 community, building of, 33
 court, 11, 14-15
 peace, 8
 social and economic problems,
 statesmen, 39
 War I, 3-5
 War II, 7-16, 36, 42, 60
 justice of, 7
 sacrifices by people in, 8
 Worldwide technical cooperation, 4
 Yoder, John, 98
 Yost, Charles, U.S. Ambassador to
 49
 Zahn, Gordon, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112