

## PEACE AND THE STATE

*Joseph Fahey*

When I became Director of the Peace Studies Institute, in 1974, at Manhattan College, the first person that I sought to hire was Ies Spetter, as an adjunct professor of Peace Studies, which he remains to this day, though health has been a problem with his teaching every semester. I recall going to the Christian Brothers and saying that I proposed to hire this local leader to the Riverdale-Yonkers Society for Ethical Culture, and they said, Well, that's fine, just put down his religion on the application form. They said, Is he Catholic? I said, I don't know, I don't think so. They said, Is he Protestant? I said, "Well, he's a bit of a protester;" Is he Jewish? Well finally, I said, "He's a Humanist." And they said, "What's that?" I actually had someone say that to me, "What's that?" Well, I'm glad to be among fellow Humanists today.

What I propose to do this morning is to do a bit of history, mainly Western history, and frankly also Christian history, to put the context of the church - rather, of the state: that may have been a Freudian slip - the state and peace in some historical context. I unfortunately have not spoken to the alleged respondents - they are not respondents, they are also fellow presenters - and I think that they might make some more contemporary comments, at least I hope they will. If not, I'm sure we'll have time for that in our discussion.

When we look at the history, at least in the Western world, I suppose, although I'm no expert by any means in Eastern history or African history or the history of the Native Americans, however research by peace studies people, anthropologists, historians and others tell me that historically there have been four major responses to the issue of the state and peace and to some extent they repeat themselves in a cyclic way. They appear in almost every culture at every time. Those responses classically have been pacifism, a just or limited war, a crusade, and fourthly, the desire for world community.

Four basic responses, and certainly in my own research, which I say has been largely the Western history, etc., they are abundantly evident at every time, in every country, among every culture, and even in every religion. People sometimes unkindly like to say that the very first response we see, for example in the Bible, to the problem of the state and peace, or war and peace, is that of the Crusade. In fact that's not true. The first response we see is much more along the lines of a limited war - just war in the Book of Deuteronomy, and it's later that we see some crusade, and obviously we also see the pacifist tradition in ancient Judaism as well as the desire for world community with prophetic literature. We also see it as you know in the so-called pagan world. One of the stories I love to tell my students is how in the ancient world, two very diverse groups were pacifists: one group was the Epicureans, people who made their fundamental ethical premise that that is virtuous that is pleasurable, and that is sinful or evil which is painful - an ethical premise I am often tempted to embrace, I must say, as I suspect some of you are. They opposed war and violence simply be-

## *Humanism Today*

cause it was not pleasurable, because it was painful and it violated their desire for other higher points of pleasure.

The Stoics on the other hand, the name speaks for itself, as you know, in the ancient world also were pacifists. Even though they did not share the ethics of the Epicureans, they were pacifists largely for philosophical reasons. They saw themselves as members of a common humanity, the word "international" wasn't used, but we can use it, and hence, since everyone was their brother and sister, whom had they to fight? Even though Stoic tradition of natural law was to have a great impact in Christian history, and I will argue later that we need to rediscover much of that tradition today. So pacifism, just war, crusade and world community as we know it are not new, they have appeared as I stated in every culture at every time among every diverse religion, economic system, what-have-you. Indeed, they are abundantly apparent in our own time.

As I was listening to the conventions, especially the one this past week, I couldn't help thinking but of those four traditions that the crusade is very much alive. Even world community to some extent, as long as we dominate it and we say what the world community is; so even the Republicans - forgive me for saying this, some of you may be Republicans - have something to teach us about the survival of these traditions.

These four traditions as we know them have developed to some extent according to temporal lines. I'm going to focus on the basic attitude of people toward the state as seen in each of these traditions. The oldest tradition that we have in so-called Western Christianity, at least, has some inheritance from the alleged so-called pagan philosophies, etc., and that's quite clearly pacifism. Christianity was pacifist for certainly three centuries and well into the fourth century of its existence. Its attitude toward the state during this period was varied. And think about this - it was quite a long time, because if we think of let's say an official church becoming pacifist today, that would take us well into the 23rd century. So it's quite a long time that they maintained the spirit of pacifism.

As you know, scholars debate why Christianity was pacifist at this time. Was it because, for example, of political reasons - that they were persecuted, and so therefore they were naturally averse to Rome and hence pacifism was a stance that they were forced into. However, you cannot argue that it's an authentic Christian stance. That position I've just stated is pretty much the official position today of the Roman Catholic Church. It tolerates pacifism and says it's legitimate, but it by no means says that it is the basic fundamental stance that Christians should take. Even though I'm well pleased and was an advisor and even wrote parts of the Bishop's pastoral last year, I have no illusions about what they said and what they didn't say. They did not say that pacifism is the central Christian position for people to take.

Another school of thought regarding this pacifism argues a kind of theological argument and that is the end of the world was imminent and much of the writings of Paul, for example, point to that and so therefore

don't just join armies, don't do anything. And even Paul writes for the Corinthians later and has to remind them that Christ is not coming very soon, that they may have been mistaken about that. We may be around here for quite some time so go back to work, and other things; however, he doesn't encourage them to join armies during this time. However, we know that in the writings of Paul, especially, there is an enormous endorsement of the state. Paul argues very, very clearly that all authority comes from God, and that those people who are in position of legitimate authority must be obeyed as if they were in the position of God him- or herself - although Paul doesn't say "herself" - and Paul has other teachings on women - I think he might be in the Rose Garden today with President Reagan.

When I was going through my own professional training, those were pretty much the reasons I had been taught. That the church wasn't pacifist, but rather it was for political reasons or it was for a reason that the world was coming to an end.

However, research that has been done well back into this century, I later found out, but certainly in the past twenty years, now I think pretty much puts the argument to rest. The reason that the Christians were pacifist was because they interpreted the command to love one's enemies as being an absolute command that no state, no society, could, in fact violate, and hence the primacy of the individual and the conscience of the individual was to take primacy over any particular state or authority. There were abundant examples as you probably know, during this period of people being put to death and citing that as their precise answer; that they have been ordered to love their enemies and not to shed blood, and if necessary, they were willing to shed their own blood so that others might be free, but they would never take a life themselves.

This early period, the attitude of the pacifist toward the state, however, is, indeed, a mixed one. As much as I would like to say that the people during this period - both, by the way, Christian and non-Christian - those who were pacifists, argued that the state should also be pacifist, argued that the state should also adopt a philosophy of non-violence. As much as I would like to argue that, however, I have a caveat on that - I can't. It's quite evident from the documents that even some of the great pacifist writers regarded the state as legitimate, they followed Paul on that. They had kind of a schizophrenic, dualistic attitude. Indeed, they argued that while Christians were the Humanists at that time, if you want secular, whatever phrase one uses - that while they themselves might adopt as a group of people a position of non-participation in war, they would not argue that it should be extended to other people. We find even certain Christian pacifist writings, saying we won't go off to war, however we'll pray for the Roman Emperor when he goes off to war. So, we'll pray for your success, however we can't pay blood. I think the modern analogy is that we won't go off and push the button, but we'll pay the taxes to do it.

This period is mixed, as I say, and I think it's instructive for today because what stand shall we take as Humanists, as religious people of various

faiths; what stand shall we take for the state, can we learn anything from this period? My caveat about wishing that the Christians also tried to make their personal ethic a social ethic or political ethic at that time, frankly springs from the recent debate between Governor Mario Cuomo of New York and Archbishop John O'Connor of New York. A very healthy debate, a good one, and I hope it continues. That is, to what extent do religious people of any tradition have a right to mandate a dubious moral principle on other people. I refer specifically to abortion. There are people of good will who support the right to abortion under certain circumstances, and there are people of good will who think that it is always an evil act no matter the circumstances. Both people are, as I say, of good will. When it's a dubious moral issue such as this, to what extent does religion have the right to say we must therefore now legislate this as either a constitutional amendment or a law, or whatever the case may be. I personally do not argue that religion has that right. Rather, religion should persuade, educate and be open to honest debate, ever willing to even change its own position, should it realize that the facts and data may argue for a change in that position.

The same, I would argue, applies to the issue of military service or service even in something I consider to be perhaps the most objective evil of our time, even in a submarine, a B-52, or any service capacity that deals with the genocide, pure and simple, the planned genocide of human beings, no matter where they are. Will it do us good to argue for constitutional amendment and forcing pacifism on the United States and arguing that no one may serve in the military - should we pursue that kind of a route? The early Christians chose not to do that.

So while I'm somewhat disappointed as I look at those people in the first centuries who chose not to interfere with the operation of the state, further study tells me that in fact, it may have been a politically very astute thing for them to do. Number one, it kept them around. I mean, they had an alleged support of the state - I'm not saying that that's always the best thing. Many of them did not, as you know - I'm generalizing here. However, on the other hand, it's quite clear that when you study meaning of peace during this period, it's by no means the absence of war. Peace is always the presence of justice, always the presence of human dignity, and so we find Christians actively refusing to participate in gladiatorial contests, refusing to endorse infanticide, refusing to support capital punishment, refusing to go to public shows, in fact being excommunicated if they do these things, etc. So while they allow the state to do these things, they say to their membership, which was beginning to grow in numbers, "you may not do it," etc.

So perhaps the silent, quiet role of education, perhaps there is a role for sect type of religion today; perhaps we can learn something from those long-silent churches in our midst - the Quakers, the Mennonites, and the Brethren whom for many years we've ridiculed and said, "Look at those silly Pennsylvania Dutch" and people such as that, when in fact they may in the long run have the most important impact on our society.

I was in Europe quite a bit this summer, and visited many monasteries, some of which were thankfully closed down by the French in the French Revolution, when I learned what the monks were doing to people. For many of them the monastic model of social change I think has validity and I think we - I can only touch on it now - but I think we can learn much from it.

In the Fourth and Fifth Centuries the second great tradition comes in, which is known again in every culture and time, and that is the just war, the limited war. I want to make it clear that both in the ancient writings of people such as Cicero, Aristotle, Plato, etc., the object was never to justify war. One of the great misunderstandings of the just war theory, the just war principles, is that somehow it was meant to bring, to make this activity a virtuous activity. Just as even Thomas Aquinas would argue, in his great *Summa Theologia*, justice is the centerpiece of all virtues, all other things flow from this. Aquinas would say - as you know, if you want to study Aristotle, and you can't get your hands on an Aristotelian ethics book, you just pick up Aquinas. That's all he did was copy; he wasn't very original at all.

And so the just war comes into Christianity for three basic reasons. Again, I think they are very instructive for us today. Look at the Western world - the world had a chance to listen to the Stoics, to the Humanists, to the Christians of the early centuries, and to become a world community. Instead of conquering, enslaving people, these people went out and treated others as their friends, much the way William Penn did in that famous letter to the Native Americans, which he wrote in a little castle on an island many centuries later.

Why the change? Is it because they didn't satisfactorily translate it into politics, it's that they remained a sect and hence they were naive and they were co-opted by the state? I think there's some evidence to support that. Is it because they began to get patriotism, to get sick of being persecuted and maligned, etc.? There's evidence to support that. And a little known amount of evidence of why Christianity at least abandoned violence and begins to accept the just war theory is because it wishes to defend the church itself against heresy. I discovered that myself but I've read that in very few places. But that's an interesting reason, isn't it? The just war theory was not just meant for the pagans, dear friends, it was meant for the Christians. St. Augustine is quite clear on that when he writes to several heretics and says that "If you don't come around and obey the orthodox teachings, we may have to force you to do it." And force in an Augustinian context is the use of military force.

And so there are three great reasons why this change takes place. I think again they were instructive for today. First is the growing union of the Pax Romana and the Pax Christiana. The Pax Romana, which was an imperial peace, the Britons said of the Romans, as you know, where they make it a desert they call the peace and leave the word "pax" fundamentally has a negative meaning - it means the absence of war. Another word, "pact" comes from that word, which can be positive. But essentially it's a negative

## *Humanism Today*

word. To the Greeks, by the way, Irene was the goddess of peace and "irene" means harmony. The Semitic people used the words "shalom" and "salam" which means the presence of physical and spiritual abundance to connote peace.

So the Pax Romana and the Pax Cristiana gradually come to be seen as conjoint works of God. If we ever saw evidence of that it was in this past week at the convention. The Republicans especially, Democrats aren't free of this, but boy, was it evident last week. They had great pictures of Jerry Falwell and all these people. So the Pax Americana is conjoint work with the Pax Cristiana. I felt when I was in the great places of Europe this summer, as if I really was, back to a thousand years ago and when I saw the smiling face of Jerry Falwell this past week, I really felt when I closed my eyes that I was back there 1500 years ago they were having the same debate: the Pax Americana, the Pax Romana and the Pax Cristiana of conjoint works of God.

The second major reason why was that Christian perfection was held not to be possible in this world. It seems to me that when I look at the great Humanist tradition, it exists in many religions and throughout many times. The great enemy has always been to place our faith in God rather than in people; the great enemy of survival of authentic religion has always been to adopt and endorse a kind of so-called realism. You heard I wrote my book on Reinhold Niebuhr. Niebuhr really was a pessimist. He wasn't a realist, because a realist takes into account not only power and the negative side of things, but also the opportunities that exist and realizes that history, while it is fraught with evil, and genocide, and rape, and a host of injustices, is also fraught with those great prophetic people in every age and every time that forge for us the human destiny of which we are capable today.

Augustine held principally in his theology - and I wonder if it has something to do with his early life, certainly people joke about it, that Christian perfection was not possible in the world, that Jesus said "love your enemies," but only he could do it because he was God. And since the rest of us are all these poor fallen creatures, we must love with *only*, the kind of love that human beings are capable of, which is very, very imprecise. Even Augustine didn't hold that it was very much possible in marriage. My later research tells me he may be right there. However, it may be possible on a larger scale than that.

Christian perfection is *not* possible. We're fundamentally depraved, evil, ruthless. Later Augustinian priests a thousand years later jumped on this, etc. We deny the presence even of legitimate defense of themselves, Martin Luther wrote, because fundamentally he held to this radical pervasive pessimism about human nature and we'll see it surrounding us today in so many policies. The presence of nuclear weapons isn't just a political or strategic question, it's fundamentally a spiritual question, and it fundamentally makes a glowing statement, which we invest billions and billions of dollars to state very simply that we do not believe that we can even talk

to our enemies and it is a perfect denial of history. I once asked a congressional committee before which I testified, when would this all end, and they had no answer. The best answer I got was, well, we'll have to continue to dislike the Soviets until at least the year 2010 because we have weapon systems prepared up until that time.

The third great reason why war now becomes a legitimate activity not only of church but of state, is to defend the church against heresy. I don't need to remind you of the great amount of violence that has been used, especially by Christian against Christian, against Moslem, against Jew, and against just about anybody who didn't agree with some very, very important and sacred doctrines such as the virginity of Mary. I remember well studying in the seminary the wars that were fought, the lives that were lost over whether or not Mary was a virgin. The professor asked how many of us would indeed enlist in the world army to defend her holiness. I remember saying to myself, "that's her problem, not mine." I suppose at that time I began to lose all desire to be a virgin myself, but the rest of that is history.

The just war principles I'll quickly enumerate, just to remind you what they are. Again I state, even Augustine felt they were not meant to justify war. Augustine said they must be a last resort and they must engage in war with a mournful, or an evil or a sinful attitude. Indeed, almost a thousand years later, even after the period of Crusades, we find in certain church documents the proscription that people must do penance if they fight in warfare. Knights had to do penance when they came back from battle. The principle was not to say, give out Congressional Medals of Honor and you have big flag-waving parades when you go to war. No, this is the fruit of the demonic, the evil one of history. We may have to do it to defend either the church or the society, but let's not go overboard about this, folks. So to be fair to Augustinian thought, he still regarded it properly as I do, as always in the realm of objective evil, philosophically.

The just war principles are seven, though you can read variations on them. The first four are the use ad bellum, and that is the right to go to war. You must fulfill these principles before you can go to war and engage in what may be called defense. Number One: the war must be declared by a legitimate authority, that being always the prince or the state, obviously. That's one reason, by the way, that until 1963 the Catholic church was always stuck with that one. The Catholic church could never get away from I think its stance that the just war was the position for a Catholic fundamentally because of that authority question. Number Two: there must be a just cause, rights must be violated. Obviously you cannot engage in war for a frivolous reason. Again, who determines that, the person who starts the war? Number Three: All peaceful means must be exhausted. We know now from our peace studies research, and thank God there is so much more of it going on, but there's a lot of good news; uncovering many, many good things about millions of years of history, we're learning a lot about the thousands of ways we have used non-violence to resist injustice and to establish peace, so that violence is, if not immoral, certainly, I hope, obsolete.

Gene Sharp, I don't need to remind you, in his monumental work, *The Politics of Nonviolent Action*, which is now just about eleven years old, has 198 different non-violent ways to resist evil and to establish justice. So according to this principle, if all non-violent means must be exhausted, we're going to spend one heck of a long time using those 198 principles before we can go off and commit violence.

The fourth principle is that the intent of the war must be to restore peace. One may not, therefore, engage in revenge or vengeance. I might declare that in that fourth reason - I did a lot of reading just yesterday on it - there has been a point Catholic moral philosophy at least, and in most of our classic ethical thought, that you don't need to commit the act to in fact be guilty of the act, as you all know. All you really have to do is commit the act intentionally in your mind. I always remember when I would go to confession back in those seminary days, and I remember one of the few times Jesus addressed that was when he talked about committing adultery with somebody before you ever did it. If you did it in your mind, then you were guilty of it. So then I was reminded by my professor that most of us may have been virgins, but we were technical virgins. The intent must be to restore peace.

The next three principles of the just war - and that is now what are your obligations when you're in the war? Fourth: The war must be fought with proper rules. Very simply, in a time honored prescription which has found its way into national war - you may not kill women, children and non-combatants; you may not pollute and destroy the environment. Some of the great oaths written during the Middle Ages by the knights even, were they were ecology minded. They wouldn't root up the vines - I know why they wouldn't root up the vines, because knights liked to drink, I realize. But at the same time - actually, I found out it was the monks who really like to drink, with all the vines around the monasteries. I recall when I was in Germany this summer at a monastery - they had to send an emissary to the Vatican to try to get the monks to drink coffee in the morning - they were drinking beer too early in the day, and there was a rebellion on the part of the monks. War must be fought with a wet wagon.

Passion is the fifth principle. The sixth principle is proportionality - the good to be achieved, you must have moral certitude that it must outweigh the evil, and hence nuclear War could never be under the just war principle just for that one reason alone. It could never be a legitimate war.

Seventh, you may not wage a war of aggression. it must always be a defensive war, and hence the weapon systems you develop must be in concert with that.

I'm doing research now on a weapons systems, and according to the just war principles for the non-pacifist, I'm going to argue that 80% of military service in the United States is forbidden to people who support the just war theory, be they Catholic, Protestant, Jewish, Humanist, whatever they be. if they argue that the premise of their military service in the service of the United State or the Soviet Union, I don't care where, is the just war theory,

then they can only take one job in five out of the military. This would pretty much, by the way, restrict them to a home guard or a national guard. •• even there, there are indiscriminate weapons, and even there we have some stories I'm beginning to uncover of the presence of nuclear weapons.

The third great tradition is probably the longest, the median between the two so-called extremes of pacifism and the crusade, that second tradition is still at least allegedly the official position of most governments, most international law treaties today, etc. - do not outlaw the use of force because of the sovereignty of the state, the absolute authority which is accorded to the state, which is something to talk about, and hence there is a desire, it is morally allowed to do this.

I haven't found many just wars in history. I don't know if you have. In fact, most wars I have found have not been at all just. I was reading Erasmus' *In Praise of Folly* today, he said you're allowed to praise yourself- it begins with that in *In Praise of Folly*.

I haven't found too many just wars, but if I've found one, it's Nicaragua. Absolutely no doubt. I've done a lot of reearch on, traveled, and other things. I've certainly found that. I think that, tragically, Nicaragua is starting to glorify it, make it a crusade. That happens here to every war. I have a caveat for that later. What I find interesting is that crusaders in the White House must condemn those who fight just wars. Notice how Reagan is really out to get those people who fight the wars of liberation in Central America. I'm quite convinced that one of the reasons is that they simply were not as indiscriminate as he would like them to be.

The fourth great tradition in the West has been that of the crusades. I don't need to tell you the barbarism of the tremendous evil of the Crusade. We can date that with some precision in the year 1095, when Urban II argued that the Franks should go off to succor the brethren of the Middle East. One of his major reasons was to stop fighting among themselves for all these things and let's get the real enemy, who was the Turk, and by the way, even our dear friend, Erasmus, sort of jokingly, once said that himself. "Why do we fight against each other as Christians, let's turn toward the Turk." But fortunately, Erasmus then says in claims of peace, "But is not the Turk also our brother."

In any event, Urban the Second didn't think so, and we have the period of the Crusades which are distinguished, it seems to me, by three great points. One is the just war is conveniently shelved where inappropriate, which is just about every place. We find examples of even monks fighting in wars and priests, who are supposed to not shed blood. There is one story of an archbishop named Christian who - the proscription was against clerics shedding blood - so Christian had a very blunt instrument made and went to battle with his vestments on, killed eight people and celebrated a mass of thanksgiving because he had not shed blood that day. So the just war principles are shelved where inconvenient, which is just about everywhere.

The second is that war is a religiously glorious activity. Now, for the first time, it is a war of God. Roman Beton in his classic work, *Christian Attitudes Toward War and Peace*, says I think in one of his simple statements that Beton is so good at, "War is more humane when God is left out of it." Certainly, this is true historically. So these religiously inspired wars, everybody is fair game, the environment is fair game, and so forth.

And the third point is that aggression is now legitimized. You may in the name of a righteous cause, send armies into other people's territories, etc. I realize this is not new, but it is certainly the foundation of the immediate tradition in the West. I think this blessing by the church made people like Napoleon feel quite at home. There is a subtle, historic question of aggression and Christianity bears the major brunt of it, and for which it is least to do repentance. These wars were marked by a tremendous amount of religious intolerance, as you know, because one of the true lessons of human history is that the state wages war always to defend against an external enemy. However, wars invariably come home. And so the enemy becomes no longer the Nazi, no longer the Japanese person, no longer the Russian. The enemy becomes the Humanist. The enemy becomes the committed religious person who wants to go on and reform things at home. So we find there were pacifists during the Crusades in Southern France and Northern Spain. The Cathari for example - when the Crusaders came home, what did they do? They went and killed them. Because they were unpatriotic and they wouldn't go off to the Crusades. We find the Flagellists in this period, we find the roots of the Inquisition against the Jew and against the Moslem, we find people were burned at the stake, all the way even into our own country - the great Ann Hutchinson. And so many of the great people that stood up for freedom on conscience and that which is right are victims of the crusades, which are very much alive and very much still with us to the extent that we could even have an Archbishop of New York practically threatening every major public official with excommunication. Whether they are Catholic or non-Catholic. I think he's exceeding his power there, but he may not know that yet.

The real reason for the Crusades, is not told to us by church historians, but rather by so-called secular historians. It was economic expansionism. It began a thousand years of European expansionism, which was to end officially only in this century, and countries such as the Soviet Union and the United States have tried to take over that legacy - they're not doing too well, thank God. But in any event, I certainly don't think they'll last a thousand years, but in any event they are the legacy of that great crusading tradition.

These are the three traditions. None of them satisfactorily answer the question of peace and the state, as you can see. But they are our legacy and if we don't know them, we are doomed to repeat their mistakes and again, that's one of my problems with so much of the political rhetoric today. I know we're an anti-intellectual society. My salary is testimony to that. However, I have never been so convinced as in recent times about the tremendous anti-intellectualism. The denial of the past. Not just the ignorance of the past, the absolute denial of the past. This irrational, insane use

of religion. Talk about a millenium of America or any other empire. It's tragic, it's dangerous, it's insane.

The fourth great tradition, which again has appeared in many places, really is a renaissance tradition, and it really, I think, is the Humanist tradition. It appears in such great people, I'm thinking at the time of the late 15th, early 16th Centuries, as Hugo Grotius, who was known as the father of international law in some circles, Erasmus of Rotterdam, Thomas More, Callay and Vivas in Spain, so many of the great Humanists at this time. Many of them were with traditional religious convictions, such as Erasmus, who employed both, I think, a phenomenal sense of humor, which is always the sign of a civilized society that it can laugh at itself, or at least a society that stands a chance of salvation. I was just reading again, Erasmus of Rotterdam and his letter to Thomas More, and what a funny, funny, situation that was.

These people, along with the historic peace churches of the Quakers, the Brethren, the Mennonites, along with the secular painters, artists, philosophers and Humanists, have begun, I think, a tradition which we are now beginning to take seriously. And there are important signs of it. That is the position that we cannot solve the problems of peace unless we work toward a world community, a world juridical community.

From my own tradition, I think, one of the great, great documents of all time, really, that I have encountered is the Encyclical Letter of "Pacem in Terris" by Pope John XXIII. It is an encyclical letter that every Jew, every atheist, every communist, and hopefully, even a few Christians, could agree with. It brings together the great strains of the Humanist tradition which go back, indeed, to our primitive forebears, whose names we shall never know, whose writings we shall never read.

This great tradition, is the tradition to build the world communities based on, it seems to me, four rather fundamental premises. One is the recovery in the renaissance of the tradition of the natural world which was early enunciated by the Stoics and some Jewish and Christian writers. Indeed, I'm beginning to discover Moslem writers - and it's a religion I've only recently begun to do any research on tragically, and yet it's one of the three great traditions also.

The tradition, number one, of natural law, and that is the fundamental assumption, *the* theological or philosophical, that we are all naturally people who are gifted with reason and will and through the use of that reason and will we can discover for ourselves in a humanistic fashion how to live as brothers and sisters. There are cultural boundaries in a tradition of the natural law, not boundaries, but legitimate and beautiful differences between people. Economic and political systems are merely different ways to arrive at a common humanity. And so this tradition of natural law is something we need to recover and to translate into its true meaning, which is the fact that world community is indeed possible because the human animal is not corrupt, is not destroyed, and *can* make a Garden of Eden, in fact.

The second great point is that all human relationships must be based on the virtue of justice. Peace without justice is a negative and shallow peace, and only justice, which is merely to give to another their due, but we are going just to someone when we recognize the sacredness and dignity of their human nature, and we seek to enable their humanity on a material, political, economic, psychological and spiritual sense, to become whole. And so justice is always the central point upon which any human relationships must be based.

The third point of this tradition of world humanity is international law. It is quite clear that even some of the founders, while they realized, I mean, even though I very much like Hugo Grotius, Grotius was for international law, but he never denied the sovereign right of the nation state to engage in war. As you know, his work, the *De Juri Belli et Pads* concerning war and peace, he doesn't deny the just war theory, but nevertheless he sees international law as the only ultimate answer. So the juridical world community is the third great hallmark of this tradition.

It seems to me the fourth hallmark is much more of an ethical one. It's not often stated, but I think we need to state it very clearly, and that is, we must recognize any form of violence as an objective form of evil. Hence, the military profession itself is an objective form of evil. We are not judging the subjective conscience of those who are involved in this. I sometimes think of the kind of caste system or class system in medieval China, and I think it's instructive for us. I like to play games with my students with this. The highest caste or class was that of the intellectuals, the next was that of the artisan, the next was that of the farmer, the next was that of the business person or merchant, and the outcast was the soldier. And I ask my students what was the common denominator to these five groups - why was the soldier the outcast, and why was the intellectual the highest, and it doesn't take them too long, thank God, thank someone, to say creativity is the measure of a civilized society. The intellectual is the most creative, since they give the fuel for thought to the artisan, and the farmer is creative, etc., etc. And so, I think we need to return to that, which is not in any way to denigrate this or look down on it. I say that with particular urgency at this moment, because I have a brother-in-law just leaving the Air Force as a colonel, who has for the past five years been terribly disillusioned with the military. The first 15 years he was a crusader, the last five years he was pacifist. I told him you don't have to become a just warrior to balance things out, to go to that other side. He was terribly frustrated because he can't get a job in the civilian sector, he's tried and tried and tried. And yet he has many offers from the military defense works. He went to a Jesuit university, Fairfield University and is terribly, terribly bitter about his education at that university 20 years ago, or a bit more, because the Jesuits never even mentioned to him the just war theory. They never raised the issue of whether or 'lot he could sit in a bomb shelter, which he was doing within six months of his graduation from that college, with his finger on the button. They never mentioned to him the fact that violence itself, although it may be used, is always an evil event. They never mentioned to him that there are careers which are objectively good and objectively virtuous, and those are the careers that graduates of Catholic colleges and Jesuit colleges should pursue.

I am also aware that fully half the graduates at Manhattan College School of Engineering, which is a college founded by the Christian Brothers, go into defense work. And no one, but a few faculty members, raise any moral problems about this.

So war, the fourth great principle, we must stop legitimizing violence as a legitimate, as a moral way, of getting things done. I think a fine example of that is a friend who's a New York City policeman. One time he was shot three times himself and was defending a woman. The guy turns his gun on the woman and my friend was begging him, crying to him, *not* to shoot and finally he shot. My friend to this day is having psychiatric help because of what he did. He may have needed to do it, but he never wanted a medal for it. He never regarded it as a good thing to do. So while we may engage in violence, we must follow Augustine and do so with a mournful attitude, lest we begin to glorify the very thing that we thought initially was evil. Niebhur was always very good on that. We must watch that the very devils with whom we struggle, we must be careful that they above all end up inside us.

So let me reach just a few tentative conclusions. I'd like to say that if you look at the broad outlines of the encyclical "Pacem in Terris" - I always like to point out that God is hardly mentioned, as you know. The first paragraph says something in it, but then, John wisely puts God aside and gets to the real issues. As you know, he wrote that 1963, six months after the Cuban missile crisis, and four months before he died. He is known as the peace pope. I did research on John. That's pretty much it, although he did some good work in World War II. In any event, he was terribly upset over the recklessness of President Kennedy. It shocked him that a so-called Catholic could, without any ethical questions, and Robert Kennedy too, never raised ethical questions about the slaughter of millions of people. It really shocked him that the so-called loyal son of the Catholic church could, in fact, make what Hider did look like child's play. So this great document came, I think it's the great survival of all these traditions coming together.

John says, very simply, the foundation for all work toward peace is the sacredness and dignity of the human person, who has the cosmic destiny. His destiny far outweighs any particular economic or political system. He states that clearly and forthrightly. The state is the servant of the individual, and never the other way around. That's the basis of his understanding for peace.

He then talks about six building blocks, I'll just mention them. The fire building blocks are very simply stated - number one: human rights; number two: nonviolence; number three: social justice; number four: disarmament; and number five: world public authority. Those are the building blocks that he sees and they are the building blocks that the great traditions East and West, it seems to me, that we must examine.

Let me reach a few personal conclusions. I'm going to state five things very simply. Number one, the normal state or status, or existential ethical

## *Humanism Today*

posture for the human being, regardless of their political, economical, social system or religion, should be that of a pacifist. This is not merely because it is expedient, it is because it is biologically and psychologically based, as well as spiritually based. We can only become full human beings when we learn that the virtue of love is not to be restricted to individual behavior, but elevated to a social and political norm as well.

Secondly, nonviolence, the philosophy and the strategy of nonviolence, which is an infant science, is at last making violence itself, if not only war, obsolete. Further, I think it is helping us to understand the tremendous immorality of it, especially when we look at the myriad methods of defense that we have which can be based on the use of nonviolence.

Thirdly, and here I to some extent touch on my own thought on the just war theory, violence may be used only as an absolute last resort. I do not deny personally the need for it in this sense. I may never say it is morally good, as I'll say later, but in this sense. If you look at something like the Nicaraguan situation, it is very difficult for me to make any kind of moral judgment on those people, but that was the last resort. I mean, it seems to me they had very little alternative in that situation under the Hitler of Central America, Samosa. So defense may be used on a violent basis, it seems to me, but only as an absolute last resort, and even then I argue that it is always to be seen as an evil. It is the lesser of evils, just as my friend saw it evil to shoot the man even though he felt he had to do it - the lesser of evils. We must never turn around and as you ride into the airport suddenly see glorious signs of people carrying rifles and things such as that. I think that's a perversion of those who lost their lives. They didn't want to kill, they felt they *had* to do it, but it seems to me it's an insult to their memory.

The fourth great premise is that we must stop much of our rhetoric, especially the Americans, about freedom. We know it's rhetorical, it's a good word, it means a great deal to me, and I fully cherish it. I've traveled enough to know some of the great benefits of our country. I do not in any sense put down the marvelous institutions that we have. However, this overconcern with freedom and the lack of attention to justice is so painfully obvious, especially in the political rhetoric of our time. The flag waving that went on at both conventions, the tragic ruination cradle of the Olympic games, which existed for thousands of years in the ancient world. If they didn't stop wars, they at least postponed them and held wars off, and now reearch on the Olympics tells us that they did a lot of negotiating at the games, etc. This tremendous perversion, and suddenly they become a contest between freedom and slavery, etc.

We must begin as educators, as religious leaders to start to make the word "justice" the principal goal for our society and eventually for the world.

The fifth conclusion, obviously, is that we must do all we can politically and actively to work for the global human society. Such practical things as supporting the National Academy of Peace, working actively through those

of us who are New Yorkers, to state publicly as often as we can (I had a petition drive among my students - we've got a thousand kids at Manhattan College) to say we're privileged to have the United Nations here in our midst rather than waving goodbye at the Hudson River, we're delighted to say "Hello, welcome to this great body." We don't endorse everything about it, but we see what enormous potential it has.

I want to just offer one last comment. I think peace is possible even in the nation-state form of evolution. I know there are many theorists who disagree with me. I was sitting down with Hans Morgenthau many hours, debating this with him. He just, as you know, he ended up his life as a Federalist, would that he had been converted a bit earlier. But in any event, Hans Morgenthau just was a pessimist about this. So was Reinhold Niebhuhr, and so many other people.

No, wherever the human spirit is, wherever human beings can work together actively, can maintain a sense of humor and a spirit of hope, I believe no matter what system they live in, they can forge dramatic changes. I would deny too much history if I said anything else.

So while we must work for these strategic and structural changes, we must keep in mind that as long as the human spirit endures, we can indeed force justice and at least prevent war and much of the violence that exists in our own time. We *can* disarm from nuclear weapons even in the nation-state form of evolution.

The last point is just a simple experience I had this summer. I went to some of the trenches in World War I, in the battlefields, and stood there as I know some of you have done in Flanders Fields and thought it was senseless horror, senseless horror. I saw graves of young German lads, French lads, Belgian lads and English lads, Americans, Canadians. And I thought of this senseless horror. And after going to Ypres, I went up to Bruges, that great city in Belgium, which is the Venice of the North as some call it. I went into the cathedral for some moments of silence. You don't have to be religious in any Catholic or formal sense either to go into one of those great cathedrals to really feel the spirit, the human spirit, which built these marvelous buildings.

I remarked that I noticed that some of the bricks were darker on the very bottom. So my friend said to me "You're perceptive," and I just read Erasmus, and he said I'm allowed to praise myself, so I said, "Yes." Seriously, my friend said, "Yeah, that's right because, you see, this was built in the 13th Century. It was started in the 13th Century. When they got the first layer of building blocks in, the Black Plague hit. It killed everybody. It killed all the stone masons, all the artisans, all the people who made those magnificent stained glass windows - killed all of them; several generations of them. It wasn't started again for another 150 years." As I stood there, and I said, "My God, what went through their minds, they thought the world was over - all the stone masons are gone, all the great intellectuals are gone, all the great people who can make marvelous statues are gone. We shall never build this cathedral; there is evidence to show that. They said "it'll never happen, it can't be done. It's over."

## *Humanism Today*

We're standing right now, dear friends, at that crucial moment in history. Some say the 13th Century, I don't know what century, but unless this century provides a turning point to the building of that cathedral. We've got the first six feet built; we've got the foundation laid. Too many of our forebears for many, many centuries, too many of your spiritual and intellectual forebears, have given their lives to see that this building be built. So let's not lose hope. Let's realize that even though it may take another hundred fifty years before we train the peacemakers who will build those bricks, before we train the specialists in justice and conflict resolution, we will put together those stained glass windows. Let's not lose hope.

I don't mean to say that you, I realize you people are based, your faith is based on the capacity of the human spirit to translate hope into political reality, which shall be the basis of justice for all of us.