

A Collection of Articles from the Catholic Worker
1955 - 1961

CONTENTS

[As best as I can verify, all these articles are in their entirety. Most I re-typed from faded back issues or our set of bound volumes; a few I got from the archives at www.catholicworker.org.]

The Catholic Worker, May 1955
Editorial: "Our Positions"

The Catholic Worker, May 1955
"Operation Suicide"
by Ammon Hennacy [1893 - 1970]

The Catholic Worker, July-August 1955
"Where are the poor? They are in the prisons, too."
By Dorothy Day [1897 - 1980]

The Catholic Worker, July-August 1955
"Civil Disobedience"
By Ammon Hennacy

The Catholic Worker, November 1955
"What is Happening? Trial Continued Until Nov. 16th"
By Dorothy Day
[not yet re-typed]

The Catholic Worker, January 1956
"H-Bomb Tests and Human Survival"
By Debbie Brennan

The Catholic Worker, July-August 1956
"C.W. Editors Arrested in Air-Raid Drill"
By Dorothy Day

The Catholic Worker, July-August 1956
"Nuclear War and the Liberals' Dilemma"
By Edmund J. Egan

The Catholic Worker, November 1956
"The Transformation of Man"
By Lewis Mumford [1895 - 1990]
[not yet re-typed]

The Catholic Worker, January 1957
"The Weather and the Bomb"
by Ammon Hennacy

The Catholic Worker
Special Edition: July 17, 1957

"DOROTHY DAY AMONG PACIFISTS JAILED"

The Catholic Worker, July-August 1957
"On Pilgrimage"
By Dorothy Day

The Catholic Worker, January 1958
Letter from Japan
Chiaki Gato

The Catholic Worker, February 1958
"Stop Atomic Tests in the Pacific"

The Catholic Worker, May 1958
"Picketing Missiles in Florida"
by Ammon Hennacy
[not yet re-typed]

The Catholic Worker, April-May, 1959
"A Radical Position Against Atomic Armaments"
By Karl Barth [1886 - 1968]

The Catholic Worker, October 1959
"Nuclear Challenge to Conscience"
By James W. Douglass

The Catholic Worker, January 1960
"The Fundamental Alternatives: Christ or the Bomb"
By Rev. Johannes Ude (1874 - 1965)

The Catholic Worker, June 1960
"500 Defy Civil Defense Drill in N.Y.C."
By Ammon Hennacy [1893 - 1970]

The Catholic Worker, July-August 1960
"Toward Nuclear Morality"
William J. Pieper, MD
& Edward Morin

The Catholic Worker, April 1961
"Polaris Action"
By Tom Cornell

The Catholic Worker, June 1961
"Nonviolence and Nuclear War"
by Dom Bede Griffiths, OSB [1906 - 1993]

"Breaking the Thought Barrier"
By Jerome D. Frank [1909 - 2005]
The Catholic Worker
Part I - July-August 1961

[Eds. Note: A longer and footnoted version of this article appears as the last chapter of Breakthrough to Peace: Twelve Views on the Threat of Thermonuclear Extermination, published by New Directions in 1962, with an introduction by Thomas Merton.]

The Catholic Worker, May 1955

Our Positions

The general aim of the Catholic Worker movement is to realize in the individual and in society the expressed and implied teachings of Christ. The basic reason why our society is un-Christian is because in our emphasis on material wealth we mistake this so-called progress for spiritual growth. Inasmuch as we do have a feeling of restlessness and insecurity and a vague idea that all is not well we generally have the wrong method of bettering our conditions, for we think with Rousseau that man is born good and is corrupted by society. From this false basis it naturally follows that all we have to do is change society and then we will have better people.

The CW holds that we will have a better world when we have better people, and that the way to accomplish this is for each person to be a responsible individual: to change himself.

Spiritual

The spiritual basis of the Catholic Worker stems from the Sermon on the Mount. When Jesus was asked to do with the woman caught in sin he said, "He without sin first cast a stone at her." He advised us to love our enemy, to turn the other cheek, and to return good or evil. Our whole society is geared to a return of evil for evil, for when we vote for a legislator who makes a law saying five days, five years, life or death, or when we vote for a judge who pronounces the sentence, or when we vote for an executive who appoints the hangman or the jailor we are making these men our servants, our arm to cast a stone. If we ourselves serve on a jury we are also denying Christ.

Economic

The economic basis of the Catholic Worker is that of the early Christians where, "From each according to his ability and to each according to his need" was the custom. And St. Paul said, "Let your abundance supply their want." Both of the systems we know of today, Capitalism and Communism -- the latter being really state capitalism, place the state as supreme. The Catholic Worker rejects the national state and all of the militarism that is a part of it. Those who thus reject the state are properly called Anarchists. Their idea of a free society may also be called Personalist or Distributist, and its basis is a decentralization of population, of factories, of life in general, with emphasis of life on the land: in village communes with outlying land, as the norm rather than the exception.

There is a positive kindness and generosity within everyone which comes from God and which is natural. This feeling is perverted by those rulers and exploiters who skillfully entwine the negative feeling of fear of poverty, of old age, of national enemies, and who promise impossible benefits if only people will renounce their individual responsibilities and allow the state to take care of them. When we appeal to this goodness within man it is not with unrealistic sentimentalism or a negation of original sin, but with the knowledge that we are called to be "sons of God" and not weaklings.

The Bomb

Since August 6, 1945, when we dropped the first atom bomb at Hiroshima the guilt of wholesale murder is upon us, and doubly so, for in the name of Christ we say we are defending ourselves from atheistic communism while at the same time our atheistic capitalism invents new atomic terrors for the whole world. The only thing stronger than this atom bomb is this message of Christ to love your enemy. We do not have faith in God if we depend upon the atom bomb. We therefore advocate that those who can do so should refuse to have any part in our present system by refusing to vote for any officials, by refusing to pay income taxes for war, by refusing to work at war work, or to buy war bonds. For boys who are 18 years of age the norm is to be drafted into the armed forces. If we brought our children up with the teaching of Christ they might be ready to refuse to register at the age of 18 rather than to prepare to kill at the command of politicians.

The Way

To achieve this new society we advocate a complete rejection of the present social order and a nonviolent revolution by direct action of the individual in cooperation with his fellow workers, rather than by political action or violence. For practically we can never hope to get 51% of the ballots or bullets, but nothing can stop an individual from refusing to cooperate with evil, or keep him from cooperating with others in boycotts, strikes, or communal enterprises; nothing except his own fear and lack of faith. Whether our efforts may appear puny compared to the huge aggregations of wealth and material power which oppose us is not important. The only thing that is important is as Malatesta said, whether each day we are trying honestly to live up to our ideal. We recall each day in our Missal the history of those who died rather than put a pinch of incense on the altar to Caesar. We recall the life of Gandhi who overcame the mighty British Empire by his nonviolent campaigns. His life of voluntary poverty and his refusal to follow the denial of companionship to the "untouchables" reminds us that we believe in the equality of all men before God and that we denounce in this country the denial of rights to Negroes and American Indians.

As the world of materialism is tearing itself up with its atomic terror we call for the formation of a "new society within the shell of the old," as the old I.W.W. preamble says, for a world whose basic ethic is "revolutionary love" which Vinoba Bhave in India is practicing today with his "land through love" whereby he receives free gifts of millions of acres of land for the poor. The application of these principles in our country means a return to the Jeffersonian principles that "That government is best which governs least," and "When we look to Washington to tell us when to sow and when to reap we shall surely want bread." It means a realization of the truth that, as Bhave says, "Equal wages would have to be paid to all unless and until it is established that one with a greater responsibility feels more hungry than the one with a lesser responsibility." Our values are human need and not human greed. We know that a few of us cannot overturn this unholy system of exploitation with its pagan values. We also know that we can live to a much greater extent the Christian values which we believe in; that we can expect more from ourselves and others in depending upon love rather than distrust and violence. For we know with that great American, Thoreau, that one on the side of God is a majority.

Reality

As Catholics we should and do believe that the Sacraments of the Church which Christ gave to us are more real than the H-Bomb. We believe that the Beatitudes are of more value than man-made laws. We believe that Christ redeemed us from original sin and there is within every person a possibility of "putting on Christ." To work that his kingdom come on earth as it is in heaven," for which we pray that we feel that we must act like Christians. This does not mean that we should kill each other in war, put each other in prison, or exploit each in either the atheistic capitalism of the west or the atheistic communism of the east. It means that we should withdraw as much as we can do so from participation in our non-Christian society. Our lives should approach that of St. Francis of Assisi in voluntary poverty. We should follow St. Peter who said to obey God rather than man.

The Catholic Worker, May 1955

Operation Suicide

by Ammon Hennacy [1893 - 1970]

This was the heading of a well printed leaflet which the War Resisters League and the Catholic Worker sponsored when we picketed the Atomic Energy Commission at 500 Park Avenue Thursday, May 5th, for it was that morning that the million dollar mock town was destroyed at Yucca Flats in Nevada.

One of the pickets had a small dog on leash with the signs "Today me; Tomorrow you." After some conversation with the police we continued our picket line.

"We may be approaching a point where we cannot be sure that we will not make all the world a laboratory and all living things the experimental objects" was our quotation from the Federation of American Scientists.

And also from Prof. A. H. Sturtevant, Prof. of Genetics, California Institute of Technology: "Any increase in the world level of radiation can damage the race... and every new bomb exploded, since its radioactive products are widely dispersed over the earth, will result in the increase in this ultimate harvest of defective individuals."

We also quoted from Contemporary Issues of March, 1955, to the effect that: "Radiologists who receive low-level doses of radiation over many years die from leukemia (cancer of the blood) at a rate of 8 to 10 times that of other physicians."

Our final advice in the leaflet was "Those who are ready should volunteer to...

- Refuse to make or transport the weapons of war
- Refuse to serve in the armed forces
- Explore non-violent ways of dealing with conflict."

The Catholic Worker, July-August 1955

“Where are the poor? They are in the prisons, too.”

By Dorothy Day

We probably all experienced different things, the thirty of us who were arrested in City Hall Park at 2:05 pm June 15th, for refusing to obey the Air Raid wardens and taking to shelter.

Here are some of the impressions, written down two days after the event, 24 hours after I was released on \$1,500 bail from the Women's Detention Home, a prison on Greenwich Avenue at Ninth Street, in the heart of Greenwich Village.

We, the thirty of us, were made up of seven from the Catholic Worker group, Eileen Fantino and her two companions from East Harlem, and members of the War Resisters League and the Fellowship of Reconciliation, and finally one lone bootblack named Rocco Parilli, who was arrested because he wanted a drink of water just as the warning sounded. When the lawyers and judge turned to the papers, made out perhaps at the Elizabeth Street station, the indictment was against

Parilli and 29 Others.

He led us all, and was oblivious to us all. He was the first in the wagon and we thought him a member of the police force. He had on some kind of badge and a crucifix in his breast pocket which he took out and kissed now and again.

There were thirty of us piled in a police van meant to accommodate ten. Why did we do it? What did the Chancery office think of it all? Of these ten Catholics making a spectacle of themselves, "a spectacle to the world, to angels and to men."

To answer that, we got out one long leaflet, too long to be reprinted here, and one short statement to be read before the news reel camera. The short statement was inspired in this way. That morning in the mail, an old autographed copy of True Humanism by Jacques Maritain, filled with my own notes and markings, was returned in the mail anonymously post mark, New York after many long years with a borrower. The date of publication was 1938, and it might have been borrowed at that time. One of the places marked provided me with the quotation I needed. My statement read:

"We make this demonstration, not only to voice our opposition to war, not only to refuse to participate in psychological warfare, which this air raid drill is, but also as an act of public penance for having been the first people in the world to drop the atom bomb, to make the hydrogen bomb. We are engaging only ourselves in this action, not the Church. We are acting as individual Catholics. Jacques Maritain, the French philosopher has written, "We are turning towards men, to speak and act among them, on the temporal plane, because, by our faith, by our baptism, by our confirmation, tiny as we are, we have the vocation of infusing into the world, wheresoever we are, the sap and savor of Christianity."

The Long Afternoon

We went to the park at twelve thirty, after a light lunch at the Catholic Worker and began to give out leaflets and papers, in front of the Old Tribune building. At one thirty we went to the offices of the War Resisters League at 5 Beekman Place, and met with Bayard Rustin and A. J. Muste, where it was impressed upon everyone that the penalty for our civil disobedience was one year in jail and a \$500 fine, and everyone was asked if they wished to take that risk. Dick Kern, who believes in non-cooperation to the extent of "going limp," was rebuked as one who invited violence by his attitude, and he was told to go off two blocks and demonstrate by himself. However he clung to the crowd and went through his little act, looking strangely pathetic and ridiculous as he was lifted like some grotesque animal by the arms and legs, unresisting but uncooperative by four large policemen. He is very young, is Dick, and his large round moon face, and dangling arms and legs were seen being pushed, or inserted through the narrow door where he joined the bootblack.

I am sure, that in spite of the warning of Bayard Rustin there were those among us coming along because it was a beautiful day, and there were 29 of us and it looked like a party. Catholics are used to the idea of martyrdom, reading daily in their missals the story

of those who are racked and torn and hung head downwards, thrown in caldrons of scalding oil, flayed alive and flung to beasts, so that any suffering imprisonment would entail should be considered slight indeed.

Just before two pm we went to the park and sat down on the benches there, and when the sirens began their warning we continued to sit. That was all there was to it. A number of elaborately uniformed men with much brass, stars and ribbons of past battles hung upon their blue auxiliary police outfits marched upon us and told us to move. When we refused, they announced we were under arrest, and the police van was driven up inside the park, up over the curb and we were loaded in driven away.

Elizabeth Street Station

Our first stop brought us very near to our old headquarters at 115 Mott Street. Every morning as we used to go to Mass on Mott Street we would pass a platoon of uniformed men coming from the station to go on duty. This was my first visit inside. The place is a barracks and is so unadorned, so dirty, so unpainted, that it was as though the men took pride in their unkempt quarters. In the large room where we were put under guard, there was one large illustration on the wall of a policeman aiming at a black target with many directions on how to shoot, to kill or not to kill perhaps? One by one we were taken before the desk, questioned, listed, and brought to still another room. Many of the girls were asked if they took drugs. We were searched in a perfunctory manner by a police woman, and a pen knife, given me a few weeks before by Smokey Joe was taken away from me.

Thirtieth Street Station

On our next ride the men were taken to Delancey and Clinton Streets, and the women to Thirtieth Street. Our drivers seemed to get lost among one way streets and we drove past St. Francis Church and around the block before we arrived at the gloomy looking building which was a women's detention house, where there was a cage, built within the building very similar to the cages in which they house lions at the zoo. It is two stories tall, built rather strangely into the building, and looking out on dark bare walls. There is neither light nor air

except artificial light of course. The place had just been hosed down and was dripping wet, ceilings, walls and floors. In each cell, into which we were locked separately, there was a metal plank to sit or lie on, and an open toilet. The front of the cell was open so that we could see several of our neighbors. Judith Beck was opposite me, diagonally. It was by now five o'clock and we had been detained three hours. Judith had not eaten since breakfast and began asking for food. The matron, a young woman with a horse's tail haircut was amiable enough, but made no attempt to allow us to send out and pay for sandwiches and coffee, or any other food. We were there almost three hours and at eight were brought downtown in another police van to the Night Court which is held in the Centre Street building which is both the Tombs and courthouse. There we were, eleven of us, together with two others, who were later increased by five more, kept in a tiny cell, nine by eleven perhaps, with a bench along one wall, an open toilet and sink in a corner, for the next four hours.

The cell was not big enough for us all to sit down. Usually four or five of us had to be standing up. There were two other cells for the accommodations of women, right alongside, but no attempt was made to use these though the benches along two walls, would have enabled some of the women to lie down. There again we had no food and Judith, who is very slight, was very hungry indeed, and again and again asked if we could not get something to eat. The matron jokingly handed her a little packet of six oatmeal cookies, which she passed around, making half a cookie to each. For fifteen or sixteen women there seemed to be an interminable amount of paper work going on for all those hours, so no one had time to provide anything to eat.

Judith is an actress in the Living Theatre group, which has a little playhouse on One Hundredth Street, Manhattan. She and her husband were playing in Phedre, by Racine. In ours of association we found Judith a gay and attractive little companion. She told us the story of Phedra, and even acted out part of it though she said that through hunger she was forgetting all her lines.

Finally after much more standing and waiting, we were all called up to Night Court, the men coming from down below stairs. They were able to tell us that during their hours of waiting, they had been able to send out for food, which

an attendant courteously served them, and they had not, up to then been cramped as we were, into one tiny cell.

There was more waiting in a "bull pen," the "cooler," outside the court, in a most inhuman cage, already crowded with human beings, men picked up from the Bowery, from the parks, all kinds and colors and conditions of men. We were all as crowded together as on a crowded subway.

When we were finally called out around eleven thirty into the court which was filled with many of our friends, we were a bit light headed with relief, perhaps. Anyway, when the police attendant began miscalling everyone's names there were smiles on a great many faces.

Judge Kaplan began shouting at once, "what all the stir was about," and Judith, from the wide semicircle which we had formed, spoke up in a very clear voice, "We are hungry. We are light headed."

She was dressed rather dramatically all in white with a long white scarf with her black hair falling down around her shoulders. She has clearly marked beautiful features, and very expressive eyes. She admits she is always acting. That is her profession. "My husband and I greatly over-estimate my talent," she had told us.

Anyway, she was acting, she was putting the spot light on herself, and in very much the wrong place. The judge demanded she come up before the bench. He asked her if she had ever been in a mental institution (after a few other questions) and she pertly replied, "No, have you?" This made the judge go into a rage, an anything but judicious attitude. He lost his temper completely, shouted, and demanded that she be taken to Bellevue for observation.

Then occurred that scene which the World Telegram referred to sarcastically in a description, as a riot staged by so-called pacifists, of such dimensions that additional squad cars had to be called out, and 29 reserve policemen. Judith had screamed out at this sentence to the psychiatric ward, her husband had also shouted out and both were dragged from the courtroom, he in one direction, and she in the other. There were such a crowd of prisoners, and Judith was struggling so, that she was carried, by several police, above the heads of the defendants, her little legs kicking like those of a ballet dancer. It was a terrible scene. Several men cried out,

some of the women started to weep, the judge himself took a recess, demanding that we be sent back to the bull pen. If anyone ever deserved to be sentenced to Bellevue psychiatric ward, it was Judge Kaplan for his exhibition of temper.

Again we went back to that ugly pen, that cage where even more men had been pressed in, and there again we waited, not only till the recess was over, but also until a number of other cases had been called up. Our whole night had been one of terrible waiting. Judith was brought down stairs and we could hear her from above, screaming again and demanding food.

Finally, when our case was called, we went back in the court to find it had been cleared of spectators by the judge, and we were treated to a speech by the judge in which we were called murderers, and our bail was fixed at \$1,500 each (we had expected fifty). The case was postponed until June 23, and again we women were brought back to that little pen downstairs, where there was by now an additional drug addict, an old Puerto Rican woman, crying aloud and staggering around the cell, retching and overcome with stomach cramps. Her entire face was black and blue and she complained that she had been kicked in the stomach. Judith was sitting in there alone with her and three other colored prisoners, dismal indeed. She was very sorry she had made such a scene, and had so lost her temper. It should have been understandable what with hunger, terrible fatigue, exhaustion too at seeing such human misery and such actual but perhaps not realized sadism.

We were all kept there until two am and still no food. Judith was taken to Bellevue finally, and I suppose a great deal of red tape and paper work, and rigmarole was gone through again.

Roger O'Neil and Charles McCormack, Agnes Bird and Betty Bartelme, finally got sandwiches in to us at 2:30 am before we were taken to the detention house, where we sat another hour before we were assigned to cells.

The pictures that will remain with us. There is one of Helen Russell and Mary Ann McCoy sitting on either side of the drug addict, embracing her and comforting her, as she writhes in agony, retching and crying out. Her black hair hangs limp around her face and she looks more an Indian than Puerto Rican or Negro. And I think how strange to see such loving kindness and solicitude in a nurse when there is so much cold severity

in the nurses at the detention house on Greenwich Street. There another trained nurse in dealing with another drug addict who had voluntarily committed herself said -- "Go on shake," taunting her. "Shake some more. I am sure you can shake more than that. I've seen plenty putting on this act, and better!" But Helen Russell is kind, kind, and Mary Ann embraces the poor woman with her long slim white arms, and Eileen sits there, her face green, her eyes half closed, looking as though she were crucified.

Phedre

There is that picture of Phedre, her head thrown back, reciting with rapt face the lines of Racine; and later singing with the others, Jungali-gali, an Israeli song which has the refrain, "Man was made for the land, the land was made for man."

There are the two tall, well dressed Negro girls who work in a jam factory in Brooklyn, brought in on the complaint of the sister in law of one of them in a dispute over fifteen dollars, and they laughed over the ribald jokes and pranks played in their factory and when Edith Horwits said in surprise that people didn't act so in the factories where she had worked, they laughed still more. All the girls sang together, and the Negro girls with them, a Leadbelly song of the Georgia chain gang which comes on records and has an expletive at the end of each line, a gasped out "Wah!"

And then there is the line up in the courts, which we attended on three other days after our release on bail, and the sight of men picked up on the Bowery and in the city parks, and all the expensive machinery of city government used to dole out fines and punishment to the pettiest of offenders, those sleeping in the parks, selling neckties on the street corners, begging alms. These are the poor who fill the jails, and occupy the courts. The "big" man can hire lawyers, can "beat the rap," and when he is really caught and imprisoned even then he is treated with respect because he got away with it so long, or did it in a big way. The man who steals a million dollars is honored. Blessed are the poor, and cursed are the rich. These are not my words but the words of scripture.

I emphasize the food aspect of the case because of what happened to Judith. She had begun her day with the typical American breakfast of toast and coffee, and had had nothing substantial for more

than twenty-four hours. On any fast, it is the first twenty-four hours that is hard. After that it is easier as those of us who have fasted up to ten days know. Also I wish to emphasize the fact that being sent to the psychiatric ward is often used here in New York as a threatened punishment and a punishment for anyone who is not submissive to the abuse of authority, to any one who speaks up against injustice in our public hospital wards. Our old friend John Griffen had had a spat with a nurse in the TB hospital on Welfare Island and had been shipped over to the psychiatric division. When Steve Hergenhan complained of the food at the Municipal lodging house, he had been so threatened. Steve wrote some articles afterwards for the CW on the Municipal lodging house and when the city sent delegates to us asking why we had not complained to them instead of publishing the articles, we told them of this new form of punishment -- sentencing to a madhouse rather than a prison. A psychiatric ward is for treatment, not punishment.

Another thing I would like to call attention to is the inhuman crowding. From the outside the Tombs is a great imposing building, but inside we were packed like animals for shipment in cages. We saw these same cages at Delancey Street, Thirtieth Street and Second Street. We pass them by daily and do not realize that inside are men and women penned, inside there is the weeping and the groaning of despair. What a neglected work of mercy, visiting the prisoner.

"When were you in prison, Lord, and we did not visit you?" It is a hard picture Christ presents. He did not forgive this ignorance. "Inasmuch as you did not visit these prisoners ye did not visit Me."

"But they are guilty, they are the scum of the earth, they are the refuse, they are the off-scouring. They drink, they take dope, they are prostitutes. They are vicious themselves and they make others vicious. They even sell drugs to little children. They are where they belong. Prison is too good for them. We can't pamper them."

"I have come to call them to repentance. I have come to be with publicans and sinners. I have come for the lost sheep. I am more there with these most miserable ones than with the judges sitting on the high seats." This is not sentimentality. This is truth.

Oh yes, one can hear these things very plainly lying in a cell when we were finally permitted to lie down, locked in again in these rows of cages, in a bare stark cell that would outdo the Carmelite in austerity. It was good to kneel there on the floor beside the bed and thank God for the opportunity to be there, to be so stripped of all the earth holds dear, to

share in some little way the life of prisoners, guilty and innocent, all over the world.

This was but a slight experience, this imprisonment, and our readers have no opportunity actually of visiting the prisoner, we realize that. We have got to pray. With love, there is no time, no space, nor bars.

The Catholic Worker, July-August 1955

Civil Disobedience

By Ammon Hennacy

"Hello, you're the radical down by Wall Street," said the cop in the Tombs to me as he gave me a receipt for what money I had on my person, for my fountain pen and bag of CW's and literature. I was next to the last in line of eighteen men who with eleven women had been arrested for refusing to take shelter in the fake air raid drill June 15th. Names were not called in alphabetical order and at 2:30 am there seemed to be a minimum of schedule. None of the guards here or at Elizabeth Street station were vulgar and abusive as when I did my five days last November for selling CW's on the streets, for then I was with peddlers and drunks, and now I was with intellectuals. The Bootblack

At City Hall Park we had all been packed into the van except three who were taken in a squad car as the van was filled. Jim Peck had one of our signs which he held by the rear door for those in the street to see, for the air raid was enforced only haphazardly, and the public was attracted to the pacifist and IWW songs which we sang. We had some difficulty in finding parking space to get unloaded at the Delancey Street station. We were all in one big room and those of us who had not met before had an opportunity to become acquainted. An elderly man with a badge on his cap we all thought was some attendant. I gave him a CW and one of our leaflets and it was not until later when the indictment was read in court that we discovered that he was Rocco Parilli, a bootblack who had been sitting in the park, knowing nothing about the air raid drill, and getting up for a drink of water to quench the taste of a cigar he was chewing, he was the first one arrested. Our indictment thus read, "Rocco Parilli and twenty-eight others willfully refused to take shelter." It was entirely fitting that

this common man, not a scholar intellectual or radical, should symbolically head the list, representative of the workers of the world we were trying to awaken.

The "Murderers"

Dorothy and I sat near the door of the van and Bayard Rustin sat on my lap. In the Elizabeth Street station while the officials got our names on cards and counted and recounted us we were able to look around and see who all were here. Carol Perry had just recently come from her tax picketing and fasting in San Francisco and holds the same pacifist anarchist ideal as Dorothy and myself. Patricia Rusk, who had bravely stood in the cold selling CW's last November while I was in jail for doing the same at 43rd and Lexington was there along with Eileen Fantino, Mary Ann McCoy and Helen Russell of the group in Harlem who have been working with the Puerto Rican children. And Mary Roberts, a young woman who has been with the CW staff off and on for years. Sterling Borowski had helped me in picketing and selling the CW at times and Michael Kovalak, a seminarian who has the distinction of being one of the three who picketed the Chancery office in the 1949 cemetery strike. These were the ten from the CW. A. J. Muste, Bayard Rustin and Ralph de Gia were old time War Resisters whom I had known for years. Jackson MacLow is an anarchist of unorthodox Jewish persuasion, friendly to the CW, who happened to walk by when I was arrested at 43rd Street and Lexington in October and who helped Dorothy, Bertha and Eileen sell CW's. Bob Berk, a young radical I had known in Tucson, and Dale Brothington, a Quaker who had corresponded with me from Florida and was

not in New York. A War Resister, Andy Osgood, had visited me in Phoenix and had demonstrated with us against H-bomb tests recently at the atomic energy commission in New York City. Hugh Corbin of the same group had demonstrated with us in January in Washington, DC on the Formosa crisis. Edith Horwitz I had met at 14th Street while selling CW's. Her husband had done time as a CO in World War II. Jim Peck, a War Resister, I had known for some years in various demonstrations.

I had not met Henry Babcock, an elderly Quaker or Robert Fisher, a Unitarian doing social work as an alternative service who had heard on the radio about our proposed refusal and had come down at the last minute in a taxi to join with us. I had an extra one of my books with me and sold him one, but it was later taken away by authorities. Kent Larrabee, leader of the Fellowship of Reconciliation in New York City was also interested in the Bruderhof and he and Fisher and I discussed at length the merits of life in a colony versus out in the world. My cell mate when we finally got to the Tombs was Henry Maiden, the first of our group to be arrested, perhaps because the cops saw his sign and bright yellow shirt. He planned to leave for France in alternative service with the Quakers this summer. Miss Orlie Pell was from the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, many of whose members in the suffragist days had been in jail. Judith Beck was an actress whom I had seen playing in the Idiot King at the anarchist playhouse this last winter. Then there was Joan Hamilton who had walked into our group and didn't know whether she wanted to stay with us or not. Dick Kern has a technique of "going limp" and getting in trouble with the police and we all felt that he should have his "party" by himself, and he promised to go several blocks away, but he characteristically bogged down in front of us and created a scene.

At the height of two World Wars I have been before judges who were patriotic and who had no sympathy with pacifist ideas but I have never seen such an unjudicial personage: such a jittery judge as Louis Kaplan before whom we appeared at 11 pm that night. The Irish clerk did not seem to want to pronounce my name in Irish way although I had previously pronounced it for him. So when calling my name in court he gave it the ungodly pronunciation of Hennacky. Some of the girls laughed slightly at this and the judge wanted to know what

was the matter. Judith Beck answered that the women had nothing to eat for twelve hours and were slightly giddy. The judge asked her to step up. She did so and came too close to his desk and he ordered her to step back, asking her if she had ever been committed to a mental institution. The answer which he got he had coming when she replied, "No, have you?" In a rage he ordered her committed to Bellevue. Her husband in the audience shouted and several police lifted her up kicking and screaming as the judge dismissed the court and called a number of squad cars thinking perhaps that the revolution had started. This reminded me of the Arkansas youth who had refused to register for the draft in World War I and when asked by the judge why he didn't go to war, answered, "Why don't you go yourself, you old so and so?" He got twenty years. In Leavenworth they could keep no discipline when he laughed at the guards. Finally they took him to the psychiatrist who wanted to know why he didn't learn how to behave in jail. "It would spoil me for the outside," he answered. They had to let him go home for in the words of the poet, "He laughed at prison bars."

When court reconvened fifteen minutes later the judge angrily would not allow anyone in the courtroom and read a written statement, for I could see him turn the pages from where I stood directly in front of him. His very words were that, "theoretically three million people have been killed in this air raid and you are the murderers." He fixed our bail at the unheard of sum of \$1,500 each. Whether he sought to climb to patriotic fame in the manner of Coolidge, prosecutor Medina and Judge Kaufman one can only surmise.

In the Tombs

Before we went to court Patricia had brought me a pair of "loafers" from the shoe room. These being without shoe strings I was the only one of our group who did not have to hand over shoe strings and run the chance of not getting them back. Henry Maiden and I were in an upper cell at 3 am with two blankets each and no sheets. We spread them on clean steel springs and slept with our clothes on. This may have been one of the 9 "good" jails of the 586 in 42 states inspected by the Federal Prison Bureau in 1954, although none were given an excellent rating.

The bread was fairly good for white bread and the food was not bad, although a vegetarian always gets the short end of eats in a jail. We were allowed about a dollar of change from what we had brought in to buy extras as the man came around. Prices were fair. For several hours after breakfast and in the afternoon until 4 pm, we were permitted to walk back and forth midst about 40 others, many of whom used their time gambling. One young Negro has 32 and was saying that he had spent 15 years, or nearly half of his life in jail and didn't know how much he would get on this charge. Most of the prisoners were Negro or Puerto Rican or Mexican and seemed to be in on charges connected with dope. To plead as an addict instead of a peddler of dope brought a smaller sentence they said.

One Irishman saw my St. Francis medal and soon got acquainted. He had done five years in Danbury when Dave Dellinger and other conscientious objectors were there and knew all the pacifist and radical terminology. He appreciated the good fight that the radicals had put up for better conditions and introduced me to some friends. Henry had one of our leaflets in the lining of his coat and they read with interest.

On Thursday I wanted to give the meat on my plate to the fellow in the next cell but the trusty would not allow it and insisted that I throw it in the toilet. Friday was my regular day for fasting so I decided to make an issue of refusing to throw food away, but as it happened the trusty obligingly gave it to the Negro next cell to mine.

"Drunk is Sin"

Henry had been released on bail just before dark on Thursday. We had planned before that several of the older rebels who had done time would be released last. As time went on I was reading the Gospel of Matthew which had been left in my cell. Some prisoner had written on the back of it: "Drunk is sin." I could hear the dishes rattling and it was about time to break my fast when a guard appeared and told me to pick up my blankets and come with him. I was soon with six others and we all met together at the CW later. The Philosophy of Civil Disobedience

When I had read about the proposed Civil Defense air raid drill I spoke to Dorothy about it and she felt that we should write up our own religious leaflet

and unite with other pacifists in some demonstration. I phoned the War Resisters and they said that a few of them and perhaps some from the Fellowship of Reconciliation would participate. Later I phoned again and we agreed to meet June 15th at 1:30 pm at the War Resisters office to publicly refuse to enter the air raid shelter after 2 pm, meanwhile presenting a letter to the acting Mayor about our concern.

Dave Dellinger did a fine job of printing and I mailed one with an accompanying letter to the Acting Mayor, the FBI, the police, NY Times, NY Post, Associated Press and United Press. On the morning of June 15th the NY Times in its announcement of the air raid drill stated that we had planned to publicly disobey the regulations at City Hall Park. A television company asked us to read a statement while we were giving out leaflets near City Hall. Dorothy wrote out the statement and I read it to the effect that we were doing this not in the name of the Church but as individual Catholics who choose to follow St. Peter who obeyed God rather than man. A message was read at St. Patrick's the Sunday before asking all Catholics to take part in the air raid drill.

Our leaflet began: "In the name of Jesus, Who is God, Who is Love, we will not obey this order to pretend to evacuate, to hide. In view of the certain knowledge the administration of this country has that there is no defense an atomic warfare, we know this drill to be a military act in a cold war to instill fear, to prepare the collective mind for war. We refuse to cooperate."

We went on to say that Fear was the American way of life, fear of the atom bomb which we invented, of diseases which our unnatural way of living has produced, of the fabrications of FBI stoolies. We spoke of the lack of freedom among teachers, unions, and tenants of public housing projects. Then we repeated our regular message that if we are Christians we must act like Christians. This does not mean that we should kill each other in war, put each other in prison, or exploit each other in either the atheistic communism of the east or the materialistic capitalism of the west. We ended by our advocacy of a refusal to work in war effort, to purchase war bonds, to pay income taxes, to register for the draft, to serve on juries, or take part in politics, with an emphasis upon life on the land in a decentralized

society, with a call for the one-man revolution.

After our arrest the diocesan paper, the "Catholic News," felt that we were presumptuous in our "private interpretation" when the Church always supported just wars and had chaplains in all armies, just or unjust. We know that there is no definite teaching in the Church that one has to be a soldier or support war. For there have been pacifist saints like St. Martin of Tours who refused a soldier bonus and refused to carry a sword and shield.

While at Father Casey's retreat Dorothy, Carol, Dr. Casey and I felt that we should plead guilty when the case came up rather than depend upon technicalities which lawyers would bring up. We felt that we were not morally guilty, but in the sense of a clear cut case of civil disobedience we did not wish to becloud the issue with legal terms. In a statement which we prepared and which we will read in court or present to the public at the proper time we gave our reasons for our stand, acting as we believe in the tradition of the early Christians who refused to place a pinch of incense the altar to Caesar, and in the good old American tradition of civil disobedience of Thoreau and William Lloyd Garrison who disobeyed the Fugitive Slave Law a century ago. We said that, "Now and in the future we pledge loyalty to God even at the risk of disobedience and subversion to the coercive State. We believe with St. Catherine of Siena that all the way to heaven is heaven, and we also feel that all the way to hell is

hell, and therefore refuse to be a part of this hellish war machine."

We discussed it with the lawyers and others who wished to test the constitution-ality of the defense regulations and they agreed that there was a value in a clear cut stand such as we were taking in court. We plead guilty not to gain mercy, for we were willing to repeat our witness against coercive law. (In my case of selling CW's and refusing to move on, I allowed the American Civil Liberties Union to carry my case to the State Supreme Court to gain the right of others to the freedom of the streets. No one else had defied the law, so it was up to me to carry it up. In this case there are many others to test the case.)

The "Commonweal" in a long editorial praised our stand: "The saint and the radical (and they are often one and the same) share a common, ironic destiny, honored by posterity, they are usually persecuted during their life times... We honor the saint and the radical -- dead; alive we find them too uncomfortable for our tribute... A society without its radicals is a dead society, just as a Church without its saints is a blighted Church... We need them to remind us of uncomfortable truths, to rebuke our slothfulness and ease."

We are called to court again, September 14th, at 2 pm at 100 Centre Street. The prayers of our readers that we may witness with strength and love will help us as Christ said: "If ye love Me keep My commandments."

The Catholic Worker, January 1956

H-Bomb Tests and Human Survival

By Debbie Brennan

What are H-bomb tests doing to this world and its inhabitants? This is a difficult question, for the whole world is the laboratory and humanity (as well as all other living creatures) are the subjects for the tests. Our Atomic Energy Commission tells us that danger is negligible. But cannot help hearing other voices which do not reassure us but warn us. We hear Aikichi Kuboyama on his death bed after the March 1954 US test explosion had showed him and his fellow fishermen with "death ash" saying that he hoped his death would be enough to stop the tests. We hear the warnings of

responsible scientists, for instance Otto Hahn, German Nobel Prize nuclear physicist, who said that 10 cobalt-coated hydrogen bombs could endanger the continuation of human life "no matter where they are dropped." If this does not seem serious since no government had made a cobalt bomb, then let us add the evaluation of Dr. Ralph Lapp who has stated that our March 1954 bomb was actually a Uranium-coated H-bomb and was "a much more potent fall-out bomb" than the cobalt bomb. Even though Dr. Lapp was speaking of the bomb's potential as a weapon while Dr. Hahn was ultimate

effects, the combination of their statements brings us up very sharply. Humanity's margin of safety seems perilously small in this atomic age.

The immediate dangers in testing a bomb, which alone contains the explosive power equal to all the explosives used by both sides in World War II are, of course, tremendous. But if we inquire as to the danger of nuclear explosions, we can ignore all immediate effects and consider only the world-wide, accumulative effects. A French physicist, Charles-Noel Martin (Comptes-Rendus, Nov. 1954), has outlined four principle consequences of nuclear explosions: chemical, climatic, radioactive, and genetic which we can consider in order.

As regards chemical effects, a nuclear explosion causes a reaction between the nitrogen and oxygen in the air which results in the formation of nitric acid. Though the total amount is not great, the result is a disturbance of the delicate balance of nature. Rainwater in the vicinity of an explosion shows an increase in acidity, an artificial effect without any compensating reaction in nature. If chemical disbalance becomes great, the metabolism of plants may undergo a complete disorganization. The AEC has never recognized this effect.

The climatic effects are due to the production of a great quantity of small particles of matter which the explosion sends into the stratosphere and which may travel many times around the world before settling out. The results, similar to those following volcanic explosions, are screening out part of the sun's warmth, local floods, disturbance of wind patterns, and changes in average temperature. The last few years have seen too much "unusual" weather to explain away the mere coincidence with nuclear explosions. The Japanese government recently published a treatise on this subject but it has been ignored by the US press and is not available here. The AEC and other governmental agencies have answered the repeated inquiries about weather effects of test explosions with the comment that explosions generate less energy than a storm, thus ignoring entirely the true nature of this effect.

Radioactive effects involve the very nature of living matter and are difficult to understand. Materials made radioactive in the explosions are taken up into the living matter of plants,

animals, and our own bodies. Dr. Libby of the AEC pointed out two "concentrating" mechanisms by which minute quantities of radioactive material can become very dangerous. Radio-strontium concentrates in the bones and radio-iodine in the thyroid glands. One known result of the concentration of radioactivity is the cell disorganization causing cancer, and an evidence of the dangers involved is seen in the cancer rate of X-ray technologists (who are exposed to small, but repeated doses of radioactivity from the X-ray machine) which is nine times as high as that of other doctors. The AEC has been more frank in evaluating this danger than some others, but because of the technical nature genetic radiation damage is most complicated of all.

There may be other effects of nuclear explosions too subtle to be seen as yet, but surely these enumerated alone are enough to make tests appear too perilous to continue. In justifying further tests, one AEC spokesman used the comparison that, as we do not cease building bridges just because there are usually some men killed in the construction, so a few casualties following test explosions must not deter us from pursuing our course of weapon development. This argument overlooks the fact that the possible victims of nuclear explosions are not people hired for a job the dangers of which they know and can mitigate by their own skill and care. The inhabitants of the earth going about their lives without knowledge of their danger or any possibility of protecting themselves should surely not be our victims, and furthermore, the creatures of nature suffer as well. Even if we argue that we have the right to kill ourselves and our fellow men, we surely cannot claim we can annihilate God's innocent creation as well.

Any necessity for further tests evaporates when we consider Dr. Ralph Lapp's statement which the AEC has not denied that the US has stockpiled at this time explosives equal to "several tons of TNT" for each and every inhabitant of the earth. Also, according to one newspaper report at least, the Russians exploded their last bomb of one megaton (million tons of TNT equivalent) while we have exploded bombs up to 20 or 30 megatons. The wisdom of the tests in the purely military sense is ephemeral, to, for every test blasts into the stratosphere its secrets. The "atomic secrets" we nominally guard so carefully and have

executed the Rosenbergs for giving away, are actually spelled out in the debris of every explosion and broadcast over the earth for any scientist to decode.

Only two reasons for continuing test explosions are apparent. One is the tremendous industrial monopoly, in effect a cartel including every giant corporation in America, which has built up around the AEC. The other is our military forces which grow like a cancerous tumor upon our country and take a constantly growing proportion of our strength. Both these institutions find

justification for their continuance in the periodic shock and fright the test explosions bring to the world.

Pope Pius in his Christmas message has asked that nuclear tests be discontinued. This appears to be one thing to which the Russians would agree since they made the proposal themselves. It is up to us, in this country, to refuse or accept the proposal. Surely any Christian, any sane person, in fact any person, who merely values his own life can agree that nuclear tests must not go on.

[<http://www.catholicworker.org/dorothyday/daytext.cfm?TextID=243>]

The Catholic Worker, July-August 1956

C.W. Editors Arrested in Air-Raid Drill

By Dorothy Day

The night before our public protest in Washington Square Park, which is a block away from the Civil Defense Headquarters in New York City, there was a meeting at the Quaker Hall on East 20th Street, at which I spoke about "our moral and religious heritage." It was the subject given to me, and everyone knows that Catholics have no tradition of pacifism as the Quakers, Brethren and Mennonite have. So I tried to explain that when men fought as they had been doing this past month in Poznan, Poland, and in East Germany a year ago they were bravely, though futilely trying to uphold man's freedom, his ideals, his right to educate his children. According to the Thomistic conditions laid down for the conduct of a just war, there must be some reasonable chance of success, and when men in an isolated city revolt against the Soviet oppressor they are not fulfilling those conditions. At the same time who would convict them of sin? They are using the only means they know about, the only means they have been taught. They are in a better state than the great mass of fearful or indifferent men, who think of their material safety, their families and not only are afraid to fight but forgot the traditions of the saints, who saw their brothers or their parents put to death for their faith, and rejoiced to follow them in suffering. The latter used spiritual weapons, the weapons of suffering, prayer and forgiveness. "Father, forgive them for they know not what they do."

But just as daily or frequent communion became rare since the days of

the early Christians, until the days of St. Pius X, so also the use of spiritual weapons ceased to be put first. For many centuries the tradition has been to fight first and when all other weapons have been used, then to trust in prayer. We need to reverse this practice, and with faith and love, overcome the enemy. I pointed out in my talk that certainly there were heroic virtues among warriors and that even in the time of David, one could point to the nobility of Urias, when King David with deceit and treachery tried to make him go from the battlefield to his wife, to cover up his own adultery. Urias said, "the arc of God and Israel and Judah dwells in tents, and my lord Joab and the servants of my lord abide upon the face of the earth. And shall I go into my house, to eat and to drink, and to sleep with my wife? By thy welfare and the welfare of thy soul I will not do this thing." [2 Samuel 11]

So David fell deeper into sin by having Urias sent to the front where fighting was heaviest so that he would be killed. An easy way of getting rid of an enemy, and a way the Communists in Spain were accused of using by John dos Passos. Urias was a greater man at that time than David. David was not permitted by God to build the temple because his hands were stained by blood.

We are certainly willing to exalt the courage of men at war, and with Gandhi to point out that it is better to fight than to run away. And we wish to point out also that we believe the whole point of the life of Joan of Arc, was that she followed her conscience, she

recognized the supremacy of conscience and stood out against the Bishops of France and of England.

I went on in my talk to say that our public demonstration on the next day of refusing to take shelter was not only to practice civil disobedience to a law which was unreasonable since there is admittedly no shelter and no defense except by dispersal, by fleeing the cities, but also to do penance for our having been the first to drop the atom bomb on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Our demonstration was to show our willingness to go to jail, to be deprived of our freedom, to suffer disgrace in the eyes of those who cannot understand our position.

God knows, it is a suffering. I don't think any of us, not even Ammon Hennacy, enjoys these demonstrations, this "going to the man in the street." It is so much easier to sit behind a typewriter, to sit in an office or a meeting house and talk about these actions and these ideas. There is a tenseness in the atmosphere, both among those who are engaged in civil disobedience, and those who are officers of the law and forced into the duty of arresting us. Only the day before, another of a series of home-made bombs had been exploded in a telephone booth at Macy's department store, and in any public demonstration the police are always afraid some unbalanced person or someone insane in his own personal way will try to explode a bomb. (Certainly the government has set him the example in violence, in bomb-making and throwing.)

Even before the sirens began their unearthly noise at four-ten pm, newspaper reporters and photographers, and a television camera were on the scene which of course added to the confusion. Many friends who did not intend to demonstrate had to be urged away so that they would not be caught outside a shelter, and when the sirens blew, the police and civil defense auxiliaries, as many of them as there were of us, converged upon us and told us to take shelter. When we refused they announced we were under arrest, and escorted us to the patrol wagons which were drawn up a block away.

There were four of us women in one: Elizabeth Quigley, Quaker and mother of three children, Pat Daw, twenty-two years old and soon to become a mother, Deane Mowrer and I. There were fifteen men, two of whom were there on the spur of the moment. There was Stanley Borowsky and Ammon from the CW and Dan O'Hagan from

Pendle Hill, and the others represented the War Resisters, the Fellowship of Reconciliation, and the American Friends Service Committee.

We were all taken nearby to the Mercer Street station and the charges against us were made out there. It took from four-thirty until six-thirty and then we were brought again in patrol wagons to the Tombs where we were all locked in cells to await the night court. Judge Strong called our case almost immediately, treated us with courtesy, set our bail at one hundred dollars each, and set Wednesday, July 25th for trial in the magistrate's court at 151st Street. We had to stay until midnight; it took so long to make out papers for us all.

We had many friends in court and there was none of the disagreeable excitement of last year when we were called "murderers" by Judge Kaplan. We have been having a wide experience among judges this past year and were singularly fortunate in having Judge Strong sitting that night, and Judge Comerford the following Wednesday.

The cases of the seven who pleaded Guilty of civil disobedience was severed from the eleven who pleaded Not Guilty. We will appear in court again October 31st.

Other Incidents

My friend Helen Crowe told me after the trial that she had last seen Judge Comerford at the laying of wreathes at the statue of St. Thomas More in Central Park on his feast day as head of the Irish Counties Association. It is an annual affair and is accompanied by the playing of harps and bagpipes.

Stanley Borowsky

Probably Stanley in his modesty would not want to be cited for heroic penance. He decided to stay in jail rather than pay bail. Bail was there and available for him, and we all thankfully accepted it, because although we have pleaded guilty, we have not as yet been tried. But Stanley wished to remain. He looked cheerful and calm after his five days imprisonment and went as cheerfully back again to his cell. Stanley has fasted and prayed, and as a pilgrim has walked to our retreats from New York to Newburgh, from Brooklyn to the end of Staten Island (aside from the ferry ride) and he is accounting life in jail as one of the works of mercy, the visiting of

prisoners. God bless him. We wish he could come out, but if he is making his own kind of a retreat, we can only reflect that God is being praised where perhaps before He has been blasphemed,

and the world is a little brighter for it.

PS. The day after this was written Stanley was released without bail.

The Catholic Worker, July-August 1956

Nuclear War and the Liberals' Dilemma

By Edmund J. Egan

The Associated Press report on the "first American air-dropped H-bomb" contains a series of indicative statistics. It informs us

- 1) that the explosive force generated equaled that of 10,000,000 tons of TNT,
- 2) that the bomb's fireball was three miles in diameter,
- 3) that even buildings "with brick walls 18 inches thick" would be completely demolished to a 6 1/2 mile radius,
- 4) that great "fire storms" would sweep through a bombed city, and
- 5) that radiation effects would insure "early death or long lingering illness" to anyone exposed within a radius of "several miles."

There is about such statistics a certain deceptive calm; their terrible meaning remains veiled behind the surreal image of spiraling numbers. There is somewhere in this spiral a point at which meaning deserts quantity; when we here of millions of tons of explosives, of hundreds of thousands of dead, of such or another radius of total destruction, of entire cities in flames, the limits of judgment have long been overpassed, and the normal sensitivities have been assaulted.

There are perhaps two basic reactions which a man may have to such statistics. He may succumb to this assault upon his sensibilities, and simply cease to respond in terms of meaning, and await with a number certitude the larger and larger numbers which his leaders indicate will characterize the next group of statistics. This reaction would seem to be the one desired by the leaders of the nations, whose utterances tend to avoid realities of guilt and suffering, while

they serve to excite the people and divert their thoughts with a stream of anxious, urgent discourse upon the means and methods of "civil defense."

The other reaction is the one which results when the mind looks behind the numbers; and this reaction entails the realization of being surrounded by insanity. For the continued and mounting production of nuclear weapons in the face of the real possibility of general human annihilation has about it the madness of an agent who desires to survive, yet, in the grip of some unknown drive, prepares the way for its own destruction.

It is of course very well to make this observation, yet until we face the question of the cause and character of such madness and the alternatives in the way of sanity, our role is that of the detached observer, the merely abstracting moralist. Yet to deal with this issue is to enter an area of serious ethical difficulties, and to risk certain almost standard assumptions regarding social morality.

The conscience of ethically interested liberalism has been stirred by this question, and the result has been an increasingly insistent plea that somehow, the nuclear weapon be outlawed. An excellent example is to be found in a recent editorial in THE PILOT, weekly newspaper of the Archdiocese of Boston. The editorial stated: "...we (America) must find some effective and immediate measures which will make the H-bomb morally obsolete before it ever becomes an actual instrument of war." What is at once apparent in this attitude is the implicit trust that "we" -- which is to say, a nation, can achieve the outlawing of the bomb, assumedly through some political, diplomatic action. Such a position evinces a hopeful and sincere optimism, and if it also betrays a certain unquestioning blandness, we must realize how severe is the alternative

position in the light of the liberal consciousness.

The liberal idealist places his faith in social structures, and out of the faith and idealism of the liberal mind have come great contributions to human progress and freedom. When, however, an historical situation arises in which a society to materially defend itself must leave the area of its own values, moral imperatives obtain whose implementation demands that the individual separate himself from the usual structures of his society.

This becomes clear with reference to nuclear warfare when certain political and strategic facts are squarely faced. First of all, it is obvious that in the context of military competition the hope of America and her allies for superiority as against the Soviet lies in tactical advantage, which today means nuclear weapons and air power. The size and the totalitarian character of the Soviet bloc gives it a superior power and military mobility in terms of non-atomic, "conventional" warfare. The leaders of the West are well aware of this, and it is quite unrealistic to believe propaganda statements by Western leaders which claim a desire to ban nuclear weapons, which are their basic means of maintaining equal or superior military power.

The Stalinist bloc, on the other hand, 1) is realistic and knows that the West needs its A- and H-bombs, 2) can therefore with cynical impunity call for cessation of nuclear testing, etc... and 3) would obviously without armed might be at the mercy of its internal and external enemies; and has therefore no intention of a general disarmament, which is the only condition upon which the West could agree to atomic disarmament.

The purpose of this analysis is simply to demonstrate that the means to "make the H-bomb obsolete" are not existent within the context of the real political situation. To seek for these "means" within such a context is to expect one political bloc or another to give an idealistic ethic priority over material autonomy and survival; and this simply is not the way of nations and states.

The answer of the radical and pacifist to this question of means lies ultimately in his doctrine of personalism; the individual taking upon himself ethical responsibility, withdrawing from that vague and supple

"collective conscience" which always bends, however painfully, to the necessary.

The consequences of an individual's choosing the personalist path regarding war in an era in which the collective drive and intention of society is war-centered, must be admitted to be as against the image of an ideal situation, unsatisfying. That each man ought to be engaged in the struggles of his brothers, and share with that even the imperfections of their social structures, is I think a great truth, and one profoundly perceived in our century.

But when society decrees as the price and pledge of this engagement, commitment to such moral abomination as modern warfare, the individual must dissent, and he is not to be faulted for it. The existential involvement in and deference to the concrete situation (as against myths, abstractions and remote ends) is among the most noble insights of contemporary thought. The Christian, however, is committed to an ultimate absolutism in which certain acts whose immediate character is evil must be rejected regardless of any broad, long-term situational demand. A frank avowal of a "situation ethic" is, however, rare among Christians. The more dominant tendency among non-pacifists regarding the problems of war has been to evade, with the aid of some or other "theological principle" exhumed for the occasion (e.g. the "double effect" approach) the fact that there is anything immoral at all about modern warfare.

In this regard, the progressive development of nuclear weapons may ironically be serving a valuable ethical purpose, in that it forces into bold relief the dialectic of war, and makes less and less possible the rationalizations which have served to obscure the moral responsibility of individuals in its regard. The liberal non-pacifist moralist is being forced by what he sees, to pose questions which admit less and less of an answer. Perhaps his questions about the means of war will finally come to be answered in the asking. But it will be answered in a realization that in this central area political society at large has deserted morality, and that a true moral sense can be regained only in the way of individual responsibility, and in the protest and dissent which today are responsibility's necessary expression.

The Weather and the Bomb

By Ammon Hennacy

"I see a bright light" said a girl, born blind, as she stood facing south at daybreak on the morning of July 16, 1945, in Albuquerque, New Mexico. All that the authorities would admit was that two airplanes must have collided. It was not until August 6th when the U. S. dropped the bomb at Hiroshima that it was known that this "bright light" was the first atom bomb, exploded 90 miles south Albuquerque at Alamogordo. My boss saw the explosion but I was not on the workshift at that time.

About six months later the cattle for many miles from Alamogordo were like Joseph's coat of many colors from the radioactive dust. The next year films of the Eastman Kodak Company were being returned spoiled. After detailed investigation it was found that the prevailing southwestern winds had blown atomic dust to Kansas wheat fields, and the straw being made into card board had been used to pack the films and thus destroyed their potency.

At the time of the first atom explosion none of the three above effects could have been predicted. Now eleven and a half years afterwards scientists are frightened at the probably results, not only of strontium-90 causing bone cancer, but of the immediate cause of drought, storms, floods, and altogether bad weather.

"Drought Damage in Billions Sears Southwest Area... Blight Called Worst in 700 Years," says a headline in the New York Times of December 9th, 1956, followed by a description of the drought in each of the southwestern states.

"Tampering can be dangerous. Nature can be vengeful. We should have a great deal of respect for the planet on which we live," TIME Magazine quote super-weatherman Carl Gustaf Rossby, featured on their front page as the man of the week on December 17th, 1956. He is quoted as saying, "each year the atmosphere is more polluted by man's airborne refuse. Man's atomic operations have already increased the earth's radioactivity." They continue, "Rossby watches all this with growing misgivings. He feels that the meteorologists and their allies must hurry to understand the atmosphere before some bungler, well-

meaning or otherwise, turns it against man."

But the most important article on this subject is that by Dr. Irving Bengelsdorf in the Saturday Review of Literature of July 7, 1956. He feels that Dr. Irving Langmuir, Noble Prize winner and expert, has the right idea: "But it would be in line with Dr. Langmuir's chain reaction theory if microscopic fragments of the bomb, perhaps invisible emissions from it, were to trigger off evolving weather prematurely or exaggerate the normal proportion of an existing storm."

I am not a weather expert, but eleven years in the southwest where about every 12th year had more instead of a little rain, and close associated with the Old Pioneer whose study of the tree rings whose width measured the rainfall for centuries, coupled with his epigram: "It'll rain; it always has," has made me weather conscious. The reader can study the three articles to which I refer and get for himself a much clearer explanation than I am able to present. I want to show that it is important to think about the connection between bad weather and the bomb.

Bad Weather

"Since the first atomic bomb explosion in 1945, certain weather peculiarities have appeared. Hurricanes have moved up from the Gulf Coast of the U. S. to harry New England. Tornadoes have multiplied (from 300 in 1951 to 532 in 1953, to 699 in 1954, to over 900 in 1955) and spread from the Southwest and Midwest as far north as Michigan and as far east as Massachusetts. Europe has experienced its most bitter winter in a century. Malaga, Spain, has had its first snow in 70 years; Holland has suffered its worst floods in 500 years."

The Russian bomb set off on November 10, 1955, near Wrangell Island, preceded by bombs on August 4th, September 24th, and an H-bomb on November 22nd, caused, it was thought by Dr. Bengelsdorf, extreme cold in Buffalo, Scandinavia, floods in California and Oregon, and ship crossings were the roughest in 35 years. In Canada there

was extra heavy snowfall, and drought in the southwest.

The areas hardest hit are west Texas, Oklahoma, New Mexico, Colorado, Arizona, Kansas, and parts of Missouri and Utah. Rivers are drying up: the South Platte being only 29% of normal, Arkansas 50%, Rio Grande and Colorado but 50%, Animas and Jan Juan 38%. While the Associated Press reports from Washington on December 17th state that 200 barges on the Mississippi necessary to interstate transportation had been stalled because of lack of water in this "mother of waters." So the Supreme Court granted an increase to 8,500 cubic feet a second of water from Lake Michigan to flow backwards through the Illinois-Mississippi waterway at Chicago to move the barges in the Mississippi. This Chicago canal was first opened in 1900. The water level of Lake Michigan has fallen 2 1/2 feet since 1952.

Williams, Arizona, has to haul water for its inhabitants, and small ranchers are selling out to the larger ones as they cannot afford to weather the drought as the saying goes. The cotton and sorghum crop in Oklahoma is 50% of normal and the peanut crop only 33%. Farmers in Texas have lost over 2 1/2 billion dollars from the drought, the area near San Antonio being the worst. In Colorado the Dolores River is dry and many farmers are quitting the land, going to the city, and much of the wheat was lost. Kansas, where we think of farmers being wealthy with their improved machinery have found out that even such machinery will not harvest wheat that does not fill out. Corn had only half a crop and wheat only seven-tenths, with water being rationed in many towns. Ironically enough the only county in New Mexico not designated as a disaster area is Los Alamos County where the bomb was born, and where men have long since ceased to produce, bent it seems on being the center of destruction. Rainfall is half of what it has been. In Missouri many farmers have to haul water, but as agriculture is more diversified there, the drought has not produced so much misery. In Utah it is only the Southeast part that suffers.

It was General Patton of choleric fame who cursed God and his Chaplain and said, "Get me some good weather." It was, however, Rossby, who studied the weather and predicted that it would clear up so that the invasion on D-day caught the Germans unprepared, as they thought the storm would delay the big attack.

Effect of Bombs

The orthodox weathermen have heretofore dealt with Convergent phenomena, by which is meant that they dealt with events which may be determined if we know the immediate causes, such as that low pressure areas mean bad weather, and high pressure areas mean good weather. Then there is Divergent phenomena explained by Dr. Langmuir who says that from now on progress will come from the study of chain reactions, in which one, small, perhaps imperceptible event cascades from any point in time. Divergent actions are such as "the damage inflicted on a single gene by a lone X-ray quantum, the pulsing of a Geiger counter by a single electrically charged particle, the leveling of a huge forest by a small match. When applied to weather, the introduction of a small cause, at the right place and time, may determine whether a hurricane or tornado is born, or whether a cloud will release its water content."

"The bursting of a nuclear bomb," continues Dr. Bengelsdorf, "therefore creates finely divided radioactive debris with a subsequent production of myriads of ions. The ions are capable of acting as nuclei for the condensation of raindrops. They might also act by some other triggering mechanism so that upon their descent into moisture-laden clouds a heavier than normal rain would fall... The energy change may set off a chain of events over large distances, causing perhaps floods or drought here and unseasonal heat or cold there."

"The day in May 1953 when the mushroom cloud of an A-bomb blast in Nevada penetrated the jet stream and was carried across the country until it was precipitated in a thunderstorm over Albany. The radioactive fallout that came down from that rain kept the needle close to the zero reading of the dial for three weeks."

Other Scientists Disagree

Six groups of scientists reported to the National Academy of Sciences in June 12, 1956, that though atom bombs did not cause bad weather, they gave these three possibilities:

- 1) the debris thrown into the air by the explosions may have some catalytic effect on the behavior of clouds and thereby

change the regime of cloudiness or precipitation over wide areas;

2) the radioactive nature of the debris will change the electrical conductivity of the air, and this may have some effect on more directly observable meteorological phenomena;

3) the debris thrown into the stratosphere by the explosions may interfere with the passage of solar radiation and thereby serve to decrease the temperature of the earth.

It is well known that only a man here and there in any group is inquisitive enough to search for the full implications of a theory or a fact; or brave enough to jeopardize his chance of promotion or his very job to think out loud. So we hear most apologists for the status quo say that war is not so bad, for we kill more in traffic accidents in a year than in a year of most regular wars. They are too dense to see that the same crazy soup-upped system that must have new model high speed cars, also by this same mass production produces wars. Likewise scientists declare that more power is shown in an ordinary thunderstorm than in a dozen atom bombs, so why should we worry about bombs. It is true a "flare" from the sun is of the same stuff as an atom bomb explosion. Dr. Bengelsdorf says,

"The biggest solar flare recorded to date (Feb. 10, 1956) did explode with the impact of 100,000,000 H-bombs of the fifteen-megaton type -- at the surface of the sun. Astronomers who observed the display have estimated that one billion tons

of radioactive debris were thrown into space at a speed of 700 miles per second. But this stupendous event occurred 93,000,000 miles away from us. When we calculate the energy that would cross that immense void and actually reach the clouds over our heads, we find it to be equivalent of only one-twentieth part of the force of a single fifteen-megaton H-bomb exploded in our own backyard of sky."

What to do about it

Whether the farmers and ranchers of the Southwest will nearly all be forced to the city slums, and the concentration of wealth continues until under the illusion of democracy and free elections the welfare state will make slaves of us all, or whether we will disappear from the earth through our atomic wickedness, remains to be seen.

A few of us are not paying taxes for all this nuclear madness. Many of us have refused to work on anything to do with war industries. A friend of the CW who has adopted a dozen children to raise along with his own, refused a job paying \$2,000 a month, because he did not desire the guilt upon his soul of atomic deviltry. Now, in this January of 1957 those who pled not guilty of playing atomic war games in the air raid drill last summer will be tried, and others of us already guilty will be sentenced. We will continue to disobey this iniquitous law, knowing that, no matter what politicians and theologians may say, that a bad law is no better than any other bad thing.

The Catholic Worker, March 1957

Detention Camps Ready for Radicals

By Ammon Hennacy

In February CW 1956 I had an article on this subject, and among the six camps mentioned there was one of 7,600 at Allenwood, Pennsylvania, near Lewisburg Federal Penitentiary. News came today that the Department of Justice has reserved this area as a "standby detention center" where suspected subversives would be interned during an "emergency." The Congressmen from that area, Richard M. Simpson of Huntington, and Alvin R. Bush of Muncy, wanted to open this area up for private industries but the Defense Department insisted upon holding it for the detention of subversives.

The Catholic Worker, April 1957

"Sees Millions Dying in U.S. if A-War Hits"

Washington, March 12 -- The Civil Defense Administration is reckoning on "millions" of casualties in event of an atomic war.

Even if the nation spent \$32,000,000,000 on a nuclear bomb shelter system, Administrator Val Peterson has told a House Appropriations subcommittee, only about 60 percent of the population could be saved.

"We are going to lose millions of people if we have a war," Peterson said. "There is no easy answer to this thing except to have peace." --From NY Post

The Catholic Worker
Special Edition: July 17, 1957

Dorothy Day Among Pacifists Jailed

Four From Our Staff Receive
30-Day Sentence
for Defying Civil Defense Drill

For the third consecutive year members of the Catholic Worker movement have openly refused to take cover in the mock civil defense air raid and for the third time have been found guilty by the courts of this city. At the first trial in 1955 twenty-eight persons from various pacifist groups received a suspended sentence, nineteen pacifists broke the law again in 1956 and the magistrate who presided over the second trial this past January sentenced five of the group who refused to pay the alternative fine to five days in jail. They served their time. And now for the third year ten pacifists, some of whom had participated in both previous years have been sentenced to thirty days in jail and are now serving their sentences in the Women's House of Detention in Greenwich Village and on Hart's Island.

The police, the civil defense authorities and the news services had been notified a few days beforehand about the demonstration and were on hand an hour before the sirens blew. The group of ten left the offices of The Catholic Worker, located at 223 Chrystie Street, near the corner of Second Avenue and Houston Street, about ten minutes before the drill began, walked across the street to the Sara Roosevelt Park and sat down on the benches. When the sirens began to blow the arresting officers asked the group to take cover. They refused to move. The officers then arrested them and escorted them to a police wagon which had been parked half a block away. They

were "booked" at the Elizabeth Street station and then quickly taken to a court on 151st Street, tried and sentenced.

Magistrate Walker Bayer told the ten pacifists: "You're a bunch of individuals who breathe contempt of the law. Read the Bible... and see what our Lord Jesus Christ did for penance... You must be bound by rules and regulations... You use your religion as an excuse to tell others to breal the laws."

This year all those who took part in the demonstration decided to plead guilty, to refuse bail and to refuse to pay an alternative fine. Who are these people? Why have they chosen to go to jail? What purpose does their action serve?

Dorothy Day is co-founder of The Catholic Worker and also publisher and managing editor. Ammon Hennacy, Kerran Dugan are associate editors and Deane Mowrer is a staff contributor. The Catholic Worker is a movement and also a monthly newspaper which have been functioning for twenty-four years. Its members are Roman Catholics; they are also pacifists and anarchists. The newspaper is a member of the Catholic Press Association.

The other five who were arrested are friends of the movement. Of them one, Carl Meyer is a Catholic; the others, Julian and Judith Beck, Michael Graine, Dan O'Hagan and Sandy Darlington are not.

In 1955 Dorothy Day wrote of the first demonstration: "We make this demonstration, not only to voice our opposition to war, not only to refuse to participate in psychological warfare, which this air raid drill is, but also as

an act of public penance for having been the first people in the world to drop the atom bomb, to make the hydrogen bomb. We are engaging only ourselves in this action, not the Church. We are acting as individual Catholics. Jacques Maritain, the French philosopher, has written, 'We are turning towards men, to speak and act among them, on the temporal plane, because, by our faith, by our baptism, by our confirmation, tiny as we are, we have the vocation of infusing into the world, wheresoever we are, the sap and savor of Christianity'."

It all seems so futile, like the task of the Prophets of Israel who were sent by God into cities of sin, not for the prophets sake but for the sake of the people. Sometimes a whole city, like Nineveh, heeds the warning; sometimes, as at Sodom, only a handful have the sense to get out; and at other times no one listens. But still one has the duty, the strict obligation to stand up and say "No" to the madness. These ten pacifists have performed their duty. They have said "No" to the madness of the nuclear arms race. They may have to lie at night for a while on a hard bed in an uncomfortable cell and be treated like criminals when they are much closer to being saints, but they can go to sleep

knowing that if a bomb should drop they will be ready, spiritually.

But what about the rest of us, on the outside? Do we ever give witness to the truth, to the immorality of modern war? Do we register for the draft? Do we pay federal income taxes, eighty percent of which goes to pay for past wars and for the nuclear arms race? Have we ever stood up once and said "No" to the government, to the modern state that lives by exploitation and war?

Ammon Hennacy fasted and picketed the AEC offices near the testing grounds at Las Vegas for twelve days and he will picket the Internal Revenue offices here in New York from August 6th to 17th and fast again, taking nothing but fruit juices. He and Dorothy Day have refused to pay income taxes since the end of the Second World War. What have you and I done?

We of The Catholic Worker intend to picket the Women's House of Detention where Dorothy Day and the other women are imprisoned every day, from noon until two o'clock pm, until they are released. Will you picket with us?

Robert Steed
Beth Rogers
Charles McCormack
(Editors not in jail.)

[<http://www.catholicworker.org/dorothyday/daytext.cfm?TextID=724>]

The Catholic Worker, July-August 1957

On Pilgrimage

By Dorothy Day

The feast of St. Cyril and Methodius, July 7. Sunday, at the office. It is as hot as blazes, real dog days, and most of the office is out, at meetings or at the beach. The soup line is finished, two hundred or so fed, and Roy Duke is out in the courtyard, in the shade of the tenement next door, slicing tomatoes. There is a basket of celery and one of green peppers on either side of him, a colorful setting. I would like to say that these came from our garden farm in Staten Island, but there the crops have not come in yet, and a drought has not helped matters. The vegetables were purchased by Chas. McCormack on his weekly shopping trip to Washington Market, with Tommie and Red or Mike. Some Fridays they arrive happily with strawberries, or peaches, and this week it was blue berries.

It is one of those quiet Sunday afternoons, after a manic Saturday night at the Chateau Garden on Houston Street just around the corner, where a wedding was being celebrated on one floor and a wild dance on the next. I could not sleep so got up and wrote letters until one a.m.

There is an article in PEACE NEWS (England) by Count Michael de la Bedoyere, about the Hydrogen bomb. He wishes that England would not make it, would give up the use of Nuclear weapons. But he does not wish England to be protected by America. He wishes people would explore the possibilities of non-violent resistance, but someone from Poland said that this would work only when the adversary had a moral sense or was stupid. It worked in the case of India versus England because England had

a moral sense, and it was used in Germany by Germans during Hitler because the Germans were stupid, presumably, but it would not work in the satellite countries because the Russians themselves outdid the German Nazis (the Germans could go to school to the Russians) and they had no moral sense.

At least this is the gist of the article as I read it on a hot day. The Count's conclusion is that one has to be prepared and fight rather than let civilization be destroyed. But the 2,000 scientists who recently signed a protest against the tests of nuclear weapons believe that atomic warfare will destroy civilization. There is no question of saving it. I believe the Pope has also said this. And how can one keep small wars localized, especially when we are sending jet bombers and nuclear weapons around the world to our air bases, and to South Korea. While disarmament talks go on, we continue to arm, we continue defense spending. Friday night on the radio Victor Riesel the blind labor reporter said that representatives of unions were in London to beg consideration for the plight of their membership if disarmament really went through. From ten to fifteen million men would be unemployed! So it is recognized that it is defense spending that keeps our prosperity going. We live on the threat of war. It is a hopeful fact that the newspapers give more and more attention to the dangers of atomic war, the words of the scientists as well as the moral leaders of the world.

There is the usual complaint of some of the older readers who also drop in to call, that the paper is not what it used to be. Too much stuff about war and preparation for war, and the duty of building up resistance. But I repeat, in Peter Maurin's day, the problem was unemployment. It was the time of depression. We still need to build up the vision of a new social order wherein justice dwells, and try to work for it here and now. We still need to perform the works of mercy because in spite of full employment there is still sin, sickness and death, and the hunger and homelessness and destitution that go with so much sickness, and our industrial system.

But the work of non-violent resistance to our militarist state must go on. Some readers, and old friends too, ask us why we do not protest Russian tests as well as English and American. We can only say that we have -- over and

over. In the two talks I gave on May Day before left wing groups, I stressed the numbers of unannounced nuclear tests made in Russia. Why don't we picket the Russian embassy, another wants to know. For one thing, we have only one chronic picketer, Ammon Hennacy, and for another, we believe in taking the beam out of our own eye, we believe in loving our enemy, and not contributing to the sum total of hatred and fear of him already in the world.

Today is the feast of Saints Cyril and Methodius, the apostles to the Slavs, and in Jubilee magazine it is stressed how they were persecuted by their own, by the Roman Catholics, and how Roman Catholic bishops of Germany contributed to bringing about the schism between west and east.

The Gospel for this feast gives the directives of Jesus Christ.

"At that time, the Lord appointed also other seventy-two; and He sent them two and two before His face into every city and place whither He Himself was to come. And He said to them, The harvest indeed is great, but the laborers are few. Pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest that He send laborers into His harvest. Go, behold, I send you as lambs among wolves. Carry neither purse, nor script, nor shoes, and salute no man by the way. Into whatsoever house you enter, first say, Peace be to this house. And if the son of peace be there, your peace shall rest upon him. But if not, it shall return to you." [Luke 10:1-7]

The Bible reading of the day in the Roman breviary is about David and Goliath and also contains a lesson for us all. David could not walk in the armor Saul sought to clothe him in, but went out with a staff and stone. And the staff prefigured the cross and the stone Christ, according to St. Augustine.

Sts. Cyril and Methodius went to conquer a barbarous people and won them to Christianity. It was the so called Christians who martyred these saints. Here on page 8 we publish the commentary of St. Chrysostom on this passage of the gospel "behold I send you as lambs among wolves."

A Sister who was in prison for several years under the Chinese said that they came to her then and said, "Now you are like us, you are even poorer than we. Your Lord told you to go with neither purse nor script and you come with your

higher standards of living, with rich among the poor, with schools and hospitals and missions. The Communists come with neither scrip nor staff and go from village to village and teach the people how to help themselves."

Of course we know that the Communists also come with arms, with the use of force, with the threat of liquidation to all who do not conform. It is that very use of force that is the heart of the problem today. The means become the ends. We cannot force people to be good, to be just, to share with their brothers. But Peter Maurin said, We must make the kind of society in which it is easier to be good. We must make it, and we can only begin with the works of mercy, with sharing what we have, with voluntary poverty.

We must do more. We cannot keep silent in the face of the bomb tests, we cannot ignore what we have done in the past to Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Each year on that anniversary, beginning August 6, Ammon Hennacy fasts for as many days as there are years since the bomb was dropped. This year he will fast. He has already fasted twelve days last month in front of the Atomic Energy Commission offices in Las Vegas, Nevada.

In addition to this demonstration of dissent, there will be our third annual protest during the civil defense drill in which the public is supposed to participate by taking shelter, next Friday, July 12. This will be before we go to press for our July-August issue, and is one of the reasons why I wish to write this column now. If we again refuse to take shelter, but go out into the streets, in our refusal to play war games as Ammon Hennacy puts it, we are liable again to a jail sentence. The first year we were only in prison a day or two days awaiting bail, -- the second year we were sentenced to five days, and it is hard to tell what will happen this year. We may be ignored as crackpots, but we have to reconcile ourselves to being a "spectacle to the world, to angels and to men," -- "to being fools for Christ."

Why Do We Do It

It is not because we can say with St. Peter that we are obeying God rather than man, that we do this. There is nothing in this command of the civil defense authorities in itself that is against the law of God. But is generally acknowledged, that there is no defense. So it is a farce to pretend there is.

There is no defense but decentralization, a return of those in the city to the land, or to the small town. One young physicist instructor from Purdue demonstrated at the same time we did, -- allowed himself to be arrested, and sentenced, just so that he could protest the foolishness of these games last year. He paid his \$25 fine and left the court, always careful not to associate himself with us pacifists and crack pots.

The main reason we make our protest, those of us from The Catholic Worker, is to do penance publicly for our sin as Americans for having been the first to make and use the atom bomb. As the priest editor of the Boston Pilot said, "This is an un-confessed sin, and as such not forgiven." We publicly confess our share in the guilt of our country, and are willing to give up our freedom by this act of civil disobedience. It is not an easy thing to do, physically speaking. As I woke up this morning I thought of that hard narrow iron bed which was suspended from the wall, in the tiny cell at the Woman's House of Detention. I thought of the crowded conditions, how Deane's bed was moved into my single cell to make room for another prisoner. I thought of the gray ugliness of the surroundings that the girls tried to alleviate in little ways as they served out their long sentences, by scrubbing, draping, decorating in whatever way they could through the long months. The sooty few feet of recreation space on the roof, the capacious floors for medicinal services, and the scanty space for recreation and occupational therapy. The work is all done by the inmates and there is not enough of that to go around. There are long periods to lie in your bunk and contemplate the four narrow walls, the tiny sink, the toilet in the corner which is also a chair with a metal table in front which comes down from the wall -- your dining cubicle in case you are confined to your cell. You find nothing there you want to satisfy but the most elementary instinct of mind or body or soul. And yet the strange and tragic thing is that so many women have found temporary content and safety there from their drab and sin-filled lives while their health was built up and with it the craving to go out and continue the only life they knew.

We know what we are in for, the risk we run in openly setting ourselves against this most powerful country in the world. It is a tiny Christian gesture,

the gesture of a David against a Goliath in an infinitesimal way.

We do not wish to be defiant, we do not wish to antagonize. We love our country and are only saddened to see its great virtues matched by equally great

faults. We are a part of it, we are responsible too.

We do not wish to be defiant, we atone in some way, with this small gesture, for what we did in Hiroshima, and what we are still doing by the manufacture and testing of such weapons.

The Catholic Worker, January 1958
Letter from Japan
September 20, 1957

To the Catholic Worker:

The third meeting for the prohibition of atomic bombs and hydrogen bombs in a war was held... when we have observed the 12th anniversary of our baptism of damage and penance by the A-bombs. The "wish to peace" rising above the sorrow came back once again to our Japanese minds. We are in a position to judge more coolly and rightly what the heavy damage in that day means. August 6th, when the A-bomb was dropped -- the terrific day which all of Japanese have never forgotten -- is also becoming a terrific day for all the world. By means of the constant efforts of the population, New Japan is progressing little by little, but the unseen destruction still works in the bodies of the survivors, and we know it not only effects their bodies but the blood of the descendants by heredity. We are anxious about the fact that the sufferers from the A-bombing have been dying of disease by the atomic heat and rays, developing sorrowful symptoms of it continuing into the far future.

Atomic power casts a dark shadow. Experiments of A-bombs and H-bombs which are being carried out undermine, gradually but steadily, the foundation of human life, on account of radiation in the air. Besides this, it becomes a great problem when, as in the case of Bikini, the ash of death is thrown about over our human heads. We cannot understand that mankind beyond our thought are put into the great whirlpool of atomic rays. Since future war includes the possibility of the use of such an atomic weapon, we should give impetus to the big-armament limitation and disarmament, and we should appeal the prohibition of A-bomb and H-bomb to the public opinion and the right of all the world; with all other nations in this world we should do our best to save the world from the most terrible crisis.

I hope, through this famous Catholic Worker, that the day when this will be understood by all of the world will soon come.

Chiaki Gato
c/o Yamashita
Tokyo, Japan

The Catholic Worker, February 1958

Stop Atomic Tests in the Pacific

The Golden Rule sail boat is protesting these tests, leaving February 9th from San Pedro harbor for Hawaii, Wake Island and the restricted area in the Marshall Islands where the tests are scheduled in April. Four Quakers, Bert Bigelow, former commander in the Navy; Bill Huntington, architect and boatsman; George Willoughby, head of the Central Committee for Conscientious Objectors; and David Gale, young pacifist, are the

crew of this 30-foot ketch with 500 feet of sail and a small 24 hp auxiliary motor.

President Eisenhower and other authorities were informed of this voyage ahead of any press release. The crew members took part in the opposing of the tests in Nevada last summer. Dorothy Day and I are on the Committee for Non-Violent Action Against Nuclear Weapons and I have met weekly with the steering

committee. We are also planning protests in Florida, Wyoming, Nevada or Washington in April, as we find advisable to correspond with our comrades in the Golden Rule on the high seas.

As the Boston Pilot said editorially in 1955: "The greatest single act of human destruction in the history of the world must be placed on our doorstep -- and we did it a second time at Nagasaki the next day as if to show it was no accident... The supreme tragedy of this moment... is that we still refuse to strike our breast and acknowledge our sin... We cannot buy back our innocence with all the gold in Fort Knox; guilt must be washed away in penitence."

This is what we are doing: penance while on the Golden Rule at sea and penance in our civil disobedience, fasting and picketing the continued testing of atomic weapons. If Admiral A. A. Burke, Chief of Naval Operations can see the possibility "which we have got to learn to live with of some madman pressing the button, and he will wipe out the Northern Hemisphere," then certainly every pacifist or pacifist sympathizer should oppose all of these atomic preparations for war, misnamed "defense."

We ask for your support to finance this voyage. Send contributions, small or large, to Walter Longstreth...

The Catholic Worker, May 1958
"Picketing Missiles in Florida"
by Ammon Hennacy

The Catholic Worker, April-May 1959
"Dorothy Day Serves Ten Days"
Robert Steed

Dorothy Day, Ammon Hennacy, Deane Mowrer, and Karl Meyer from the Catholic Worker, and thirteen others were sentenced to ten days in jail or \$25 for refusing to take shelter during New York State's Civil Defense Air Raid Drill. Those who had broken the law for the first time were given suspended sentences. Dorothy, Ammon, Deane, Karl and Arthur Harvey had broken this law on previous occasions and refused to pay the fine; they are now serving their sentences. About fifty men, women and children have been picketing the Women's House of Detention each day for two hours where Dorothy is being held and distributing leaflets explaining this civil disobedience action. Those arrested come from a variety of backgrounds, they are not all pacifists, they don't all agree about religion or politics but they all have one conviction in common: that there is no defense against nuclear attack except peace.

The Catholic Worker, April-May, 1959

A Radical Position Against Atomic Armaments

By Karl Barth [1886 - 1968]

From quite different quarters, in the course of the last few years, decisive arguments demonstrating the danger and injustice of atomic armament have been brought to everybody's knowledge; they have been elaborated upon with all desirable clarity. Whoever had an ear to lend was able to hear them.

However we find ourselves confronted by a triple fact:

a) Doubtless our governments see the problem; they recognize or, at least, do not deny its gravity but they are all the same determined to pursue and put into execution their fatal undertaking.

b) Though the majority of our populations are secretly -- and in part overtly too -- deeply frightened by the severe threat bound up with atomic armament they are not ready to step into opposition or even definite resistance.

c) The reason for this interior contradiction every where consist in fear: fear of a threat supposedly graver aimed at our most sacred possessions by an adversary on two levels, that of ideology and that of world politics.

No one believes that this threat can be done away with in any other fashion than resorting to the counter-threat of atomic arms.

If one does not manage to extirpate this ideological and political opposition as well as the reciprocal anguish

resulting from it one will be unable to defeat this contradiction: wholesome knowledge on one side and bad politics on the other pertaining to our governments, our populations, our literate world and our Churches. And if this contradiction cannot be defeated, one will have to count with the ungodly and fearful development of atomic armaments.

The primary duty of those opposing atomic armament should consist, in a new effort, stripped of all prejudice to overcome this ideological and political opposition. In other words, the opponents of atomic armament must themselves adopt and bring to light a position which will be exempt from this reciprocal anguish, which will be solely oriented in the direction of God and authentic man. It follows that opposition to atomic armament must continue on every level (in each country and in each domain in the manner that circumstances will require) independently of this vaster context and, consequently, without taking into account direct success or direct failure.

Since there has been quite enough discussion on this subject, the question now is to know whether this opposition ought not to concretize itself in an active resistance (perhaps taking the shape of a direct invitation to rejection of any military service).

COEXISTENCE
Jan-Feb 1959
Belgian Monthly

The Catholic Worker, July 1959
"Civil Disobedience in Omaha"
Five Arrested So Far

The Catholic Worker, August 1959
"Fifteen Arrested, Six Jailed in Omaha"

Nuclear Challenge to Conscience

By James W. Douglass

The man who shatters the confines of his most sacred thoughts and trudges painfully across his biases will one day know his own life...

In June, 1956, Lt. Gen. James M. Gavin was asked at a Senate Investigation how many deaths would result from a Strategic Air Command assault on Russia, if the prevailing winds were in a south-easterly direction. As Director of the United States Army's Research and Development, he said:

Current planning estimates run on the order of several hundred million deaths that would be either way, depending on which way the wind blew. If the wind blew to the southeast they would be mostly in the USSR, although they would extend into the Japanese and perhaps down into the Philippine area. If the wind blew the other way they would extend well back into Western Europe... (New York Times, June 29, 1956)

A more recent article in the London Times is helpful in realizing the weight of those Army Research "planning estimates." In a coverage of the SAC bombers which circle the Soviet Union with their megaton-range nuclear cargoes, The Times reported that "one load in one bomber alone surpasses the explosive capability of the bombs and all the ammunition expended by all the planes flown by all the nations during all six years of World War II." (London Times, May 8, 1958)

Dr. Linus Pauling, Nobel Prize winner in Chemistry, makes use of even larger terms of comparison in estimating our hydrogen power. In a speech before a Chicago convention of social workers last May, Dr. Pauling referred not to the explosives expended by all the planes in World War II, but rather in the explosive power of the entire War. According to Dr. Pauling, the single hydrogen bomb which the United States tested at Bikini in 1954 had "five times the energy of all the explosives used in the whole of the Second World War." This super-bomb left a hole in the floor of the ocean where the island of Bikini had been. It was a thousand times more powerful than the Hiroshima blast which killed a hundred thousand people.

Such a bomb exploded over New York could kill ten million people.

I do not wish to stress the obvious, but we are so used to witnessing the Yucca Flats explosions on TV that we should occasionally reflect upon the wartime contents of an atomic mushroom. The towering cloud of sand and gravel in the desert means, in a city the size of New York, several million civilians blown from their homes and offices. As for the surrounding area -- in an all-out attack the surrounding continent -- life anywhere would depend on which way the wind was blowing.

I mention these facts to break free of the isolation booth of academicism in which so many discussions of morality and atomic weapons becomes enclosed. We must not isolate ourselves in airtight ethical debate from full awareness of the existing situation. Ethical considerations are an integral part of this discussion, but they are of no value unless we bear in mind the overwhelming effects of nuclear warfare. We live in a world, not a syllogism, and a syllogism merely works with the things of our world and the transcending values to which life testifies. Deliberation which aims at validity must never lose sight of the annihilating power which both East and West hold in constant readiness, nor of the almost inconceivable consequences of that power if unleashed.

St. Augustine said: "He who can think of war unmoved has lost all human feeling." (The City of God, Book 19, c. 7) He who can think of hydrogen war unmoved has lost all human intelligence as well.

The first consideration is one of justice, of human natural rights. I do not question the divine gift of freedom or the right men of good will to defend that gift. I am questioning our right to defend it in any way we please. Is the United States justified in employing the threat of nuclear retaliation as a deterrent to Soviet aggression? This question is based on an assumption which I believe most observers would admit as correct: that in the event of an atomic attack on the West, the US would retaliate in kind. Do we have the right not only maintain but to increase constantly a deterrent power of such monstrous proportions -- a deterrent which is already capable of exploding and poisoning a continent of people? A further

question forces itself upon every thoughtful American who is subject to the draft: if the use of large-scale atomic weapons is not a just defense, how can I agree to training which will call for active participation in such incredible slaughter?

In our search for right answers to the problem, a valid standard of judgment is the principle of double effect. This principle is frequently cited in support of thermonuclear defense.

Double effect was recognized implicitly by St. Thomas as the basis for our individual and national rights of self-defense. The conditions for a just war which St. Thomas sets forth in the Summa Theologica (I-II, q. 40) are simply an explication of double effect as applied to international conflicts. The principle states that an act leading to both good and evil effects is permissible, first, if the act in itself is good or indifferent. We can begin by saying that Catholic ethics considers the killing of one man by another an act indifferent in itself. The intention of the killer, and the circumstances surrounding his act must be known to determine whether or not the killing is morally justifiable. A deliberation on these points involves the other conditions of double effect: the good effect must be proportionate to the evil effect, and must follow as immediately as that evil. Finally, the doer must not intend the evil effect for itself.

Thus, to use a common example, a policeman may spot a dangerous spy in a crowded café. The spy must be captured dead or alive or an international disaster is likely to result. The policeman makes sure of his prey by throwing a lighted stick of dynamite into the café, killing forty people besides his target. Was the policeman right in his action? Double effect says no. The good effect of the spy's death is not proportionate to the indiscriminate massacre. The policeman should have made a discreet approach or aimed a careful shot at the spy.

In a similar manner, the principle of double effect is the source of moral distinction between combatant and noncombatant in the problem of bombing raids. When a state defends itself by bombing proper military targets, which in human terms mean massed combatants, the unintentional killing of innocent civilians is normally justified by theologians as the accidental by-products of a legitimate act of war. The good effect, which is the killing of combatants by a justly warring nation, is held to be proportionate to the

evil effect, the unintentional killing of civilians in an area liable to attack. A natural question arises here as to the specific identity of the "combatants" in their "proper military targets." Which men in war are morally liable to the vision of death falling towards them from a bomber-filled sky?

The first and most obvious answer is "the men in the enemy's uniform," the members of the aggressor's armed forces. These men have either volunteered or been drafted to fight for their state's cause, a cause which we have supposed is unjust. Either from voluntary choice or acquiescence to an evil order, they have placed themselves in a morally and physically vulnerable position. They have allowed themselves to be made the instruments of injustice; now they can be forcibly repulsed by the defenders of a just order. By their own participation in the unjust actions of their state, they have exposed themselves to lawful execution by the exigencies of war.

The evil of conscription has made it certain that many of these "combatants" are men too young or unequipped to make mature judgments of their nation in war. Men of good will, they become legitimate targets if we adhere to a merciless logic. These innocent combatants can be destroyed according to ethics because they pose a threat to our own safety. Christianity has been said to call for a more positive way of life than the following of a natural code of ethics. We are engaged in no sacrifice when we kill other men to save our own lives. To the question, "How great a sacrifice does my Faith fall for?" a man of courage should meditate upon Calvary. To regard ethics alone as the criterion for acting is a denial of self-sacrifice. Many of the men we kill in the next war will be better human beings than ourselves. The killing of men in good faith, just though it may be, should reinforce the fact that our use of the ethical right of self-defense is not laudable, but simply permissible.

But even admitting the just defender's right to kill combatants, we are faced with a graver problem in the case of civilians. Does the civilian share the soldier's liability to execution? Has he, or more accurately, she -- for the civilian population in war is always predominantly female -- in some way made herself and her children liable to execution by war? In 1939 this statement appeared in the Vatican publication, L'Osservatore Romano:

"...For seven centuries the Church in her councils has declared the inviolability of civilian populations -- and what is more, of their workshops, their houses -- from every assault of war. Reprisals against civilian populations are a monstrous thing."

Theoreticians of Catholic ethics do not always accept this inviolability of civilians "in their workshops." Civilians in jobs which make important contributions to the military effort are frequently designated as legitimate targets for destruction. Rev. Austin Fagothey, SJ in Right and Reason maintains this less inclusive range of civilian inviolability:

...workers on arms, munitions, transport, communications, and the like, despite their technically civilian status, are actually combatants; their work is directly military in nature and can have no other purpose. The same is not true of farmers who grow food that will eventually be used by the armed forces, those who take civilian jobs to free men for military service, those who merely contribute money or lend moral support toward the war effort; their cooperation is too remote to make them combatants...

Although the exact line of demarcation between combatant and noncombatant is debatable, the principle of double effect makes an implicit demand for a distinction between the two. In saturation bombing -- and a single atomic burst city-aimed is saturation bombing -- the evil effect of indiscriminate slaughter far outweighs the destruction of military targets and combatants in that area. That an entire city is a military target could be claimed only in the rare case of a completely mobilized population engaged in direct military work. Cape Canaveral is an American site whose military function is of such a high priority. In less extreme cases the inviolability of civilians must be respected, if we are to maintain the proportion between the corresponding good and evil resulting from hydrogen bombing. We should keep in mind, too, that overall victory in a war cannot be used as the good effect to balance the evil of numerous wholesale holocausts on the way to that victory. It is never permissible to seek good through evil; we may not excuse our butchery for the sake of and as a means to a final end. Not the possibility of final victory, but the immediate destruction of strictly military targets is the good which

must balance the killing of civilians. In the nuclear bombing of civilian populations, the obliteration of military installations in the area does not balance the huge massacre of innocents. In terms of our earlier example, the policeman is again throwing dynamite in the crowded café to make sure of his adversary. The reaction we would feel to the policeman's murderous method of protection should be a lesser outrage than our attitude towards the hydrogen bombing of a Russian city.

Field Marshall Montgomery was quoted in April 1957 Jubilee as saying:

We at SHAPE are basing all our operational plans on using atomic weapons in our defense. It is no longer a question of 'They may possibly be used': it is very definitely 'They will be used -- if we are attacked.'

If we adhere to Catholicism's conditions for a just war, then a failure to reconcile the nuclear bombing of civilian populations with the principle of double effect forfeits from a state using that defense the claim to a just war. Needless to say, if a Catholic does not follow the Church's traditional, but non-dogmatic conditions for a just war, he has imposed upon himself the obligation of finding some other measure of morality in war which is consistent with his conscience.

The condition that the evil effect of an act must not be directly intended also makes it difficult, if not impossible, to see how an atomic attack on a city could be declared ethical. If it is claimed that the authorities who order the attack do not have the direct intention of violence to the innocent, we must ask why these authorities do not choose bombs which can knock out military targets without annihilating residential areas. The deliberate decision to so use these devastating explosives, which when dropped upon cities by their very nature wipe out the distinction between combatant and civilian, must necessarily include the direct intention of violence to the innocent. This may be considered regrettable, on the order of "We're sorry but we had to do it to them," but to deny that this intention would be part of our leaders' decision is to deny that they have the rational power to decide their weapons. The nuclear apologists argue that an H-bomb is innocent of those responsible simply concentrate their intent to kill upon the combatants in the area. Sophism and hypocrisy have not lost popularity in the Atomic Age.

There is one, inevitable justification for nuclear retaliation argued by politicians and moralists alike, who wish somehow to place God on their side. From the politician it issues as: "We have only one effective way of defending ourselves from Soviet aggression -- atomic warfare. If we have to, we'll use it." The moralist will use different terms, such as "rights," to restate this position: "If the nation has the right to defend itself, it has the right to use whatever force it needs to attain that end." The politician and the moralist are both arguing from the same principle, always the underlying basis for a verbal defense of nuclear warfare; the end justifies the means.

The right of self-defense, for either an individual or a state, is not unconditional. It is derived from the principle of double effect and limited by the conditions of that principle. When self-defense is referred to without an implicit recognition of those limitations essential to it, this "right" will always, upon careful analysis, dissolve into a re-statement of that infamous maxim: the end justifies the means. The state has the right to defend itself, but only when that defense can satisfy all of the conditions which govern the right. Nuclear warfare can never satisfy those conditions.

If we are unwaveringly dedicated to vindicating our present methods of defense, we must invent a new code for the just war which somehow manages to prove that the end does justify the means. The end in question here is the few pockets of Western citizens which will survive the Third World War. Our nuclear apologists must make these pockets of survival justify the inferno which will envelop North America, Europe, and Asia, our guilt in this being something like the "several hundred million deaths" in Asia, and a like toll in Europe... if the wind blows the wrong way.

The irreconcilability of total morality has been the dilemma of Catholic militarists since that dawn in 1945 which was shattered by the first atomic explosion. They have dealt with the dilemma in various ways by a silent front which ignored the new moral problem of the Bomb; by a deistic nationalism which made "God and country" one supreme entity subverted by the pacifist; by a seizure of isolated parts of moral principles to justify the new weapon; and most recently, by painting the Catholic pacifist as an outlaw from the Church by alluding some of the public statements of Pope Pius XII. The latter method is now the most

frequently used to demonstrate that the pacifist is "subjectively in good faith but objectively wrong."

The attempt to establish a case against pacifism by carefully selected quotations from Pope Pius XII's messages is futile for more than one reason. Pope Pius XII never issued an ex cathedra pronouncement on the pacifist position. Every statement he made on the question was that of a learned man speaking in a fallible, non-dogmatic manner. His view of the pacifist seemed to shift, too, from one address to another. As early as 1944, he stated in his Christmas address:

"If ever a generation has had to appreciate in the depths of its conscience the call: 'war on war', it is certainly the present generation... the theory of war as an apt and proportionate means of solving international conflicts is now out of date."

"War on war" had been a favorite phrase of the pacifist movement long before it was taken up by the Holy Father. That war is no longer "an apt and proportionate means of solving international conflicts" was his 1944 application of the conditions for a just war.

The Christmas 1956 message of Pope Pius XII contains the quotations most frequently seized by the anti-pacifist. This address includes the controversial statement that "...a Catholic citizen cannot invoke his own conscience in order to refuse to serve and fulfill those duties the law imposes." For two years now, those words have been the argument used to discourage young Catholics from exercising their own consciences on the problem of nuclear warfare. Those who so use the quotation seldom mention that the sentence preceding it makes explicit mention of the condition of "legitimate instruments of internal and external policy" in a state, or that this section if the Papal message when fully read is an obvious reference to the Hungarian Revolution which was occurring at the time.

No Pope has ever passed public judgment on the justness of a particular war. Catholic tradition has given us non-dogmatic principles of judging wars, but the Church does not serve as the individual's own conscience; the individual citizen-soldier must decide the justness of the wars he agrees to fight in. Nor is there any foundation in our Faith for the comfortable notion that the state has replaced the citizen's conscience when it is confronted by questions of morality in national law. St. Paul's admonition that

we must obey God, rather than men" has not been superseded by the dictates of modern nationalism. "God and country" can be our cry only when the state's acts are in agreement with their divine source of authority. When God and country are seen to be in conflict, and we as thinking persons must judge when such a conflict occurs, then we are obliged to "obey God, rather than men." Neither the Church to which we owe our first allegiance, nor the state to which we give our loyalty, can remove the individual's responsibility for making his own moral decisions by the aid of reason and divine grace.

The Catholic pacifist has the vocation to turn man's conscience to the moral vacuum which surrounds the question of nuclear warfare. The Catholic pacifist's convictions grow from his contemplation of the meaning of the Crucifixion, of his infinite debt of love. It is a pacifism based on true and loving man-to-God relationship, which necessitates a loving man-to-man relationship. What more is this than the order of living called for by the Gospels? As Father J. F. T. Prince says in A Guide to Pacifism, the Catholic pacifist accepts "wholly the cross as the means appointed to save and set right, not rescinding from it when the need is most obvious and the occasion most critical."

The crucial issue is that of faith. How much should man trust in faith? What limits, if any, should he place on faith? The Catholic rationalist will find many. The Catholic pacifist looks to Christ and

says, "No limits on faith." He then suffers to live his belief.

Ours is the age of the terror bomb, of the cold-warm-hot war, of global fire and winds of poisonous dust, all threats dependent upon the sanity of key, shifting minds. The individual American citizen has a negligible political power over these threats, a single vote which is absorbed into the collective swarm of public opinion. If he cares enough to reflect on the nuclear arms race, its suicidal significance, and his country's preparation for slaughter, he is frequently discouraged by his own weak bit of democracy. He too often accepts this weakness in quiescence as a chain of destiny. He forgets his voice; he forgets moral protest. He neglects the wisdom of Thoreau, who said, "It matters not how small the beginning may seem to be: what is once well done is done forever." He neglects the inspiration of Gandhi, whose victory over the British in India proved Thoreau right. And in his greatest oversight, the citizen prone to inadequacy ignores the enormous power at his disposal, the potential weapon of a soul with an immeasurable capacity for strength. The soul of the citizen in reflection needs a painful, spiritual training, whereby the acts demanded by personal conscience can withstand an age without collective conscience. That citizen can retain his moral power of protest until the white flash blinds him. Then he will see his moral activity, or passivity, in its eternal reference.

The Catholic Worker, January 1960

"The Fundamental Alternatives: Christ or the Bomb"

By Rev. Johannes Ude (1874 - 1965)

(Text of a sermon preached in the Church of St. Kanzian in Austria on June 4th of last year.)

Mankind as a whole, and therefore every man in particular, is now faced with the necessity for making a decisive choice on which depends nothing less than the possibility of establishing peace in the world. I have no doubt that you who are assembled here sincerely desire a true peace. But such a peace can come about only if each individual assists at the building of it. Every man, without exception, must contribute to this undertaking. Has it not been pointed out

that the best of us cannot live in peace if our ill-disposed neighbors stand in the way? We have to make ourselves realize that war and peace are born in the heart of each individual.

Meanwhile, there is the practical question to consider: what must we do in order that, at last, peace may become a reality? To pose this question is to place before ourselves the fundamental alternatives: either we choose to follow the way of Christ or we choose the atomic bomb. There is no third solution. To follow the way of Christ is to opt for life, to elect, with His help, to secure and consolidate a real peace. But if we

adopt the view, held by every nation-state in the world, that peace can be obtained by atomic bombs, then, to be sure, we will also be choosing peace, but peace of a very different kind -- the kind found in cemeteries.

That is why I am asking you, and the rest of humanity as well, which way you will choose. The way that leads to peace through Christ, or the other way, that professes to reach the goal with the aid of the atomic bomb. But perhaps you have already made your choice.

More than nineteen hundred years ago, on the banks of the Jordan, a man named John the Baptist cried out to the people: "Be on guard, do penance, because the Messiah has come among you, the Savior whom God has sent you and whom you do not acknowledge: the Messiah, the Christ, sent by God to show all men the road that leads to eternal life."

You all know what happened. They did not listen to him. They crucified Him who had come to bring them Truth, Salvation and Peace. We know what the consequences of this rejection were. Jerusalem was chastised for having chosen to follow its false prophets, its politicians and its clergy, rather than Christ, the Divine Messenger.

An identical fate -- or rather a fare more terrible one -- lies in store for us if we ignore God's warning and if we do not make up our minds to initiate the indispensable revolution of conscience. Everywhere in the world, the scourge of atomic death threatens men. In the wake of numerous nuclear tests, the terrestrial atmosphere becomes progressively more contaminated. In the United States, seventy-five thousand nuclear weapons are stored; the Russian stockpile is even larger. The American weapons alone are enough to destroy all the people on earth twenty times over.

All the statesmen, the leaders of the Western camp as well as those of the Eastern, the representatives of the churches, whether Catholic or Protestant, stubbornly adhere to the old slogan: "If you want peace, prepare for war." All their actions are inspired by this principle. The States and the Churches believe that peace can be established with atomic bombs, arguing that neither of the blocs will dare attack the other, for fear of precipitating a world-wide nuclear conflict. Because everybody, including Eisenhower, Khrushchev, and all the other men who hold power, knows that an atomic war would mean the almost instantaneous disappearance of life on earth.

Yet we must ask ourselves if this assurance is sufficient. What guarantees do we have that the stockpiles of nuclear weapons, Eastern or Western, will not, in fact, one day be used? Meanwhile, the world lives in perpetual anguish, paralyzed by the fear of being present at the final catastrophe, when the bombs will finish us all off. Is this kind of anguish compatible with peace? Isn't it ridiculous to hope that peace can spring from such constant anxiety? As far as I am concerned, people who share this hope have no business being at large; they ought to be in asylums.

Christ said: "The Peace which I give you is mine to give; I do not give peace as the world gives it." [John 14:27] The peace of men, with their pride and lust for pleasure, is founded on death, on slaughter and destruction, in short, armed peace. The peace of Christ, on the other hand, is peace stripped of violence, the peace that is the fruit of love, because the fundamental law of Christ, the one that resumes all the others is the law of Love. From this splendid law of Love follows the commandment that the Apostle John has transmitted to us: we must be ready to lay down our lives for our brothers. From this some law of Love follows also the prohibition against taking life.

And yet how do soldiers, whether they be Christians or not, act, once war is unleashed? They give themselves over unreservedly to their trade; they kill, pillage and destroy. I ask you, is such behavior compatible with the law of Love, with the injunction against doing evil to another? Or is the mighty law of Love suspended every time war breaks out?

And I ask those who defend this work of destruction how they reconcile the death of the criminal with the interdiction that Christ made against doing evil to others. Isn't the criminal whose death you desire the very neighbor whom Christ commanded us to love?

And I ask those who preach "legitimate defense" if the aggressor, the killing of whom appears clearly justified to you, is not the very neighbor whom God has commanded us to love more than ourselves. Or is it that the great law of Love is, once again, suspended every time an unjust aggression takes place?

* * *

According to the teaching of Christ's Apostle, the prohibition against killing admits of no exception.

I am well aware of the objection that some of you will raise; thousands of have already raised it. If the Western camp

does not arm, millions of Russians will descend upon us; this will mean the end of Western culture and Christian civilization. We must have a sufficient supply of arms, including nuclear arms, and must do everything in our power to achieve military superiority. Only the atomic bomb can protect us against invasion. The identical argument, with the terms reversed, is echoed by the East.

Who then is right? Christ, according to whom "all those who take the sword shall perish by the sword?" Or our contemporary worshippers of the atomic divinities, who contend that the bombs are indispensable to the maintenance of peace? Such a position, such a justification of armaments is enough in itself to enable Christ to discern the falsehood in you; you have ceased to be a Christian.

That is why you must be told, you madmen who hold power and all of you who sanction their crimes, in the name of Christ, who forbade all killing, without exception: you have no right to obligate your fellow citizens to violate God's law by imposing military service on them. A man cannot be a Christian and kill; a man cannot be a Christian and a soldier. And that is why we who are sincere Christians do not recognize the military obligation you would like to impose on us. Every barracks built by a government, on the instigation of international capitalism, is a place of perdition, where young men are taught to kill and to destroy the fruits of culture and civilization.

War is now more than ever a business venture, in which huge sums of capital are invested in the hope of reaping immense dividends.

This means that a terrible responsibility rests upon all those who expect peace to come from the atomic bomb. And this holds true especially for you, moralists and Christian theologians. You use every subtle device of dialectic to persuade us that the divine commandment, "Thou shalt not kill!" admits of certain exceptions and, specifically, that atomic armament is sanctioned by the moral law. Those who talk this way are guilty of a crime against humanity.

Christians of the world, have two world wars taught you nothing? Whose fault is it that in the course of these two conflicts, sixty-four million, seven-hundred thousand people lost their lives? Whose fault is it that the nation states are already arming for a third world war? On whom does the guilt devolve for the tragedies of Hiroshima and Nagasaki? Who bears responsibility for the countless

nuclear tests that are poisoning the atmosphere? Whose fault is it that the governments offer up hundreds of billions of dollars as a sacrifice to the monstrous idol of militarism? In the last year alone, the United States, Great Britain and the Soviet Union have devoted more than fifty billion dollars to armaments!

Who is responsible, I ask you, for the horror of the innumerable deaths, the destruction, the atrocities, the indescribable misery? The answer is that the responsibility rests upon all who do not take Christ's commandments seriously, who turn away from his words.

Of course, we all desire peace. But the vast majority of those who call themselves Christians aspire to the peace of the atomic stalemate rather than the peace of Christ. Accordingly, the words that the prophet Isaias once addressed, in the name of God, to the unbelieving Jews now apply to the general run of humanity: "Pray as much as you like; I will not hear your prayers, because your hands are steeped in blood. Save yourselves, purify yourselves, remove the spectacle of your wickedness from my sight, cease doing evil... But if you disobey me and provoke my wrath, you will be destroyed by the sword." [not an exact quotation]

So it is up to every man to make a choice between Christ and the atomic bomb. Unhappily, most men have already made their choice; they seek peace through violence, atomic peace, the peace of perpetual anxiety, the constant prospect of death and destruction. But there are others who are seeking Christ's peace, the unarmed peace solidly based on the prohibition against taking life and the obligation to propagate love.

You who hear me must make your decision. Your choice is free. Choose, while there is still time, the way that will lead you, and the rest of humanity, to safety. But since the majority of men have already decided in favor of the peace of the atomic bomb, I am doing no more than my duty as a Catholic preacher when I solemnly adjure them:

"Heed this warning; stop and reflect. Make up your minds once and for all to choose the peace of Christ"... Amen.

Translated from the French by Martin J. Corbin

Tr. Note: Fr. Ude has taught moral theology at the University of Graz, in Austria, for over thirty years. His outspoken pacifism earned him a prison sentence during the Nazi occupation. The French text of Fr.

Ude's sermon appeared in the July-August issue of Coexistence (formerly Routes de Paix). Once again, we wish to call the attention of our readers to this bi-monthly magazine, published in Brussels, which regularly prints important articles on war, colonialism and related topics. The same issue contains an assessment of the Fifth

Republic by Robert Barrat, Paris correspondent for the Commonweal, and extracts from "La Gangrene," a horrifying and detailed account of the obscene tortures carried out by the Paris police on seven Algerian students. (The book itself was confiscated by the French government four days after its publication.)

The Catholic Worker, April 1960
Editorial: Civil Disobedience to Civil Defense

The Catholic Worker, June 1960

500 Defy Civil Defense Drill in N.Y.C.

By Ammon Hennacy [1893 - 1970]

Seems that Dorothy, Deane, Karl and I these last years were like the Dutch boy holding the break in the dike with his hand until help came -- and this time it came 500 strong as mothers with children, students, and hundreds of others from the Village and all over town were packed the park. When the sirens blew we were with signs in the middle of the crowd. Officer O'Hearn who arrests us each year ordered all to seek shelter and when no one responded he declared us all under arrest. We were just as surprised as he was to see this solidarity. The crowd commenced to sing "Civil Defense is No Defense: We Shall Not Be Moved." And right behind me, Kay Boyle, the author, joined us in singing, "John Brown's Body." The frustrated police asked us if we were Americans or not and they were greeted with boos. The police picked off demonstrators along the edge of the crowd, being careful, it seemed, not to arrest any of the leaders. Dwight MacDonald and Norman Mailer were there. One girl thought she was being rushed to a shelter and resisted the police who grabbed her, but when she found that she was being arrested she went quietly to the paddy wagon. Zita Ferron, an artist, Diane Lewis, a proofreader and Thomas Franz, a student, were the three Catholics among the 26 arrested.

When the drill was over Dave McReynolds got up and said to the crowd: "This law is dead." I was asked on television if I would be back again next year to disobey the law and I replied that I would, and the narrator suggested

that I lead the crowd in a song of victory, which was "John Brown's Body!" On Friday they all pled guilty in court when they appeared before Judge Calazzo and heard him talk about this being a free country, but those in the courtroom laughed. Later they were given a lecture on law observance and five days in jail. Roberts Blossom, an off-Broadway actor, pled not guilty but was given the same time. In court I asked Officer O'Hearn why he had not arrested Dorothy and me as in other years. "Why didn't you ask me?" he replied. My answer was that he knew where we were by our signs, and that next year there would be a thousand of us and he had better get more police. That night I picketed the Tombs for 14 hours, some students coming to help me from time to time. Bob Steed picketed one night and I picketed two nights at the Women's House of Detention. Some police knew me from other years. All of the 11 women said that they would do it again next year.

Radio and television gave us good coverage. The Village Voice had pictures of the demonstration on the front page, and the Nation and Commonweal had editorials favoring our staunchness of purpose. The conservative New York World Telegram had an editorial entitled Exercise in Futility: "Yesterday's test can be called meaningful and successful only if a potential enemy's plan is to drop marshmallow puffs on New York City - and to advertise in advance what time they are coming." However the best comment was by Murray Kempton in his column in the N.Y. Post entitled Laughter

in the Park. Hundreds of high school students also refused to take part in the drills but they were only scolded and nothing further was done as punishment. Five students at Drew University where I had spoken also refused to take shelter and were arrested.

We had a party on a Saturday night at Debs Hall where A. J. Muste, Paul Goodman and other spoke and where A. J. gave diplomas to the jail graduates. On the 26th a meeting was held at the Community Church addressed by James Weschler, editor of the New York Post, Kay Boyle and others, and plans were made for a continual protest during the year on the matter of the folly of civil defense.

Speaking of judges, courtrooms and the practice of law, the day before the drill the New York Times had an article headed, "Judges Rumored Paying for Posts." "Prof. Wallace S. Sayre of Columbia University and Prof. Herbert Kaufman of Yale asserted that it is rumored among lawyers that there is a going rate for judgeships, currently the equivalent of two years salary for that office. In a new book, Governing New York City, published by the Russell Sage Foundation they wrote: 'for elective office, the amount is frequently set on the basis of a fixed sum, from \$50 to \$1000 for each election district in the judicial area'... The study said most jobs over which judges have discretion are filled to pay 'political debts'... The same was held true of appointments of referees in foreclosures, special guardians, commissioners in incompetency proceedings and referees to hold hearings... Party leaders, the study said, 'do not appear able to influence very many judicial decisions,' but intervene 'largely for information about procedures, timing and the probably range of the pending decisions.'"

Hunter College

On the day after the air raid drill I spoke at Hyde Park Day to the students at Hunter College, as I did last year. Herbert Apteker spoke for the Communist Party and the man for the Republican Party did not show up. As usual I gave the difference between the pacifism as to method and anarchism as the goal of the CW, and the use of force and emphasis upon the State which Communism, along with Capitalism and Fascism employs. Current booklets and articles in Catholic circles about Communism are about as

clear and true as would be articles on Christian Science by the medical profession. Or of Paul Blanshard on the Catholic Church. May 4th is Cardinal Spellman's birthday and May 5th is that of Karl Marx. One girl knew that we had been excommunicated from the Church two years ago. I told her to phone the Chancery Office and the answer would be, "They are Catholics. We are not for them. We are not against them." She came back later laughing and saying, "That is just the answer I got." One girl had refused to take part in the air raid drill the day before and had been suspended for four days, but she did not have many previous cuts in her classes and this did not prevent her graduation.

Students in San Francisco

I hear from San Francisco that my friend Jerry Kamestra who runs the Cloven Hoof bookstore where I spoke was beaten up by the cops in the recent demonstration at the Un-American hearings. "What made the students and other demonstrators so angry was that the hearing was packed by friends of the committee and there was no room for the opposition. Seats with the exception of a handful were made available by invitations sent out by the committee. What touched off the riot was that a policeman who was on the wrong side of the barricade was knocked down by the police themselves and then some demonstrator hit him with his own club. The police turned on the fire hoses and started beating everyone. The support and sympathy here is with the students, even the mayor is for the kids." Here and there I have found friendly cops, but I did not realize the terrible hatred prisoners have for the police until I saw the movie Vertigo in Sandstone prison. At the beginning the police are chasing a fellow over the roof tops and a cop falls down many stories to death. The prisoners cheered. It was awful to hear. I did not feel that way, but as I listened in there and see on the outside where human beings take money to pull the switch or release the gas pellets, and take bribes to frame some and to release others I can understand the feeling against the police.

On the Beach

Janet Burwash and I saw the movie about atomic radiation finally reaching the last hold-out in Australia. The

Salvation Army with the sign, "There is still time Brother," at their meeting while they are playing "Onward Christian Soldiers Marching as to War." And another meeting when few are left, but they as well as nearly all religious organizations never seem to realize that in the name of Christ who said "Thou Shalt Not Kill" they deny Christ when they support atomic war.

In the Market Place

I am glad to be back again on Tuesday noons at Pine and Nassau and Tuesday night from 9:45 to 10:30 at the New School; Wednesday noon until 4 pm at uptown Fordham; Thursday 6 to 8 pm at 14th and Broadway; Friday 11:30 to 1:30 at 43rd and Lexington. Saturdays I will picket at Woolworth's with others. Sunday 8 to 10 at St. Patrick's, where last Sunday I had to educate a cop as to my rights.

The Catholic Worker, July-August 1960

Toward Nuclear Morality

William J. Pieper, MD & Edward Morin

Drawing upon pronouncements by Pope Pius XII, a prominent Catholic political theorist (John Courtney Murray, Review of Theology, The Catholic Mind, 1959) has currently outlined the minimum requisites of morality for the execution of modern (ABC) warfare. He concludes that the only warfare which can conceivably be allowed is Limited War, and this only under the following conditions: a nation can declare war only to meet an outright attack on itself, war must be a last resort after all other means of settling differences have been exhausted, war can be entered only when there is some possibility of success, and -- despite any consequences -- annihilation can never be permitted.

Fr. Murray realizes that limited Atomic, Bacteriological, and Chemical war is a purely speculative concept. He points out that at least this Grenzmoral has been achieved, but that now there exists a duty to take steps to make Limited War possible -- i.e. to translate moral theory into public policy.

The number of questionable points in Father Murray's reasoning are manifold, relating basically to three separate categories. First, there is the assumed meaning of warfare, next the actual qualifying conditions arrived at, and finally the admonition of translating moral theory into public policy as this applies specifically to nuclear war.

No formulation of "limited" war theory into public policy can be accomplished without a minimum continuance of nuclear testing to devise appropriate weapons. And this major problem is the concern of the present article.

* * *

Because of a widespread misconception regarding the nature of nuclear warfare, nuclear weapons seem to call forth old value judgments applicable to conventional weapons. New value judgments have to be formed in the popular mind about nuclear weapons based on the nature of nuclear energy. The patent fact is that, unlike the pre-atomic era, it is impossible not to violate the rights of innocents even by only testing nuclear weapons. This is due to the phenomena of fallout and the biological effects of radiation.

Everyone is familiar with the frightening visible event occurring when nuclear weapons are detonated, but actually the most dangerous results of the explosion are not perceived by any of the senses immediately. Various insensible particles and electromagnetic rays are released, the majority of which are blown into the stratosphere. Gradually these highly charged insensible particles fall back to the ground. The time period for the fallout from a nuclear explosion to occur was estimated at 5-10 years in 1957. This figure for released particles returning to earth was recently reduced to 1-5 year.

The insensible charged particles of which the fallout consists are harmful to all living organisms. Three of the most important particles are strontium-90, cesium-137, and carbon-14. These highly charged particles (isotopes) do two principal types of damage to man, depending upon where the isotope lodges itself after body incorporation.

Strontium-90 is similar chemically to calcium and is likewise stored in the

bones. It should be noted that annual studies at the Lamont Laboratories of Columbia University have documented an increasing concentration of strontium-90 in the bones of American children.

This type of damage is termed somatic in contradistinction to the injury to tissues caused by isotopes such as cesium-137 and carbon-14 which lodge in the genitals. This genetic damage is unique not only in the immediate harm it produces -- i.e. sterilization, monsters, and still births -- but more importantly in that the germ cells of the involved person are irrevocably affected. Thus the biological basis for the continuance of the human race is permanently damaged.

Instances of leukemia, striking down children, malformed and still births are anything but mute testimony to the effects of nuclear detonation. But the most horrible aspect all but defies imagination: for the first time in his existence man can harm not only his brother and his brother's children but all succeeding generations of humankind ad infinitum. Further, this crime is accomplished and will continue to happen each time a nuclear detonation occurs.

* * *

Once one grasps the full importance of these facts it seems impossible that anyone could even conceive of nuclear weapons testing, much less warfare; but the issue is still being debated as if there were a choice at all. Doubtlessly, this universal blindness has a multifactoral basis, part of which lies in the nature of the nuclear phenomenon and the historical correlates of the problems.

When the atomic era bowed in only 15 years ago, it pronounced a new dispensation; its cosmological implications are so vast that they defy rapid assimilation. However, the minds of leaders and their public were formed by a Weltanschauung of the pre-atomic era. Reinforcing this general phenomenon is the seeming magical nature of nuclear energy. We look upon nuclear energy as something like a magician's trick which allows only the effects to be seen, and these are adroitly and illusively interpreted for us. Whereas a bullet of shell fragment hurts from the instant of contact and can affect other humans only indirectly, a nuclear injury is produced without causing feeling, may not become apparent for years afterward, and then appears suddenly as cancer. Finally, the effects are transmitted directly to other human beings not yet born.

Annihilation connotes a spatial event, i.e. total destruction on a global scale. However there is a temporal dimension also which has become possible only with the advent of the atomic era. The conclusion from what is outlined above is that as surely as total nuclear war would be annihilation in a spatial dimension, atomic testing annihilates in a temporal dimension.

Speculations on the problems of war have traditionally been made sub specie aeternitatis. But the reality of nuclear energy gives the phrase new meaning. While attempts are being made to establish the "rights" of limited warfare, the rights of innocents have already been violated in a temporal futuristic sense.

The Catholic Worker, April 1961

Polaris Action

Dear Dorothy,

You have been reading about the activities of the Committee for Nonviolent Action against Nuclear Weapons in Groton and New London, Connecticut. If I am not mistaken, Dorothy, you helped organize the committee, so I thought you would be interested to know that I have been active in the New England committee. We formed a New England CNVA to make it easier to administer POLARIS ACTION and to follow up last summer's very successful activities with further community education and continued experimentation with civil

disobedience as part of a nonviolent alternative to war. It has been a wonderful experience for me, frustrating at times, but that's the price paid for organization.

Our planning sessions are a wonder to behold. One meeting held last August to plan civil disobedience commenced at 9 am with a silent meeting after the manner of the Society of Friends, since many of our people are Quakers. I had already attended early Mass that Sunday, and since the meeting was a silent one I saw no harm in sitting with these good people and silently fingering my beads in my pocket. After

about one half-hour of silence, Brad Little arose and extended his hand to me. I guessed that I was supposed to pass the handshake on to the others present, which I did, recalling the Kiss of Peace which used to be passed on to the congregation during high Mass, from celebrant to deacon, then to sub-deacon and the officers of the Mass, and then to all the members of the congregation. This was the last of peace and silence that I experienced that day. Since all decisions, even the most trivial, had to be made with the approval of all the participants, it took a very long time to come to decisions we had to make about items on the agenda. We spent an unbelievable amount of time settling the question of the door. You see, our office in New London had received many hostile, even violent, visitors who had damaged and stolen considerable office and personal property, and we were planning one of the civil disobedience demonstrations, an illegal act in itself. The question of the door was: is it in the spirit of nonviolence to erect an artificial barrier between ourselves and irate citizens, juvenile delinquents, military and FBI spies and/or the police? If not, then what of the door of our apartment a few blocks away? It had been entered by some of the local swains and one of our girls, alone at the time, was threatened with criminal abuse. Her would-be assailant ran away when heard the sound of some of our unsuspecting young men approaching. If we opened the office door, should we not then unlock the door to the apartment, argued one of our members, Dave McReynolds, who tried to show the absurdity of the situation by this reductio. After the passage of a period of time I do not feel emotionally qualified to calculate, the sense of the meeting had it that we should unlock the door but leave it closed, with a note tacked to it saying that we were in meeting and that we would welcome visitors in the evening, after the meeting. The meeting extended well into the evening, however. Brad Little's strong and efficient leadership helped to cover all the items on the agenda and we finally came to agreement. This form of meeting is very democratic, more so than that by majority vote, because all the members have to be convinced to acquiescence at least, and this is a very difficult job, with so many very intelligent and sensitive people. Bob Swann who, with his wife Marj, now directs POLARIS ACTION, chaired the meeting with unending patience.

The most characteristic difference between POLARIS ACTION, CNVA, and the other

peace organizations is that civil disobedience is a primary objective of ours, whereas it has either no place (SANE), or a secondary place in the programs, activities or philosophies of the others. The Catholic Worker has done a wonderful job of keeping civil disobedience before the conscience of the people with its repeated Civil Defense demonstrations, but I think you will agree that this sort of activity has always been secondary to the personal performance of the corporal works of mercy and the theological-philosophical interpretation of personal responsibility of religious, social, economic and cultural life, "Cult, Culture, and Cultivation." Secondary to that are the techniques of nonviolence and the integration of the three C's of Peter Maurin. We have had many demonstrations of civil disobedience, most of them well-documented by the press and radio-TV, considering the self-regulating (i.e. gagging) which the free press is so accustomed to by now. The New York Post and the New York Times have been particularly good, but many of the local radio-TV stations in New England areas directly affected by our widespread activities this summer were really outstanding. We have had good contact too with the British pacifists in the news lately because of their demonstrations at Holy Loch. We were touched to read that the British took inspiration from our efforts and had formed a committee called POLARIS ACTION over there. We inspire each other, for we have never had anything like their demonstration of nearly 100,000 people at Trafalgar Square last Easter at the conclusion of the annual Walk from Aldermaston.

Sometimes our demonstrations have elements of the ludicrous mixed in with the deadly serious. In fact, some people sneer or laugh at the young men and women rowing out in canoes, row boats and rafts to intercept or to board Polaris submarines. They might remember that Churchill laughed at Gandhi and called him a "naked Indian fakir." How could this itinerant ascetic mystic, with such impractical ideas as converting your enemy with love and the superior moral force of your idea, ever hope to compete with the Prime Minister -- who did not become such "to preside over the dissolution of His Majesty's Empire!" We do not really expect to keep the Ethan Allan from sailing to Holy Loch. We don't know, precisely, what our effect will be. I have always thought it better to do what the Spirit moves us to do, being reasonably sure that it is the Holy Spirit that moves

us, and let God's Providence take care of the specific results. We never know, anyway, what the results of our teaching will be, beyond very superficial appearances. We are, nevertheless, being as sensitive as possible to the reactions of the public because we are trying to perfect the techniques which citizens might use in resisting tyranny, either home-grown or imposed from without. THE NEGRO SIT-IN MOVEMENT is such a technique, and it has been developed with just this idea in mind. It is such a repulsive idea to the American mind that a foreign army should ever take control of our country that very few will entertain it, and almost no one will admit the possibility in public. It is more likely, of course, that after another war we would have no country at all. Military occupation by the United States Army may be even more likely, without a war.

Last August Loren Miner and I spoke at Willard Uphaus' camp, World-Fellowship, about CNVA and our experiences with it. The most spectacular of CNVA's activities at that time was the Atomic Energy Sit-In, which preceded the atomic test moratorium and which may, with many other factors, have had some effect in bringing the moratorium about. Loren participated in that demonstration and sat, fasting, for over a week with about a dozen others before being granted an interview with Admiral Strauss. Now probably the most "arresting" of CNVA's activities have been POLARIS ACTION and the Trans-Continental Walk, which started in San Francisco on December 1, 1960, and will arrive early in June at the UN in New York. There is a small core of volunteers which will participate all or most of the way, walking or helping to arrange public meetings, lodging, meals and medical aid for the group of walkers, which gains and loses walkers along the route. The response from the communities along the way has been warm and very encouraging, although now that the FBI has been sending agents ahead of the

walkers into the communities en route, warning them of the dangers of the insidious doctrine of peace, the response has been cooler. Members of the Walk will be flown to England and will continue walking there and conducting public meetings in concert with British peace groups. Then to the continent of Europe, with a continuation of the Walk through West and East Germany, Poland, and finally into the Soviet Union to the Kremlin in Moscow. The Walk will proceed with or without visas, committing civil disobedience at national borders if necessary, bringing the message of direct, nonviolent resistance in the spirit of Christ directly to the people, with a hope of reaching their political leaders. This is a bold undertaking, surely, but today it might just be possible and the attempt, with the help of God, cannot but have a good effect.

Meanwhile POLARIS ACTION in Connecticut continues with a vigorous program in progress and more planned for the summer. The office at 13 North Bank Street, New London, is being maintained, though most of the activity emanates from 113 William Street, Norwich. The next planned civil disobedience campaign will take place on March 11th, at Portsmouth, New Hampshire. A new Polaris submarine, the Abraham Lincoln, will be commissioned at a public ceremony. Recruits will trespass by land or water upon Navy property in order to demonstrate their inability to acquiesce in the final absurdity of defense by nuclear suicide pact.

I was very disappointed at missing you, Dorothy, on my last trip to the Loft and the Farm at the beginning of the New Year. Ammon had left too, but I had a good visit with Deane and Ralph and the others. Hope to see you before CD Day.

In His Love,
Tom Cornell

The Catholic Worker, June 1961

Nonviolence and Nuclear War

by Dom Bede Griffiths, OSB [1906 - 1993]

Last December a conference of the War Resisters International was held at Gandhigram in South India, which I was invited to attend. I was only able to go on the last day, but I felt that the meeting was significant both for its timing and for its setting and for the conclusions to which it came. I was glad to find that there were two or three other Catholics present, including a priest sent by his bishop from Belgium. Catholics are not generally supposed to be favorable towards pacifism, but it is obvious that the threat of nuclear war calls for a radical change in our attitude to war, and it seems inevitable that there will be an increasing number who will feel obligated to take up a pacifist position in regard to at least nuclear war. The timing of this meeting was significant because the W.R.I. is an international organization without any religious basis, yet clearly it was felt that the birth of Christ was something which is relevant to the issue which faces all men today, and I must say that I was impressed by the spiritual attitude which was shown by the majority of the delegates. The setting also was significant because clearly it was felt that the country of Mahatma Gandhi was the country in the world which could best be expected to offer some guidance on the supreme problem which faces our generation.

There is no doubt that the Indian background gave a very definite character to the conference. It should be explained that Gandhigram is an institution founded some years after independence to perpetuate Mahatma Gandhi's ideal of life in India. It includes schools for "basic" education, that is education which is given through training in some form of practical work from the earliest years, and schools for training in every kind of village industry. But, of course, behind it lie the principles which governed all Mahatma Gandhi's conception of life, which he called "truth" (Satya) and "nonviolence" (Ahimsa). By these words Gandhi understood something very definite. By Satya he meant the inner voice of conscience, the inner light which guides every soul; and by ahimsa he meant something far more than the negative

attitude which the word might seem to imply, something which was very near to the love of one's neighbor as oneself. The teaching of Gandhi was therefore based entirely on the Natural Law and this is what gives it its absolute universality.

It was interesting to find that the conference took these ideas as its basic principles and that it then went on to consider war not as an isolated phenomenon demanding a particular solution, but as part of the problem of bringing a just order into society. In regard to this it adopted the principles of the Sarvodaya movement which was founded by Gandhi and which now continues under the guidance of Vinoba Bhave. Sarvodaya means literally "service of all" and is the name which Gandhi gave to the movement for the regeneration of the villages of India by helping to make them self-supporting. But once again the basic principle of this movement is "non-violence"; it is this which gives its distinctive character to everything which Gandhi undertook. Thus the conference accepted non-violence as the basic principle for human society, not merely in regard to war but also in regard to social and economic development. It is worth noting that it was led to declare that "both the capitalist conception of private ownership and the Communist conception of state ownership are insufficient where the ideal of non-violence is concerned."

This conception of an order of society based on non-violence is surely something which deserves our serious attention. No one can pretend that a capitalist order of society, even though it is superior to a communist one, can satisfy the demands of a Christian conscience. But the more closely one examines it, the more clearly does it appear that the order which Gandhi envisaged is essentially Christian. It is true that the idea of ahimsa is derived from Indian tradition, not only Hindu but also Jain and Buddhist; it is an ideal which, once formulated some five hundred years before the birth of Christ, has gradually permeated the heart and mind of India. There is no doubt, either, that Gandhi's first acquaintance with ahimsa was through the Jain and

Hindu traditions of his native Gujerat. But it is no less clear that the reading of the Sermon on the Mount and the writings of Tolstoy transformed this somewhat negative conception into a positive dynamic force in his life, which he believed was capable of transforming the world. To express his ideal of non-violent resistance he used the word satyagraha which means literally "truth-force." He sometimes also described it as "soul-force" or "love-force." In this way he wanted to bring out the fact that the ahimsa is essentially a positive force. He was strongly opposed to any idea of "passivity" or failure to resist aggression. "Non-violence," he once wrote, "in its dynamic condition means conscious suffering. It does not mean weak submission to the will of the evil-doer, but it means putting the whole of one's soul against the will of the tyrant."

Gandhi even went to the extent of affirming several times that he would prefer people to offer violence in self-defense than weakly to give in to an aggressor. But it was his deliberate conviction that non-violence was the better way to resist evil. He believed that moral strength is always greater than physical strength and that the man who gives way to violence is morally weak. But such moral strength he believed must be based on a complete freedom from hatred. "It is no non-violence," he wrote, "if we merely love those who love us. It is non-violence when we love those who hate us." He had no illusions about the difficulty of this, but he showed in his struggle with the British in India that he was capable of carrying it out in practice.

Again he was convinced that non-violence was incompatible with fear. "We must give up all external fears. The internal foes we must always fear. We are rightly afraid of animal passion, anger and the life. External fears cease of their own accord, once we have conquered the enemy in the camp." Thus it is clear that the discipline of non-violence is one which demands the overcoming passion in all its forms, fear, anger, hatred, and also lust, for Gandhi believed that brahmacharya, that is chastity, whether in the married or the unmarried, was a necessary condition for a satyagrahi. He summoned the whole matter up when he said: "Non-violence requires as complete a self-purification as is humanly possible."

This far it might be said that Gandhi was following the Hindu ascetic ideal, only making it of universal application and extending it to people living in the world and exercising their political rights. But there was a further element in his conception of ahimsa, which seems to derive from the teaching and example of Christ alone. This was his belief in the efficacy of suffering. "The satyagrahi," he said, "seeks to convert his opponent by sheer force of character and suffering. The purer he is and the more he suffers, the quicker the process." That this view of the mystical value of suffering was derived from the example of Christ he showed clearly when he wrote: "I saw that nations like individuals could only be made through the agony of the Cross and in no other way. Joy comes not out of the infliction of pain on others but out of pain voluntarily borne by one-self." We have here, surely, the key to Gandhi's whole doctrine. He had the courage to apply to the struggle for national independence the principle of suffering for justice's sake which he saw to be the principle of the life and teaching of Christ.

It is this that gives Gandhi's teaching such an immediate relevance to our own problems. For centuries the Church has accepted the principle that violence is a normal way of settling international disputes. Rules have been laid down, not very successfully, to limit the degree of violence which may be used, but no one has had the courage to suggest that the principle of suffering for the sake of justice which was proclaimed in the Sermon on the Mount and exemplified in the Passion of Christ can be applied in the social and political world. This was what Gandhi had the courage to do and this was the method by which he won independence for India. It is only recently that an attempt to face the implications of Gandhi's teaching and action for the Catholic in relation to the problem of war has appeared in Pere Regamey's "Non-violence et Conscience Chretienne." Here at last we have the principle of non-violence in its social and political implications studied by a theologian of note.

The reason why the doctrine of non-violence has so far failed to penetrate the Catholic conscience seems to be that the teaching and example of Christ in this matter are regarded as "counsels of perfection." They are not precepts binding on all Christians but counsels

given for the benefit of a few chosen souls, which can safely be ignored by the rest. Pere Regamey shows what a caricature this is of Catholic doctrine. The Christian law is not merely a set of precepts which have to be observed like the Old Law. According to St. Thomas the essential difference in the New Law of the Gospel consists in the fact that it is an interior law; it has nothing less than the grace of the Holy Spirit in the heart. It is not merely a series of commands but a call to perfection. "You shall be perfect as your heavenly Father is perfect," is an exact expression of the New Law. Every Christian is thus called to perfection, to the love of God with all his heart and soul and strength and to the love of his neighbor as himself. The obligation of the Gospel, as Pere Dubarle has remarked, is the obligation to respond to the love of the heavenly Father.

Thus the sayings of Jesus in the Sermon on the Mount, not to resist him who is evil, to turn the other cheek, to give away one's coat, to suffer persecution for the sake of justice, are not counsels given to a few, but the expression of principles which must govern the life of every Christian. Pere Regamey further insists that these principles do not apply only to the individual. Wherever there is a human group which has been penetrated by the principles of the Gospel, the obligation exists to make these principles effective in public life. It is here that the fundamental principle which guides all Pere Regamey's considerations comes out. Though the principle of non-violence, as expressed in the Sermon on the Mount and in the example of Christ, must be a guiding principle for all Christians. It will be applied somewhat differently in the case of every individual and every group of Christians. The principle of non-violence is precisely not a law which can be applied indiscriminately on all occasions alike. It is a guiding principle which has to be applied by each person and each group of persons according to their circumstances and according to their state of conscience.

Thus ultimately it comes to this: it is a matter of the conscience of each individual person. There is no absolute rule which can be imposed, there is only a guiding principle and the inner light of the Holy Spirit to teach each person how to apply it in his life. But what is essential is that this conscience should be formed. At present it seems that very

little serious attention is given to this problem. The law of non-violence, not to resist evil, to turn the other cheek, to suffer for the sake of justice, to return good for evil, to love one's enemies, is engraved in the Gospel and was proclaimed in a language which no man can misunderstand, on the Cross when God deliberately chose to overcome the powers of evil in this world not by violence or resistance of any sort but by suffering and dying. This was the example which was before the eyes of the martyrs when they without exception preferred to die rather than to offer resistance in any form. This principle was so strong in the early Church that many of the Fathers of the first three centuries regarded war as incompatible with the profession of a Christian. The changed circumstances of the fourth century led to a change in this point of view, but the continuous tradition of the Church aimed at imposing the strictest limitations on war.

Pere Danielou has argued that the circumstances of the present time compel us to re-examine our attitude to war. Just as the conscience of mankind has developed on the subject of slavery and the use of torture, which were once not only tolerated but authorized by the Church, so we may think that the threat of nuclear war is forcing us to a deeper awareness of the implications of war. It would seem that in the teaching and example of Mahatma Gandhi we have an extraordinary penetrating light shed on this problem. The Christian conscience cannot continue to accept war on the modern scale as something which the normal Christian must accept as a duty, if he is called upon to fight for his country. It poses a problem for the conscience of every man, and the principle of non-violence as Gandhi conceived it is surely an essential element in the formation of a Christian conscience. But if our conscience forbids us to take part in total war or in the use of nuclear weapons whose effects cannot be controlled, what alternative have we? The problem is particularly acute because our potential enemy is one who threatens to impose a system of atheistic materialism on society, which is opposed to every Christian principle. Yet it is here surely that our faith is most clearly tested. If we believe that Christ taught us to love our enemies, to suffer violence for justice's sake rather than to inflict it on others, to overcome evil by good; and if we accept his example in

suffering in suffering and dying at the hands of an alien political power without resistance, in order to establish the kingdom of God as the pattern of life which every Christian has to try to follow; can we refuse to believe that this faith is capable of overcoming the powers of evil in the modern world? If we need an example in the circumstance of the present day to show what such a faith can achieve, we have again the example of Gandhi both in Africa and India, where he was able to win freedom for his people in the face of the strongest political power by the use of non-violent resistance.

These methods of "passive resistance" are still available to us today, as Sir Stephen King-Hall has recently made clear. But if such methods are to have any force, as Gandhi so well understood, they must be based on a firm spiritual conviction. They cannot merely be produced in an emergency. It is here that it seems to me that the conclusions of the conference of the W.R.I. at Gandhigram are so significant. There were concerned, as I have said, not merely with the resistance to war, but with the building of a non-violent order

of society. Much discussion was devoted to the problem of easing tensions which may lead to war, such as racial conflicts, and it was decided to form a Peace Army, on the model of the Shanti Sena which Vinoba Bhave has founded in India, to attempt the work of reconciliation wherever conflicts may arise. Even more important than this was the decision to accept the principles of the Sarvodaya movement, so as to work for a social and economic order based neither on competitive capitalism nor on communist collectivism with their inevitable accompaniment of violence, but on free cooperation and non-violence. Such an idea may seem Utopian, yet it is hard to see what other path is open to us as Christians. If we accept the principle of non-violence as part of our commitment to the following of Christ, then we must be prepared to follow this principle in every sphere of life. It is through the growth of such "cells" of people committed to non-violence in their daily life that we can best hope to establish the conditions of peace. It is for each to apply the principle in his own life as best he can.

"Breaking the Thought Barrier"
By Jerome D. Frank [1909 - 2005]
The Catholic Worker
Part I - July-August 1961
Part II - September 1961

[Eds. Note: A longer and footnoted version of this article appears as the last chapter of Breakthrough to Peace: Twelve Views on the Threat of Thermonuclear Extermination, published by New Directions in 1962, with an introduction by Thomas Merton.]

The leaders of the world agree that nuclear armaments pose or soon will pose an insufferable threat to the existence of humanity. This is reflected in the unanimous United Nations resolution of November 2, 1959, that "the question of general and complete disarmament is the most important one facing the world today." Yet the preparation for war goes on feverishly.

The psychiatrist will recognize here a pattern similar to that of the patient who has insight into his problems but is unable to act on it -- for instance, the alcoholic who drinks in order to relieve himself of anxiety and depression, even though he knows that this will ultimately

prove disastrous to him. He says, in effect, "I know this is killing me," as he takes another drink.

The Nature of the Threat

The core of the problem is that mankind is faced with a rapidly and drastically changing environment. More drastic changes in habits of thinking and behavior are required than have ever occurred in the history of mankind, and they must be made in a very short time. As Albert Einstein put it, "The unleashed power of the atom has changed everything save our modes of thinking, and thus we drift toward unparalleled catastrophe." The challenge of the nuclear age is at once two severe and too obscure to be met head on with the resources now at our command.

One facet of this challenge is the growing interdependence of the world through improved communication and transport. Humanity is now one

interdependent web. The problems which this interdependence creates are immensely aggravated by the fantastic destructive powers of modern weaponry. Mankind now has the power to destroy himself in three entirely independent ways: by nuclear weapons, by nerve gas, and by bacteriological weapons.

There is no defense against these weapons, and it is highly unlikely that there ever would be, for the same thought processes which perfect a defense against a weapon at the same time devise ways of thwarting the defense. For example, we are now trying to develop a system for intercepting missiles through plotting their trajectories. We boast of our means of confusing Russian radar, but they, of course, will be able to confuse ours equally well.

In the days of conventional weapons, a defense which worked reasonably well was good enough. But because of the massive destructive power of nuclear weapons, a defense would have to be at least ninety percent effective -- a level of effectiveness never achieved in history; and the likelihood of its being achieved when technology is advancing at such a fantastically rapid rate seems extremely remote.

And weapons are getting more deadly and more effective all the time. Right now, according to Herman Kahn, it would be possible to build a machine capable of literally blowing the earth into little pieces, at a cost between fifty and a hundred billion dollars. It will become even cheaper to make such machines, which would be set off automatically in case of an enemy attack, so that perhaps the smaller nations will build them, and be able to blackmail the large nations.

Some sophisticated defenders of nuclear armaments maintain that if certain drastic conditions are met -- in itself highly unlikely -- a country might survive a nuclear war with its social structure relatively intact. Perhaps this would be true during the next few years, but as Kahn has said, "It is most unlikely that the world can live with an uncontrolled arms race lasting for several decades."

Too [sic], nuclear explosions permanently make the environment more hostile to man. The increase in radiation alone after a nuclear war would cause higher rates of genetic malformation for at least ten thousand years.

It is extremely unlikely, even today, that any country could win a war fought with modern weapons, and the likelihood of it becomes smaller with each increase in

the accumulation of destructive power. In the next war all humanity will be the loser. There may be a few survivors, but the way of life for which they fought would not survive. They would mainly be preoccupied with trying to stay alive.

As a psychiatrist, I am especially impressed with the dangers inherent in the steady diffusion of power to fire modern weapons. As nuclear weapons multiply and the warning time for retaliation decreases, the power over these weapons filters further and further down the chain of command. Every population contains a certain number of psychotic or profoundly malicious persons, and it can only be a matter of time before one of them comes into position to order the firing of a weapon which in a flash will destroy a large city. This danger is aggravated by the fact that a large proportion of the generation now coming to adulthood spent its formative years under conditions of unprecedented chaos in refugee camps. The disorganized conditions of living and unstable human relationships following the last war were worse than those in Germany following World War I, which produced Hitler's followers. It is persons like these who will have the power to set the world on fire.

Americans have nominal command of the weapons in the bases in foreign countries, but they could not prevent local soldiers from seizing them if at some future time they wished to become independent of us.

And if there is anything certain in this world, it is that accidents will happen. Even if atomic energy is confined to peaceful uses, disastrous accidents will occur. For example, on December 12, 1952, a nuclear reactor in Canada burst. A 10,000-acre area had to be evacuated temporarily, and the reactor had to be buried. The ABC found that a single major accident near a city the size of Detroit could, under adverse climactic conditions, cause 3,400 deaths, 43,000 injuries, and property damage of 7 billion dollars through radiation alone. It could require the evacuation of 460,000 people and restrict the use of 150,000 square miles of land. A world at peace could cope with atomic accidents as it does with volcanic eruptions, earthquakes, and hurricanes. In a trigger-happy world, however, it is all too easy to envisage how such an accident could set an irretrievable chain of destruction in motion before its source was discovered.

The Emotional Blocks to Solution

The responses of individuals to the threats of modern weaponry include all the reactions that people customarily show to massive dangers which exceed their powers of adaptation. One of these is a kind of apathy or fatalism. For instance:

"Last week I was invited to lunch with a tall, smiling young man, happily married, who has risen in a very short time to one of the highest executive posts in American journalism... Other forms of life, he said, have been destroyed; what was so special about the human race, which was doomed to ultimate annihilation anyway, by the cooling of the earth?"

If enough of our leaders feel this way, we will go to our doom like cattle to the slaughter.

Somewhat similar in its effects on the person is habituation to the danger, and we lose our moral repugnance toward any evil which persists long enough. We now talk of being able, through a massive civil defense program, to limit out casualties to "only five million dead" and show no qualms at all about exterminating all of Russia.

A more common maladaptive response to an overwhelming threat is the denial of its existence. In the form of minimizing the dreadfulness of modern weapons, seriously impedes out efforts to solve the terrible threat they present. For example, we assume that somehow our weapons can wipe out Russia but theirs cannot wipe us out.

The more subtle form of denial is a fallacious appeal to history with the advent of each new weapon alarmists prophesied that it would destroy mankind, and they were wrong; so those who say that nuclear, biological and chemical weapons threatens the existence of humanity are probably also wrong. The fallacy lies in the proportionate increase in destructive energy made available by the splitting of the atom. The killing power of weapons has increased over the most deadly non-atomic weapons by a factor of somewhere between 12,500 and infinity in a scant half-generation.

Another form of denial is to believe that nuclear weapons will not be used just because they are so terrible. But our whole military policy commits us to the use of nuclear weapons. I we got into a major war, we would have no other alternative, since we no longer have sufficient conventional weapons.

To return to the alcoholic, he takes a drink to gain immediate relief from anxiety, even though he knows through his memory and powers of anticipation that the

following morning he will feel much worse. Transferred to the international level, this principle operates in both space and time. Thus the mother who cannot bear to see her child's cut finger is unmoved by the extinction of eighty million people in Hiroshima or twelve thousand in Agadir. A good example of the soothing effect of temporal distance is the fixation of Russia and America on the immediate danger each poses to the other and their neglect of the greater long-term danger to both resulting from future dissemination of nuclear weapons.

A final, subtle form of denial is the universal tendency to use reassuring words to describe our predicament, even though they are rapidly losing their meaning in today's world. People talk of defense when it is clear that no nation will be able to maintain even a semblance of security for its citizens at the expense of the security of other nations.

Current Attempts at Solution

If one's efforts to cope with a problem are based on false assumptions, one arrives at absurd solutions. So far our attempts to resolve the threat of nuclear weapons are based on an assumption which used to be true but no longer is -- that possession of superior destructive force assures victory. The proposed solutions which follow from this view are self-contradictory. So we support the UN resolutions calling for cessation of the spread of nuclear weapons and for general disarmament, while also giving nuclear arms to West Germany and Turkey, and of having to build up our armed strength before we can disarm.

The argument for this 'realistic' solution goes something like this: Disarmament is certainly necessary, but bitter experience shows that you can't trust the Russians. The only thing they respect is force. Therefore, only by being strong can we give the Russians an effective incentive to disarm. While this position has a superficial plausibility, just a little reflection shows that it hopelessly self-contradictory. For a build-up of our armed strength practically compels our opponent to do the same, and both sides will have to reserve the right to accumulate those weapons which they believe to be the most effective.

The military part of this argument has two interrelated aspects: the build-up of the capacity to wage limited wars, and the development of invulnerable or undetectable launching sites for deterrent

weapons. The ability to wage limited wars requires an arsenal of conventional weapons and "small" atomic weapons, so [missing line]... might use them if we did not have them. Human judgment is notoriously fallible at best and because especially so under conditions of war. It may be possible to limit a few wars, but sooner or later one would trigger off the holocaust.

The second plan stresses the development of invulnerable retaliatory bases to eliminate the advantage of surprise attack. But in view of the rapid advances in arms technology, a base that is invulnerable today may prove very vulnerable tomorrow. One thinks of the Maginot Line.

But the most serious flaw in the doctrine of invulnerable bases is that it could cause an enemy to conceal the source of its attack. A country might arrange to fire a weapon in such a way that it would appear to come from Russia, and we and Russia then fall on each other.

Arming in order to disarm can only increase the world's insecurity; and in addition it places almost insuperable obstacles in the path of disarmament. As long as each side believes that it can negotiate only from a position of strength, the conditions for negotiations which are acceptable to one side are unacceptable to the other.

There are two logical possibilities for disarmament -- by agreement, or by unilateral action. Since we distrust the Russians and they distrust us, the fears of each create grave obstacles to disarmament by agreement. We demand an adequate inspection system, but with the breakneck development of modern weapons, such inspection and control becomes ever less possible. Already it is impossible to inspect for stockpiles of atomic weapons, and we have been told that there can be no perfect inspection for underground explosions. Witness that fact that Russia and the US have been unable to agree on something as simple as a ban on atmospheric tests of nuclear weapons, even though both countries have stopped these tests.

Unilateral disarmament is even more difficult, for any move of this kind would arouse initial suspicion by the other side. To be convincing, disarmament would have to involve obvious weakening and to be persisted in long enough to convince the other side that it was genuine. But undoubtedly this action would be viewed by both as surrender.

To the extent that we do not succeed in denying the dangers of modern weaponry, we are made anxious by them. Anxiety in

moderation facilitates thinking and motivates a search for new and better solutions to the threat. However, if it gets to severe, it tends to make thought rigid and to paralyze initiative. This may have something to do with the repetition compulsion in neurotics, when they keep trying to solve current problems with solutions which may once have worked, but no longer do.

At the level of group dynamics, emotional tension is most seriously reflected in the formation of the stereotype of "The enemy." Whoever we are and whoever the enemy is, we gradually assume all the virtues and they become like the incarnation of everything evil. Once we have cast another group in the role of the enemy, we know that they are to be distrusted -- that they are evil incarnate. We then tend to twist all their communications to fit our belief.

If we meet individual members of the enemy group and find that they do not seem villainous, but appear to be ordinary, easy-going, fun-loving family men like ourselves, we preserve the stereotype by assuming either that they are diabolically clever at deceiving us or that it is their leaders who are villainous.

The mutual distrust of enemies has two dangerous consequences. First, it tends to disrupt communication between them. If a member of one group wishes to communicate with the other, this automatically subjects him to the suspicion of disloyalty. Even Senator Hubert Humphrey, who has maintained a steadfast anti-Communist position for many years, felt it necessary to reassure the public that his desire to talk with Khrushchev did not mean that he was favorable to Communists. Furthermore, since the enemy is viewed as so diabolically clever, each side fears that the other will be able to use improved communications to its advantage.

Disruption of communication prevents gaining information which would help us to rectify any incorrect perceptions of one's opponent. On the other hand, increased communication, however desirable, does not in itself remove the causes of war between groups. No peoples communicated more completely than Northerners and Southerners in the early days of our country. Yet because they were operating under systems of value which were incompatible on one crucial issue, that of slavery, they wound up fighting the most deadly war in history up to that time.

The second and greatest danger of the mutual stereotype of the enemy is that it

tends to make itself come true by virtue of the mechanism of the "self-fulfilling prophecy," which means that we expect people to behave a certain way and then behave in such a way toward them as to cause them to fulfill our prophecy. Enemies may not be untrustworthy to begin with, but if the mutual posture lasts long enough, they eventually become so, as each side acts in such a way as to justify the other's suspicion.

For example, for some time now Russia has been making conciliatory proposals for disarmament which we consistently reject, or view with great suspicion. Since they are undoubtedly convinced of their sincerity, as we are of ours, our attitude can only serve to exasperate them. Constantly accusing someone of bad faith is scarcely the best way to win his friendship. Further, since they distrust us, and thus conclude that we are seeking excuses to continue arming, the only possible purpose must be to attack them. Thus their only hope for survival would be to attack us first. Thus their disarmament proposals would indeed become screens for their arming, heightening our fear that they would attack us, to forestall which we would have to attack them first. Each side fearing, each frantically builds up its striking force, so as to be able to retaliate if the other side should strike first. Thus each country's original policy, that under no condition would it strike first, begins to shift to the position that it must be prepared to strike first.

But even if the world achieved some degree of disarmament by agreement of by reciprocal unilateral action, it would be faced with another problem. If the rest of the world were totally disarmed, the country that had withheld a dozen nuclear weapons could blackmail all the rest. Therefore disarmament will get more and more difficult as it proceeds.

"Breaking the Thought Barrier," Part II - September 1961

A second misunderstanding is that the reliance on nonviolence requires that conflict be eliminated from the world. The goal is rather to develop effective nonviolent means of resolving conflict. A third common misconception is offered as a simple, global solution to the dangers which threaten us. Actually it is an extraordinarily difficult one which incurs grave risks and demands the development of a wide variety of measures tailored to meet

The Only Ultimate Solution

The knowledge of how to make weapons of mass destruction, like the knowledge of good and evil, will never pass from the mind of man. Even in a completely disarmed world, any nation that was so minded could reconstruct these weapons in a few months. Therefore, the only solution lies in creating world conditions which would inhibit a country possessing superior force from using it. In brief, this means the abolition of war.

The relinquishing of war would require very drastic changes in human value systems and behavior, analogous to those produced by a religious conversion. This will require overcoming the thought barrier which has been constructed over the thousands of years in which conflict was always settled in favor of the side with superior destructive power. It will require relinquishing a pattern of behavior as old as humanity and constantly reinforced by success, and adopting a new and essentially untried line of conduct. One must remember that the correct solution for an unprecedented problem is almost certain to appear ridiculous at first, for the habitual, and hence seemingly reasonable solution almost by definition becomes maladaptive when conditions change drastically.

Our language lacks a term to describe exclusive reliance on nonviolent means of persuasion. The usual terms, such as nonviolence, passive resistance, pacifism, conjure up images of a person standing by with a holy look on his face while a soldier runs a bayonet through his sister. Actually, the aim of nonviolence is to prevent this situation from arising -- to inhibit the use of destructive force by persons who possess it.

the specific requirements of different types of conflicts.

Through the ages a few religiously inspired persons have kept the ideal of nonviolence alive, and in recent years two of them Gandhi and Martin Luther King, have shown ways in which it might be practiced on a mass scale. Yet the doctrine of nonviolence has been existence for two thousand years in the form of Christianity and for longer than that in other religions, without having the slightest

effect on war. In fact, differences between religious doctrines, both of which preach peace, have been used to justify extremely destructive wars.

One reason for the ineffectualness of pacifist preachments today is that we agree in principle, simultaneously dismissing them as hopelessly idealistic -- an attitude which renders them impotent. Thereby we put our consciences at rest and avoid having to think further about the matter. Many hold that it is absurd to expect man ever to renounce war, because he is by nature aggressive and self-aggrandizing. On the other hand, humans also show strongly affiliative and altruistic behavior. Students of human nature, depending on their philosophies, tend to view man as basically aggressive but forced to tame his hostile impulses by the necessity to live in close relationships with his fellows, or basically affiliative, becoming hostile only when frightened.

Freud holds that in each generation the child painfully learns to hold his self-aggrandizing, destructive impulses in check, under the pressures of his parents and his group, since social survival would otherwise be impossible. But they are always just beneath the surface, ready to break forth under the slightest encouragement. Moreover, the more elaborate and complex civilization becomes, the more it necessitates damming up man's hostilities, which then eventually break forth with even greater fury. Human existence is thus a race between love and destructiveness, with the latter more likely to win out.

In situations of extreme stress there is no doubt that the veneer of civilization drops off many people. They trample each other to death in panics; they murder and eat each other under conditions of starvation. The more civilized societies become, the more destructive are their wars; and highly civilized societies, such as that of Germany under the Nazis, perpetuate the most fiendish atrocities.

Fortunately, there is evidence that man's affiliative drives may be at least as basic as his aggressive ones. In infants loving as well as aggressive behavior appears spontaneously. Furthermore, for most people anger and hate are unpleasant emotions which they desire to terminate; whereas love is a highly pleasant one which they endeavor to prolong. Finally, just as aggressive drives can cause people to make heroic sacrifices, so can affiliative ones, which cannot be explained on the basis of self-interest. Both trends are very

strong; and the elimination of war requires that the former be strengthened and the latter be inhibited or re-channeled.

The crucial point is that man is extraordinarily modifiable. His attitudes, feelings, and behavior are molded by the groups to which he belongs; his society transmits to him its values, standards and ideals.

War is a social institution, and the values supporting it must be transmitted afresh to each new generation. It is conceivable that we can learn to adhere to a set of values which excludes the possibility of war. There are isolated societies which do not have the institution of war, such as the Hopi. Another form of aggression is open to him -- sticking out his tongue. Aggression does not disappear, but it can be re-channeled. The Hopi are prone to nightmares, but any of us would settle for a few nightmares in exchange for the removal of the threat of extermination.

The Comanche, as a plain tribe, was extremely warlike, but as a plateau tribe, they were without such patterns. The tribe passed from one existence to another in a few generations -- a striking example of the power of group standards.

Within civilized societies there has been a steady reduction of the kinds of conflict for which personal violence is sanctioned. Dueling is no longer an acceptable method for solving conflict in our society. And only two generations ago industrial conflicts regularly involved the use of force on both sides. Yet there have been many prolonged and bitter conflicts in which neither side entertained the possibility of resorting to force. Certainly today's workers are not less belligerent as individuals than their forebears, nor are the police stronger in 1960 than in 1910 when industrial warfare was common.

At least there is the possibility that mankind may eventually subscribe to a set of values which exclude war. But for the present, when violence is still sanctioned as a means of settling disputes between nations, the problem is whether it is possible to win by nonviolent means against an opponent whose group standards sanction the use of violence/.

Almost everyone unhesitatingly answers "No," it is not possible to remain nonviolent in such a violent world, but there is room for doubt. At the level of the individual, a very important aspect of behavior is that it is guided by the responses of the person to whom it is directed. A person's response to what I do influences how I respond to his response,

and this in turn influences what he does next. Violent behavior, like all other behavior, is not self-sustaining. Whether it increases or decreases depends on how the victim responds. It seems to be stimulated by counter-violence or by fear and inhibited by a calm, friendly attitude which implies that the victim is concerned about the welfare of the attacker as well as himself.

If a person can find the courage to meet aggression with calm friendliness, this may have a powerfully inhibiting effect. Only a rare individual has such moral strength in the face of threatened death for himself or his loved ones; but when very strong group support is forthcoming, nonviolent campaigns may be surprisingly successful. Certain features are unusually favorable in the case of Gandhi in India and King in Alabama. They were able to turn the values of the dominant group against them -- to the British and American sense of justice. In both instances the opposed groups were in close personal contact, so that the oppressors could not take emotional refuge in the insensitivity to the remote. And in each case, the oppressed could use the media of mass communication to sustain their own morale and to sway public opinion. But despite the seemingly favorable circumstances that one is now able to see in these cases, no one would have predicted that the nonviolent campaigns could have succeeded, and one cannot exclude the feasibility of a nonviolent approach to some of the current conflicts in the world.

The heart of nonviolent resistance is to fight the antagonism, not the antagonist. Gandhi makes a sharp distinction between the deed and the doer. He rejects the stereotypes of the enemy, assuming that his opponents are acting righteously according to their own standards and tries to demonstrate how his position would achieve their aims better than their own approach. Further, he insists that the conflict must be waged in a constructive way. Thus to oppose the salt tax he organized a march to the sea to make salt.

Thirdly, the waging of a nonviolent battle is not a simple or easy way of fighting and requires the highest type of generalship, with an extraordinary level of flexibility, courage, and organizational ability. The leaders must be able to activate the strongest type of group ideals and controls in order to hold despair and violence in check, despite provocations. These controls will differ in different

cultures. Gandhi fasted as a means of mobilizing guilt in his followers when they strayed from the path of nonviolence, and King held nightly prayer meetings with hymn singing to maintain the morale of the Negroes.

Because it rests on group controls, successful conduct of a nonviolent campaign does not require that individual members be saints, or even believers in nonviolence. Gandhi, with less than 200 disciples, was able to free a nation of 350 million. King's followers, as individuals, are considered to be among the most prone to violence in our society, at least according to popular stereotype. But nonviolent methods of fighting, like violent ones, require a willingness to stake one's life on the outcome. The psychological problem is to create group standards which impel people to offer their lives in a peaceful battle with the same dedication that they do to war.

Thus while steadily inhibiting the aggressor's use of violence, prove to him that he cannot gain his ends with it. In most battles destruction is not the primary end, but a means of coercing the adversary -- except where the aggressive feelings have been strongly fanned or the group standards require the destruction of the enemy, as was the case with the Nazis and Jews. If the aggressor's violence continues to meet with no reinforcing response and if his destruction of members of the other group fails to coerce the survivors, then in time his violent behavior may grind to a halt as his own guilt feelings mount.

In trying to apply the lessons of Gandhi and King to present international conflicts, there are two cautions. First, they are examples of the successful use of nonviolent means by one group against another within a single society, rather than between societies. Second, in each case the society was grounded on democratic values.

The question of nonviolent conflict with a dictatorship arises in two forms. First, if a doctrine of nonviolence ever showed signs of winning the adherence of a majority of the American people, the remainder who still believed that force must be an instrument of policy would almost certainly attempt to seize power, to prevent the disaster that they feared. The outcome would depend on whether the proponents of nonviolence had been sufficiently trained in the use of nonviolent methods and were able to be steadfast in their purpose. A dictatorship from within could not maintain itself

against a persistent refusal of the masses of the population to cooperate.

If our renunciation of force tempted an enemy to impose a military occupation on us, the question would be: Can nonviolent methods prevail against a dictatorship by a group which does not highly value human life?

The most powerful argument, at least from an emotional standpoint, against the success of nonviolent methods opposing a dictator is the fate of the Jews in Germany. There are some situations in which no method of fighting would work, and this was undoubtedly true of the plight of the Jews after World War II was under way. Incidentally, the murder camps were set up only after Germany was at war; whether even the Nazis could have perpetrated such atrocities in peacetime is problematical. The Jews had three choices, none of which could have saved their own lives: violent resistance, nonviolent resistance, and fatalistic acquiescence; and so all they could do was to die in the way most compatible with their own self-respect and most likely to win sympathy for them abroad. Most simply acquiesced. There are many moving anecdotes of Jews who, having received a notice to report to the police station, would go to their non-Jewish friends and say farewell, without expressing any thought of attempting to escape.

But no one knows what might have happened had the Jews resorted to nonviolent methods of resistance early in the Nazi regime. Suppose, for example, in organized fashion they had refused to wear the stigmatizing arm bands and forced the police to publicly drag them off the prison. This would at least have made it more difficult for the German people to pretend they did not know what was going on. One cannot know what effect this might have had.

The question really comes down to whether the group standards of the rulers are sufficiently strong to sustain indefinitely a program of slaughter and torture against a trained, undefeated people who steadfastly maintain a pattern of behavior which tends to inhibit aggressiveness. An artillery observer in the last war found great satisfaction in the impersonal game of directing artillery fire until, one day, a German officer surrendered to him, and, a few minutes later, saved his life by directing him away from a heavily mined area. From that point on, directing artillery fire became in his mind a personal assault on the bodies and lives of fellow human beings. He rapidly

developed incapacitating emotional symptoms and had to be hospitalized. In 1953 some Russian soldiers were shot because they refused to fire on the East Germans in the nonviolent revolution. Thus, although it is clear that a nonviolent campaign against a dictatorship might be very costly in lives and difficult to maintain, it is not a forgone conclusion that it could not succeed.

Whether nonviolent methods can be used successfully in an international arena is unknown territory. Nations have resolved many disputes through peaceful negotiation, but these have always been held with the knowledge that violence could be resorted to if the negotiations failed.

One advantage that a nation would have, in comparison with an oppressed group under a dictatorship, is its greater command of the instruments of mass communication. It could wage a massive propaganda campaign in favor of its view, and of a form which would tend to inhibit the enemy's use of violence, such as Russia is doing fairly successfully today.

The fragmentary experimental data on the resolution of conflicts between groups suggest that the most successful way to resolve an intergroup conflict is through the creation of goals of overriding importance to both groups, which can be attained only by their cooperation. The exploration of the undersea world, the conquest of outer space, and cooperative efforts to speed the economic advance of the underdeveloped countries. Moreover, these activities would offer substitute goals for the satisfaction of drives which in the past would have been satisfied by war. Many years ago William James called for "the moral equivalents of war" and modern technology has made such equivalents potentially available on a scale never before possible.

Suppose that America has committed itself to exclusive reliance on means other than military force for pursuing its aims and defending its values. It then would welcome the Russian proposal for complete disarmament in a given number of years -- not out of fear but from the conviction that it would be to our advantage, because our goals can be achieved only through peaceful means. Commitment to nonviolent means does not require instantaneous total disarmament, any more than belief in the decisive power of superior violence requires the immediate launching of nuclear war. Actually, drastic disarmament by the US without considerable advance preparation might plunge the world into chaos.

Ultimate values, however, guide day-to-day behavior, so renunciation of violence would be promptly reflected by a change in attitude at the conference table. If at each choice point of negotiations we would select that line of action which would most foster the development of a peaceful world, we would be prepared to run risks in order to achieve this end, knowing that at worst they would be less than those entailed by the continual build-up of weapons of unlimited destructive power. We would, of course, try to establish such controls and inspection as the Russians would permit, but we would not make our disarmament contingent on having precisely the controls we desire. As we disarmed in accordance with a pre-arranged schedule, assuming that Russia was doing likewise, we would be taking certain other very important steps. That is, disarmament as a means of carrying out a program of nonviolence could not occur in a vacuum.

To abolish armies as well as war colleges and general staffs each country would have to wage a peaceful propaganda offensive within its borders as well as outside them; failure to do so would in itself be an evidence of bad faith. Therefore, a major task would be to change certain of our values. Today we give lip service to peace, but glorify violence, as our TV programs bear witness. We would have to learn to venerate heroes of peace as we now do gangsters and desperados.

We would have to be prepared to make the necessary economic readjustment required by disarmament. We must make plans for conversion of the armaments industries to other types of production.

Believers in nonviolence would have to learn the methods of nonviolence, for the most pessimistic possibility is that they might have to resist seizure of power by internal as well as external groups, or even that an internal group might trip to foment a war in a desperate effort to keep control. The optimistic possibility is that the growth of a movement for nonviolence in any one country would encourage the like-minded in other countries, leading to increasing pressures on all governments to negotiate their differences peaceably.

We would especially emphasize cooperative activities toward the attainment of superordinate goals, such as the highly successful International Geophysical Year. The stronger habits of cooperation become, the more effectively they would inhibit a subsequent resort to violence. Along the same lines, we would work toward peaceful resolution of

outstanding tension spots in the world, such as Berlin. We could expect to resolve all the disputes in our favor. We have gotten ourselves into certain positions which are untenable positions with or without war, and we would have to recognize this fact. In each case we would seek the solution which most furthers the cause of universal peace, rather than the one which seems to promote an illusory national interest.

Our all-out effort to win over the uncommitted countries to our way of life would take the form of expansion of medical help and of measures to raise their economic level by self-aid. Whenever possible we would conduct these programs in cooperation with the Russians.

Finally, we would work toward bringing about world-wide disarmament and building up institutional machinery for the peaceful solution of international disputes. This would require surrender of some aspects of national sovereignty, but the advent of modern weaponry has doomed unlimited sovereignty, in any case.

The most favorable outcome would be that each successive disarmament step would become easier as the advantages to all countries became increasingly effective institutional means for peaceful resolution of disputes.

In such a world, any government that contemplated taking advantage of general disarmament to blackmail another country through threat of violence would face extremely unpleasant consequences. The move would have a profoundly demoralizing effect within the country that made it. And even Hitler, who probably conducted the most vigorous internal campaign to glorify war in the world's history, required several years to rouse Germany's martial fervor sufficiently to enable him to start the war. Russian leaders would have a considerably more difficult time, especially if the liberalizing process in Russia had been accelerated by increasing prosperity, removal of the threat of war, and rise in educational level.

Then, too, every country of the world would rearm as rapidly as possible, and the aggressor would be the common enemy. Since the countries would still know how to make weapons of unlimited destructive power, and since some of those are very cheap and easy to produce, the government which threatened violence would have to be prepared to police the entire world. And, too, she would know that she would meet stubborn nonviolent resistance.

If one country did announce, after the world was disarmed, that she had

retained enough nuclear weapons to destroy us, and therefore attempted to coerce us, and if we continued to follow the policy of nonviolent resistance, three choices would be left the country -- to exterminate us with a nuclear raid; to occupy us; or to use her superior force to weaken our influence internationally by threatening our allies and the uncommitted nations.

A nuclear raid would be unlikely, for the fear that we would strike first would be gone. Her aim would be coercion, not destruction. An attempt to occupy us would be more probable, but this would be difficult, for she would have to reassemble an invasion force. Meanwhile, we would use all possible means of mobilizing world opinion against her and of strengthening the will to resist of our own people by propaganda and refresher courses in nonviolent resistance. If she nevertheless occupied us, our nonviolent methods would probably be costly in lives, and they might not succeed. But even if they failed, it would be better to die in a course of action which held out some hope for the future than as part of a general holocaust. The cause of liberty might be set back for a time, but it would eventually prevail, for the only sure way of extinguishing it is through the destruction of the human race.

More likely than outright occupation would be the effort to use her superior force to overcome our influence in doubtful areas of the world and to gradually encroach upon us in this way. Then we would have to rely on the determinations of the peoples involved to resist because they had been convinced of the superiority of our way of life. Obviously, we would lose in some areas, as we will if we rely on force. But again in the long run the future would be much brighter for humanity.

It therefore seems possible that, having considered nuclear blackmail, a country such as Russia would decide that the game was not worth it, and would commit herself to the peaceful competition she already professes to want.

Commitment to winning through superior destructive power leads further and further along the road to a garrison state at home and tyranny abroad. Renunciation of violence implies that the values we believe in can be promulgated only by peaceful means. At home we are already witnessing a steady erosion of freedom. Dissent becomes ever more dangerous. Recently in Baltimore some high school students mobbed a young man who was merely trying to peddle a Socialist paper. A short time ago our President Eisenhower

rebuked the Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee for daring publicly to question our China policy on the ground that this endangered our will to resist.

It is safe to assert that all human beings aspire to freedom. The common denominator of all psychiatric illnesses is that they impose limits on the patient's freedom, and his longing to be free of the tyranny of his symptoms is a strong motive for accepting the work and suffering often entailed by psychotherapy.

The chance that conversion to abandonment of force as an arbiter of international conflicts could come about is not without hope. Such religious conversions -- and nonviolence as a way of life must have the magnitude of a religious conversion -- occur typically in persons who have undergone a long period of desperation, hopeless, or panic. To use a phrase of which alcoholics are fond, they have "hit bottom." But perhaps it may be possible for the peoples of the world to renounce violence if they see the "bottom" to which modern weapons are leading them before it actually comes to pass.

And it may be even easier to change group standards than to change those of individuals. Witness the fact that Germany and Japan have changed in our eyes from diabolical enemies to trusted allies in about a decade. In all honesty, the most likely source of a conversion of mankind to renunciation of mass violence would be a nuclear accident which would bring home the horrors of modern war. But we must bend every effort to develop group standards of nonviolence through intensive educational methods. It may be hopeful that in America, in contrast to many European countries, has glorified nonmilitary figures, such as Thomas Jefferson. Perhaps we can exploit the potent TV image of the heroic cowboy who throws away his gun and faces down the villain by sheer will power.

In view of the present grave and entirely unprecedented threat to survival, it is important to examine all our patterns of behavior to discover which are still useful and which must be modified. Then we must fully exploit those which still work and endeavor to change the others. Among patterns of human interaction which undoubtedly still are valid are certain features of internal organization of societies, such as relations of larger to smaller units of governments and of governments to individual citizens. But the time-hallowed institution of war must eventually be abandoned if the human adventure is to continue.

The necessary first step toward achieving the renunciation of war without a catastrophe is to combat the world-wide hypnotic fixation on superior violence as the ultimate arbiter of conflict. This would release the imaginations of the world's intellectual, moral and political leaders to devise constructive alternatives for war. If this can be accomplished, it

would liberate man's energies to create a world of unimaginable plenty in which humanity, freed at last from poverty and war, could develop its full potentialities. One may hope that the human mind, which has proved capable of splitting the atom and putting satellites in space, will also prove equal to this supreme challenge.
