

upon reason, and that the base of appeal can be correspondingly broader. But two questions may be raised about its final efficacy in appealing beyond the realm of "the Clergy and Faithful" to "All Men of Good Will."

First, the conclusions that Catholic theology draws from the premises of natural law are not always conclusions that seem equally self-evident to non-Catholics, and natural law theory is thus sometimes divisive as well as inclusive. The hopeful fact is that (sometimes as a result of contact with non-Catholic thought) Catholic moral theology is occasionally willing to take a fresh look at its conclusions.

The other premise upon which natural law theory itself is based, namely that there are not only rationally deducible principles but also minds clearly equipped to draw the deductions, is likewise open to certain questions. When Pope John urges that "the true and solid peace of nations consists not in equality of arms but in mutual trust alone," and then immediately adds, "We believe that this can be brought to pass," one can only hope fervently that he is right.

Perhaps the most complex contemporary issue to which the encyclical points has to do with the ongoing problems of coexistence and (to select only one example of those problems) the difficulty that is raised when one nation is engaged in actions internally that seem a threat to the good of all. If one affirms the right of freedom of conscience, for example, as a right to be enjoyed by all men, what should or can be done when a given nation is denying that right to its own citizens? That the citizens have a right to rebel is clear from the Pope's reiterated insistence that evil laws need not be obeyed. But how, and in what ways, is the defense of this principle to be extended beyond the internal life of a state?

These comments suggest only a few areas in which those examining the encyclical need to push beyond its explicit statements to determine what specific applications may lie implicit within it.

The twin resources for such examinations are wisdom and commitment. The encyclical wisely points out that neither is sufficient without the other. A man cannot play an active part in world affairs "unless he is scientifically competent, technically capable, and skilled in the practice of his own profession." But these things, "although necessary, are not of themselves sufficient to elevate the relationships of society to an order that is genuinely human" since "it is also necessary that they should carry on those activities as acts within the moral order."

To the technicians the Pope is saying that technical skill is not enough, and to the theologians and men of good will he is saying that piety is not enough.

PACEM IN TERRIS

3. The Uses of Tolerance

By HERMANN J. MULLER

THE SCIENTIFIC REVOLUTION has so inordinately increased the powers of men that all human groups must rapidly find social measures that will allow them to live with one another in peace, unity, and voluntary cooperation. For otherwise they will continue to drift down collision courses that inevitably lead to mutual annihilation. Pope John XXIII, in "Peace on Earth," argues forcefully for this conclusion from the standpoint of a Roman Catholic. This message is of great importance both because of its direct influence in helping to swing the Catholic sixth of the world's population into line with the effort to achieve a workable coexistence, and also because, less directly, it will be conducive to the adoption of similar policies by others.

Curiously, the clue to the attitude by which non-Catholics may hope to come to that rapprochement with Catholics and others which is necessary for the attainment of coexistence is given in a few paragraphs that Pope John addresses specifically to Catholics, in instructing them in how to treat with non-Catholics. As he states therein, Catholics "should be prepared to join sincerely in doing whatever is naturally good or conducive to good. . . . Meetings and agreements . . . between believers and those who do not believe or believe insufficiently because they adhere to error, can be occasions for discovering truth and paying homage to it. . . . Furthermore, "false philosophical teachings regarding the nature, origin, and destiny of the universe and of man [cannot] be identified with historical movements that have economic, social, cultural or political ends, not even when these movements have originated from those teachings and have drawn and

still draw inspiration therefrom. For . . . the movements, working on historical situations in constant evolution, cannot but be influenced by these latter and cannot avoid, therefore, being subject to changes, even of a profound nature. Besides, who can deny that those movements, in so far as they conform to the dictates of right reason and are interpreters of the lawful aspirations of the human person, contain elements that are positive and deserving of approval? . . . It can happen, then, that a drawing nearer together or a meeting for the attainment of some practical end, which was formerly deemed inopportune or unproductive, might now or in the future be considered opportune and useful."

EXACTLY these same principles are applicable, reciprocally, to non-Catholics in their dealings with Catholics, and with others of different groups from their own. The fact that even Khrushchev (whose policies in this field are allegedly to be maintained by those who have overthrown him) gave his approval to Pope John's appeal for a *modus vivendi* of this kind is a signal example of the possibility of its acceptance by realists of the most divergent opinions. It is to be anticipated that even the leaders of China, when their experience with nuclear weapons brings them to a better perspective on modern realities, will within a decade or two admit the soundness of this approach. Yet the present situation is too fraught with danger for us or anyone to sit idly by, waiting for time to work the necessary changes of heart and of policy. We must bestir ourselves in actively promoting in our own as well in other groups the will to work toward a sound and lasting peace, founded on mutual tolerance.

It should not be overlooked that Pope John, in the paragraphs quoted above, also took occasion to warn Catholics not to "compromise in matters wherein the integrity of religion or morals would suffer harm." And he reserved to the Church "the right and the duty . . . to intervene authoritatively with Her children in the temporal sphere, when there is a question of judging about the application of those principles [of ethics and religion] to concrete cases." It is to be expected that non-Catholics, similarly, will seldom compromise their underlying principles when coming to agreements with Catholics and other



—From "The Wood Engravings of Joan Hassall."

groups on matters of policy and procedure. Nevertheless, they, like Catholics, can usually find ideological pathways whereby their principles are brought (for them at least) into consistency with their practical programs for peaceful relations. Not all groups, however, and certainly not the humanists, would approve of invoking any ideological or religious "authority" in support of their position.

Although in all groups sheer physical survival, and also survival of the values they represent, would prescribe a course of peace in today's world, most of the groups would also find among their principles more specific grounds for fostering, in the present situation, friendly relations between all peoples. For all major cultures that have united diverse tribes have emphasized that good will and good works should be extended by everyone to the members of the community in general. And now that advances in science, along with technological achievements in communication, transportation, and industry are drawing all peoples closer together, the pressure of feeling is everywhere strong to extend to all men the fellowship earlier reserved for others of the same nationality. At the same time, the advantages of this course become ever stronger and more evident to those who draw rational conclusions.

Humanists and many others not bound by traditional dogmas will not agree with Pope John when he attributes the existence of fellow feeling and rationality in man to the operation of supernatural causes. They will, however, agree that the germs of both fellow feeling and rationality are deeply rooted in human nature. These faculties are in the first place rooted genetically, as a result of biological evolution, because the structure and the mode of life of proto-humans and humans were unique in causing both fellow feeling and rationality to be especially conducive to survival. In the second place the cultural evolution of man laid further stress on these faculties. This happened because both their objective and their subjective value in aiding human life caused the groups that exercised them in greater measure to win out.

IN this sense, it is in agreement with the conclusions of biology and anthropology to say, along with Pope John, that morality and rationality in man are in accord with "natural law." Although such an extension was long ago proclaimed as an ideal, only in recent times has it been practicable for men to extend their fellowship to all humanity. Today this extension is in fact an urgent necessity. To be sure, it would constitute a departure from the natural law of the past. It represents a present-day conse-

quence of human progress in which the larger implications of the individual steps previously taken in that progress had only been dimly realized. It is as natural as anything else, but it is a principle unique in modern man, growing out of the qualities natural to him only. If it is presently to come to fruition, it must be by means of man's fully conscious exercise of these same distinctive attributes of his, which are morality and rationality. Thus, in the case of man, the artificial is the natural, being the product of his heart, brain, and hand, working in concert.

Certainly it is not necessary or feasible for the different groups of men to reach agreement on the mode of origin or the primary causes of man's humanity before establishing workable accords based on man's actual humanity. As the anthropologist Gerald Berreman has recently pointed out in the *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, people—and peo-

*"Only in recent times
has it been practicable
for men to extend
their fellowship to
all humanity"*

ples—can in fact cooperate on a practical basis, even if they have different views and values, provided that they communicate with one another effectively enough to realize that both or all sides are sincere in the desire to engage in mutually serviceable behavior. And as they proceed in this course they are likely to communicate ever more effectively and so to understand one another's position ever better. For after all there is only one truth, and this may be approached from various angles.

In order that, in the meantime, the different facets of truth (often complementary to one another) that are now cherished by different peoples, or different subgroups, may not be lost, and in order, further, that serious rethinking may be promoted, it is essential that individuals and associations of them be allowed the maximum freedom of thought, expression, and action consistent with peace and civil order. Let discussions go forward searchingly and openly, and let ideas and practices be proven by their fruits. For no man, no creed, no nation, no social, political, or intellectual organization, has a monopoly on truth or right.

Most thinking persons, of whatever

background, will be able to agree with Pope John that individuals and societies everywhere should aim to promote the ascendancy among men of "truth, justice, charity [or 'love'] and liberty." But political groups will differ greatly in regard to the forms these abstractions should take, and the means by which they should be striven for. I would prefer to put the same matter by saying that for all men there should be a maximum of cognizant voluntarism and social orientation in their ordering of their personal lives, of their work and of their leisure, and in their participation in the affairs of the community. To be practicable of attainment this ideal implies, of course, a high level of education on the part of the common man, the development in him of a deep sense of brotherliness for others, and, basic to both of these, his economic and social well-being.

The great political rifts in the world today are between peoples who are told, and for the most part believe, that they alone have the solutions to the problems of how these ideal-seeming relations among men are to be attained. So long as this is the case each group, considering its own position to be sacrosanct, must maintain its inner independence in regard to its own affairs. For conquest of one major power by another is out of the question since all sides would lose disastrously, and surrender would appear to each to entail the loss of the most profound values that mankind has achieved. Since, however, the "balance of terror," with the arms race that supports it, is so unstable that it would be likely before long to break down into war, even if inadvertently, the great question is, how shall it be superseded? How can the contending powers be brought to accept, in its place, a balanced reduction of arms, finally leading to their complete elimination, without advantages being opened to one side that would be regarded by its opponents as too dangerous?

POPE JOHN fully recognizes this problem. He has been criticized for not giving specific answers to it. However, at the present stage these would be premature. We may agree, for the time being, on these more general points that he has emphasized: the need for serious and courteous communication between the opposing groups, the need for sincere negotiations based on their realization that accords are in their common interest, and the need for an increase in cooperative efforts that could be undertaken by them in diverse areas. Certainly also the United Nations should be strengthened.

In addition to these it should be remembered that there is another equally important task if durable peace is to be

achieved. That is the rendering, without condescension, of truly massive and effective technological and economic assistance to the less developed and less committed peoples. At the same time, it is imperative that their rights be safeguarded, preferably under agreed-upon auspices, to choose their own economic and ideological courses.

Departing from generalities, however, one specific feature of such aid that is an absolute essential, but that was not mentioned by Pope John, must be insisted upon. That is the imparting of information regarding the need for birth control, and regarding appropriate means of accomplishing it. This information should be accompanied by whatever technical and material assistance may be necessary in this connection. Otherwise population increase could undermine all other progress and destroy all foundations of peace. It would be insufficient, and it would often be inadvisable, to attack this difficulty by following the policy hinted at by Pope John of evening up population concentrations and economic inequalities by transfers of people and goods.

MODERN techniques and modern knowledge do make the world, potentially, one unitary community. The way to achieve this unity in the face of the existing schisms is to promote both common action and common thought. By engaging in joint enterprises and acquiring joint interests, the opposing groups will find their areas of accord gradually increasing, relatively to their areas of opposition, and this evolution will occur in matters both of practice and of theory. Pope John has recognized this as the main path of convergence. As a devout Catholic, Pope John must of course have been convinced that in this way the principles of his Church would at last attain general recognition. No doubt the partisans of the Soviet system would hold a corresponding view, and be just as confident that by this means *they* would prevail. It is fortunate that the most militant sponsors of each contending group of doctrines can adopt this attitude. For in this way men can indeed approach closer not only to peace but to objective truth, and to policies and practices that will better serve the interests of all humanity.

In his concluding section Pope John makes a major point that, coming from so authoritative a Catholic source, is especially noteworthy. He observes that there are great areas for continued and complex revisions in social, economic, political, and cultural life, inasmuch as "these must all be adjusted to the era of the atom and of the conquest of space. . . ." Unfortunately, such matters are little referred to elsewhere in the encyclical. But they involve what is at

the same time the most critical and the most hopeful aspect of the situation. For, on the one hand, it is the increased knowledge and enhanced powers of human groups, issuing from the advances of science and technology, that have brought these groups to the present dire crisis in their relations. Yet, on the other hand, the still further advance of human understanding and of human practice, when conducted in behalf of mankind in general, could henceforth lead to the resolution of these conflicts, by providing the opportunity for effective common effort in the pursuit of ever nobler objectives.

Let us not accept science and technology grudgingly, and feel that we must make the best of a difficult situation. For they are in a way our sensory system and our motor organs, which have enabled us to behold the world as it is and to deal with it accordingly. Seeing, at long last, through the eyes of science, that the universe is incomparably greater than what we had dreamed, and learning of our own long ascent, we human beings can now more truly appreciate our own uniqueness and the awesome potentialities we hold. For science, setting men on this lofty peak of knowledge and granting them the wondrous capabilities of manipulating both the infinitesimal and the immense, has completely revolutionized men's prospects. By its means, in the technically advanced countries, the standard of living of the common man has already been enormously raised, and the richness of his life can still be greatly enhanced. Moreover, it is not only in these countries that poverty can now be eliminated and human dignity augmented. For if science is rightly applied, this can be accomplished everywhere.

Science, however, is far more than a means to ease and enjoyment. It represents a spirit within which is held the aspirations of all humanity. Let us not be afraid to carry this spirit forward into all realms of thought and action.

Essential components of this spirit are adventurous and imaginative inquiry, balanced judgment, unrestricted but honest criticism and self-criticism, a willingness to build upon the work of others and to build with others, frank and lucid communication, maximally unbiased testing, searching observation, penetrating calculation, creative planning and execution, exhilaration in pushing forward both the material and the spiritual dominion of mankind. There must be an interweaving of this spirit with the spirit of sociality and with that of art, so that an integrated culture may emerge.

ABOVE all, the spirit of science is the spirit of progress. Science seeks no static utopia or heaven. It can afford men ever newer horizons and higher peaks to climb, materially, mentally, and spiritually. It can afford ever greater and more inspiring opportunities for cooperative as well as individual achievement. Its pathway leads not only outward into space and to other worlds than ours, but also inward into the recesses of life, of the mind, and of the heart. By its means we will ourselves assume the role of creators of ever lovelier worlds and of more sublime beings. By its means, too, we can reach increasing agreement regarding the nature of things, since the conclusions of science rest on objective tests.

As the earth's peoples increasingly join hands in these open-ended enterprises, their ancient hates and fears, as well as their more recent estrangements, must gradually wither. In a state of abundance, problems of distribution will become less acute. Where positive actions can achieve results, negative reactions and strife tend to lose their meaning. In the forward path of mankind there is room for multifold experimentation and variation, and men can freely share each others' diverse gains. Thus will the beast in man transcend himself, and the sublime burst forth in a mounting symphony of self-creation.



4. The Revolutionary Truism

By EVERETT E. GENDLER

AS RECENTLY as ten years ago I can recall conversations among seminary students who found themselves wondering if traditional religion had anything really to say to the modern scene. Was there, finally, anything in the biblical and rabbinic tradition which, applied today, was something more than a truism, a generality, a statement of the obvious? In those youthfully naïve days, when nuclear delivery time was still measured in bomber-hours rather than ballistic-minutes, we had not yet realized how very penetrating and radical statements of the obvious and proclamations of truisms would soon come to be.

How should we have imagined then that a simple call to trust one another would sound so revolutionary? That to declare the mass killing of hundreds of millions of human beings "no possible instrument of justice" would sound so radical? That to assert men's basic rights and dignity should prove so critical of present social organization on this earth?

Yet all these things have come to pass, and it is now painfully clear to us that the once obvious is no longer obvious. Values once taken for granted, limitations once readily assumed, are no longer to be taken for granted or assumed; this is the singular religious and ethical fact of our age. It was to this condition that the much loved and much lamented Pope John XXIII spoke in his encyclical "Pacem in Terris," and it is to this condition that every one of us also must now speak. The reassertion of simple things is today a radical task which every tradition must again attempt, and it is one modest effort in its barest beginning that I would offer in appreciation and tribute to Pope John's stirring execution of his task. By such an approach I trust that some of the broad areas of agreement with emphases of the papal encyclical will become evident.

Where shall we begin? Clearly with our sense of cosmic purpose, for it is only within that larger scheme that our own limited place can be ascertained and appreciated. Two brief statements, one biblical and one rabbinic, help me, for one, to gain some idea of where we are and what it is all about:

... the Lord Who created the heavens
(He is God!),
Who formed the earth and made it

(He established it),
He did not create it a chaos,
He formed it to be inhabited!

In the hour when the Holy One,
blessed be He,
created the first man,
He took him and let him pass
before all the
trees of the garden of Eden,
and said to him:
See My works, how fine and
excellent they are!
Now all that I have created,
for you have I created.
Think upon this, and do not
corrupt and desolate
My world:
for if you corrupt it,
there is no one to set it
right after you.

Of course, how simple and obvious! The earth is meant to be inhabited, cared for, and enjoyed by us! Can anyone, in tranquil moments of the spirit, not know this? Yet the lulling din of daily pursuits somehow drowns out the echo of this plain proclamation of planetary purpose, and it is only at moments of keen hearing that we reawaken to the appalling fact that the military means by which we now seek to attain certain ends jeopardize the very existence of human life on this planet so precious to us.

It is true, of course, that violence was resorted to and war waged throughout human history, often with religious sanction. But neglected in such a statement is the fact that classical Judaism was quite specific in limiting the application of violence for human ends, for it was well aware, even in those technologically primitive times, of the frightening uncontrollability of weapons and the tragic tendency of violence to become indiscriminate and unbounded.

It is well known and often asserted, for example, that Judaism recognized the preservation of one's own life as a primary duty. Less well known, however, is the clear rabbinic limitation set upon violations of the religious code in accomplishing this.

In every other law of the Torah, if a man is commanded, "Transgress and suffer not death," he may transgress and not suffer death, excepting idolatry, incest, and shedding blood. . . . Murder may not be practiced to save one's life. . . . Even as one who came before Raba and said to him, "The governor of my town has ordered me, 'Go and kill so and so; if not, I will slay

thee.'" Raba answered him, "Let him rather slay you than that you should commit murder; who knows that your blood is redder? Perhaps his blood is redder."

It is also well known that Judaism recognized the right of a person to defend himself against an attacker, to the point of killing him if necessary. Not so often noted, however, is the strict limitation of means imposed even upon this plain act of self-defense.

It has been taught by Rabbi Jonathan b. Saul: If one was pursuing his fellow to slay him, and the pursued could have saved himself by maiming a limb of the pursuer, but instead killed his pursuer, the pursued should be executed on that account.

The same limitation, incidentally, applies also to a bystander who, witnessing such a murderous pursuit, is enjoined to intervene on behalf of the pursued. He too, if he needlessly slay rather than maim the assailant, is regarded as deserving execution because of that excess.

This same insistence upon limitation characterizes authoritative biblical and rabbinic rulings concerning the waging of war. Massive destruction of population and resources may have been thinkable, but it was clearly unacceptable to traditional Judaism.

When siege is laid to a city for the purpose of capture, it may not be surrounded on all four sides but only on three in order to give an opportunity for escape to those who would flee to save their lives . . .

When in your war against a city you have to besiege it a long time in order to capture it, you must not destroy its trees, wielding the ax against them. You may eat of them, but you must not cut them down. Are trees of the field human to withdraw before you under siege? Only trees which you know do not yield food may be destroyed. . . .

Can one imagine such a tradition sanctioning modern nuclear warfare or even modern "conventional" warfare? I cannot. Nor can I imagine it sanctioning the "mere" act of preparing for such modes of conflict. Genuine preparation, after all, is predicated upon the possibility of use in extreme circumstances, "credibility" being essential to a policy of deterrence. But if, as seems clear to me, the use is quite outside the bounds of permissibility in any circumstances whatsoever, the preparation itself is also illicit.

Pope John found it "hardly possible to imagine that in the atomic era war could be used as an instrument of justice." Many of us in other traditions, basing ourselves on authoritative teachings of our own traditions, subscribe wholeheartedly to the finding that modern war