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ABSTRACT

PEACE AND HUMAN RIGHTS IN THE NUCLEAR AGE

*(THE ENCYCLICAL AND THE SPEECH OF 1963)*

Name: Howell, Roger William
University of Dayton
Advisor: Dr. Sandra A. Yocum

This thesis examines Pope John XXIII’s encyclical *Pacem in Terris* and President John F. Kennedy’s *Commencement Address at American University*. Both documents were produced in the spring of 1963 by two leaders who would leave the world stage that same year. This thesis examines these documents in the light of their historical setting and what they mean to humanity in the 21st century.

*Pacem in Terris* and the *Commencement Address at American University* are two documents that provide perspective that resonates with the present, and provides a reminder of how elusive peace is today. *Pacem in Terris* is the cornerstone for Catholic social justice on peace and human rights. President Kennedy’s Commencement Address at American University, but for a few phrases, is largely forgotten. The nuclear age, gave urgency to Pope John XIII to make cooperation a priority among nations with the publication of *Pacem in Terris*. The significance of my research is to show that it is possible to commit to a vision that will lead to a peace that is solid yet flexible, to meet the challenges before humanity.
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CHAPTER I
TWO DOCUMENTS

Introduction

The year 1963 was a pivotal time for the advancement of peace. Proliferation of nuclear weapons without arms control rendered other critical issues such as human rights meaningless. The matter was so grave that it transcended church and state boundaries. *Pacem in Terris* and the *Commencement Address at American University* are two documents that provided a strategic vision for securing peace in the nuclear age. In the aftermath of the first truly global war, these statements also provide a foundation for protecting human rights.

*Pacem in Terris* and the *Commencement Address at American University* are unique as a papal encyclical and presidential speech because they define peace from ecclesial and secular positions at a critical point in history. In the eighteen years following the end of World War II, no agreements were concluded for managing nuclear weapons. Humanity in the nuclear age could not pursue an arms race to be followed by war, as was the case prior to 1945. It was not until July 1, 1958, after years of proposals, that a conference was held to address the issue of a nuclear test ban. Later that year, in October 1958, negotiations began in earnest, coupled with a moratorium on all U.S. testing of nuclear weapons that lasted until September 15, 1961.
These were the first steps toward some control over nuclear weapons between nations.¹

In mid-1963 Pope John XXIII and President John F. Kennedy chose to influence the course of history to build on the tenuous peace of the Cold War. Accommodating nuclear weapons carried with it significant concerns. Among these concerns is the idea that humanity can use nuclear weapons in a limited manner. In the early years of the nuclear age this idea was part of some strategic thinking.

Nuclear weapons might always be a part of our reality, but the longer we live in their shadow the harder we must work against the idea that a nation must have them. The work towards peace becomes more complicated as Christian values compete with non-Christian values that dominate in modern society. A post-Christian world, where Christian values no longer dominate, makes the task of securing peace ever more difficult.² In both cases, the threat posed by the use of nuclear weapons cannot be understated.

Prior to the formation of the Soviet Union, America and Russia had a history of common values; both had a history of Christianity in their respective culture. A world of competing values may open the door to nuclear war becoming thinkable and draw humanity toward a materialistic view of the world. With a materialistic view, creation loses its value because our stewardship is no longer a gift from God, but ours to do with as we please.


² Post-Christian World: This a view of the world in which Christian ideas no longer dominate society. I first encountered this term reading Thomas Merton’s Peace in the Post-Christian Era, (Maryknoll: Orbis, 2004).
As men with shared values, Pope John and President Kennedy understood all too well the crisis that the world faced. The five years prior to 1963 demonstrated that the world could not step back from the brink of war or take a step forward for peace. The stand-off between the United States and the Soviet Union in Berlin, and the Cuban Missile Crisis were impasses that threatened to turn hot.

The nuclear threat is a threat to the advancement of human rights because resources are lost for more critical needs of society. *Pacem in Terris* and the *Commencement Address at American University* are products of the ecclesial and secular and speak to a world divided between democratic and totalitarian values. Although no longer divided along Cold War lines, the world is still divided politically and economically. Countries, which seek nuclear capabilities beyond peaceful uses such as for domestic energy, will only promote tension in the global community.

The philosopher Charles Taylor sums up what Pope John and President Kennedy were striving towards. In his work, *A Secular Age*, he presents a vision of the new moral order in society functioning along agreed upon norms. Society is undergirded by natural law. Natural law allows society to operate within accepted parameters of what is right and wrong, just and unjust. It provides the moral underpinnings of how people behave living in the same community or how they as a community of nations treat each other.

The picture of society is that of individuals who come together to form a political entity, against a certain pre-existing moral background, and with certain ends in view. The moral background is one of natural rights; these people already have certain moral obligations towards each other. The ends sought are certain common benefits, of which security is the most important.

The underlying idea of moral order stresses the rights and obligations which we have as individuals in regard to each other, even prior to or outside of the political bond. Political obligations are seen as an extension
or application of these more fundamental ties. Political authority itself is legitimate only because it was consented to by individuals (the original contract), and this contract creates binding obligations in virtue of the pre-existing principles that promises be kept.³

Charles Taylor’s reference to social contract invokes political theory that may or may not be the specific type of social structure envisioned by Pope John. Whether Pope John agreed or disagreed with the particular resulting political theory of the 18th century, he did agree that it did transform government, and we live in a society that was formed as a result. The political theory that formed the American Constitution and its Bill of Rights laid out basic human rights in writing that Kennedy was obligated to protect. The Commencement Address at American University and Pacem in Terris emphasize human rights and the threat that the Nuclear Age poses to them. It is not just the explosion of the bomb, but the dollars spent to research, develop, and maintain a nuclear stockpile that threatens human rights.

The encyclical and the speech are a strategy for peace that is the antithesis of a strategy for war. Pacem in Terris and the Commencement Address at American University were introduced at a time in American history when Strategic Air Command bombers were on alert 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.⁴ During the Cold War the two superpowers were not directly shooting at each other as they fought wars by proxy. As

⁴ The now-deactivated Strategic Air Command began the mission on February 3, 1961. It took the nickname Looking Glass because the mission mirrored ground-based command, control, and communications. From that date, an Air Force EC-135 Looking Glass aircraft was in the air at all times 24 hours a day, 365 days a year for more than 29 years. On July 24, 1990, Looking Glass ceased continuous airborne alert, but remained on ground or airborne alert 24 hours a day. Crews accumulated more than 281,000 accident-free flying hours, an aviation phenomenon. On Oct. 1, 1998, the Navy’s E-6B Mercury replaced the EC-135 in the Looking Glass mission. (accessed on 31 December 2010) available from http://www.stratcom.mil/factsheets/ACP/Airborne_Command_Post/; Internet.
nations and even transnational groups prepare strategic plans for war, so we must have a strategy for peace.

The strategy for peace as spelled out by *Pacem in Terris* and the *Commencement Address at American University* is just as relevant today as in 1963. The vision of Pope John and President Kennedy that called for peace survives decades after these two men left the world stage in 1963. Their documents serve as a foundation on which to build as peace is threatened by many forces, whether in the guise of the nation-state, transnational groups, the national security state, the military-industrial complex, or the intelligence-industrial complex. Terrorism, racism, poverty, and hunger are just a few of the threats to a peaceful and just society.

Nuclear weapons became a part of arms control talks in the first decade following World War II. Human rights now had to include the right to live free from the fear of incineration. With a sobering reference to a ‘nuclear sword of Damocles’, President Kennedy reached to classical Greek history to illustrate the constant threat that nuclear weapons are to the world. On September 25, 1961, in his address to the United Nations, President Kennedy made clear that the threat of nuclear war was a grave concern.

Today, every inhabitant of this planet must contemplate the day when this planet may no longer be habitable. Every man, woman and child lives under a nuclear sword of Damocles, hanging by the slenderest of threads, capable of being cut at any moment by accident or miscalculation or by madness. The weapons of war must be abolished before they abolish us.⁵

As nuclear fear gripped America and the world, the struggle for civil rights highlighted other shortcomings of American society’s commitment to human rights.

---

Pacem in Terris and President Kennedy’s Commencement Address at American University are significant for providing a vision of peace not only by calling for a reduction of nuclear weapons as significant as that was, but also by making human rights the centerpiece of future peacemaking. The president’s address produced tangible results within a few months while Pacem in Terris clarified the transcendent nature of peace. The world in its fallen state will continually undermine true peace through political, military, religious and economic forces that have competing interests. The circumstance of our time includes the military-industrial state that has grown over many decades. Humanity has experienced arms proliferation in large part due to the military-industrial state which sells weapons on a global scale. Pope John’s sense of the state of the world made cooperation a priority among nations, and in Pacem in Terris he seeks to break down the boundaries separating humanity by addressing all people of goodwill without qualification.

President Kennedy expressed a vision of peace from the political view of the nation-state that was attempting to achieve the same objectives as the Church. A display of force goes hand in hand with being the leader of a nation, and President Kennedy faced in Nikita Khrushchev a political leader, who was prone to making statements that verged on ultimatums. Throughout the Cold War, testing boundaries was a key part of the tension that resulted. A show of force is predicated on the basis that you will use that force when necessary. We can expect the Church to develop its social teaching along the lines of nonviolence, but what of a nation such as the United States? Its leadership must reconcile the needs of the nation—and by extension the world—by following policies that preserve and promote peace.
The voices of Pope John and President Kennedy are those of public figures. They hold office at the highest levels of Church and State. Other voices of peace speak to us, and we may consider them to be public, but they do not hold such public office. These other voices inform us and indeed those who possess them carry out the work and mission of Catholic social justice. They are involved in the day-to-day mission of the Gospel, and with the vision of *Pacem in Terris*, they can bring credibility to the public square to remind future leaders of State that policy must not result in a more dangerous world.

The voice of Catholic social justice from American Catholics such as the late Thomas Merton and Dorothy Day or today John Dear, a Jesuit, who carries the message of non-violence with a very active voice, is needed to inform the American conscience. These voices are critical reminders that issues of social justice challenge society to produce leaders who measure up to firm moral standards and can lead with compassion and humanity. Such characteristics are important in leaders who must confront and create policy in a time when industry and national defense have merged into what we have come to call the military-industrial complex.


When the Son of Man comes in his glory, and all the angels with him, he will sit upon his glorious throne, and all the nations will be assembled before him. And he will separate them one from another, as a shepherd separates the sheep from the goats. He will place the sheep on his right and the goats on his left.

Then the king will say to those on his right, 'Come, you who are blessed by my Father. Inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world.
For I was hungry and you gave me food, I was thirsty and you gave me drink, a stranger and you welcomed me, naked and you clothed me, ill and you cared for me, in prison and you visited me.'

Then the righteous will answer him and say, 'Lord, when did we see you hungry and feed you, or thirsty and give you drink?

When did we see you a stranger and welcome you, or naked and clothe you?

When did we see you ill or in prison, and visit you?'

And the king will say to them in reply, 'Amen, I say to you, whatever you did for one of these least brothers of mine, you did for me.'

Then he will say to those on his left, 'Depart from me, you accursed, into the eternal fire prepared for the devil and his angels.

For I was hungry and you gave me no food, I was thirsty and you gave me no drink, a stranger and you gave me no welcome, naked and you gave me no clothing, ill and in prison, and you did not care for me.'

Then they will answer and say, 'Lord, when did we see you hungry or thirsty or a stranger or naked or ill or in prison, and not minister to your needs?'

He will answer them, 'Amen, I say to you, what you did not do for one of these least ones, you did not do for me.'

And these will go off to eternal punishment, but the righteous to eternal life.\footnote{New American Bible, Catholic Book Publishing Co.: New York, 1992, 58. Also available at: http://www.usccb.org/nab/bible/matthew/matthew25.htm; Internet.}

This Gospel passage is our key social justice response to the military industrial complex.

It gives us the transcendent response to the imbalance we face today between security through arms or food. It forces us to contemplate about the foundation on which true security is built. How we allocate our financial resources says a lot about who we are. America is generous through the use of foreign aid (not to be confused with foreign military sales) and spending on social programs at home. However, the most vulnerable in our society are always at risk. Without the Gospel to guide us, we will go down a path where the least are at great risk of being forgotten. This will lead to an American society
that is ultimately less secure while an economy produces arms which take from the least of those among us.

The Documents

War and peace is punctuated by the mushroom cloud in the era we call the Nuclear Age. Nuclear war is the ultimate form of war, *the total face of war*, as President Kennedy described it.⁷ Despite the finality with which the mushroom cloud punctuates war, non-nuclear conflicts have been fought continuously since the end of the Second World War. As each year passes, the Cold War is receding further into history. The world of two super powers maintaining a balance for peace was complicated as each sought to undercut the other’s influence in the world. Decades after the advent of the nuclear bomb, it challenges who we are spiritually, and our Catholic theology is forced to come to grips with a world that is more interconnected and exposed to rapid change than the generations before it. Today we have entered an era where we are part of a world that previous generations could not imagine. Grounded in Scripture and tradition, our task is to demonstrate the relevance of the Gospel and its nonviolent message to our interconnected world.

The military-industrial complex has become a part of the corporate fabric of our society and drains dollars from those who have no voice. Defense work is spread across several states creating jobs that are tied to the life of a weapon system. It is difficult for Congress to eliminate jobs in the congressional district at home, making it all but impossible to end these defense programs. Multi-billion dollar weapon systems do

---

⁷President John F. Kennedy, *Commencement Address at American University* on June 10, 1963 (accessed on 10 January 2011); available from [http://www.jfklibrary.org/Historical+Resources/Archives/Reference+Desk/Speeches/JFK/003POF03AmericanUniversity06101963.htm](http://www.jfklibrary.org/Historical+Resources/Archives/Reference+Desk/Speeches/JFK/003POF03AmericanUniversity06101963.htm); Internet.
nothing to lift-up the marginalized in our society or promote a stable middle class. Our society has taken on the attributes of a permanent war economy as these programs become embedded in the domestic economy.

_Pacem in Terris_ expresses the core values of peace and human rights that clearly mark Catholic social teaching and brings these ideas to the forefront of the Church in the nuclear age. President Kennedy’s _Commencement Address at American University_, delivered two months after the release of the encyclical advocated a policy of détente as part of American foreign policy. The voice of President Kennedy with his inflective and dramatic oratory skills gives peace a voice of urgency underscoring the teaching of _Pacem in Terris_. It is about six pages compared to the thirty-five or so pages of the encyclical, but those six pages when spoken project the ideas of peace in very eloquent words. The confluence of events that moved Church and State to appeal for peace were influenced by major events of the time such as the missiles of October, and the Berlin Crisis, as well as completing the Limited Nuclear Test Ban Treaty.\(^8\)

Transcendent peace is not possible without the Creator, and without the Gospel, words of peace are futile in this imperfect world. The encyclical is clear that peace “can never be established, never guaranteed, except by the diligent observance of the divinely established order.”\(^9\) President Kennedy’s speech acknowledges the challenge of creating and maintaining peace as being pleasing to the Lord in making peace with our enemies.

All this is not unrelated to world peace. "When a man's ways please the Lord," the Scriptures tell us, "he maketh even his enemies to be at peace

---

\(^8\) The formal name of the treaty is the _Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and Under Water_ (accessed on 9 January 2011) available from http://www.state.gov/t/isn/4797.htm; Internet.

with him." And is not peace, in the last analysis, basically a matter of human rights--the right to live out our lives without fear of devastation--the right to breathe air as nature provided it--the right of future generations to a healthy existence?\textsuperscript{10}

President Kennedy may have maintained that his faith was private; but he was capable of focusing scripture on where it was needed most—world peace. President Kennedy reminded the world that in light of the nuclear threat we are all mortal. Peace came down to human rights—the right of humanity to live without fear and the right to breath air naturally, free of nuclear fallout, and the right of future generations was included showing that we have a responsibility to the stewardship of our planet for those yet to be born.

\textbf{Strategy for Peace}

President Kennedy’s speech is a political speech, yet it quotes scripture seeking to connect his Cold War policy to a higher calling. It is an American speech with a message that must reach an international audience with the same impact as with the domestic audience. President Kennedy had to connect with the average person on the issue of nuclear war and peace. He had to communicate its importance that it had to the average citizens’ daily life. A commencement address is an excellent venue for a speech on world peace. The audience is young and ready to accept the challenge being brought to them by President Kennedy. The language of the speech delivered not just memorable phrases, but also announced the establishment of a hot line between Moscow and Washington, as well as raised hopes that a partial test ban treaty would be completed later that same year. The speech is eloquent in its statements seeking to uplift the audience out

\textsuperscript{10} President John F. Kennedy, \textit{Commencement Address at American University} on June 10, 1963 (accessed on 10 January 2011), available from http://www.jfklibrary.org/Historical+Resources/Archives/Reference+Desk/Speeches/JFK/003POF03AmericanUniversity06101963.htm; Internet.
of crisis and provide a vision of a world in which humanity could work together towards reducing tensions.

*Pacem in Terris* is a social justice document, and in 1963, the Church focused on the direction it sought in regard to its relation with the nations of the world in the latter half of the 20th century. The effort to highlight peace was further enhanced by the efforts put forth by the Second Vatican Council which had convened in October 1962, six months prior to the release of *Pacem in Terris*. It did not allow social justice or human rights to fade from the conscience of Catholics or people of goodwill. The crisis that preceded the year 1963 proved that this was not a time to pass on an opportunity to make a positive impact on the world.

With *Pacem in Terris* and the Second Vatican Council, Catholicism was emerging into participation in the full human community. This encyclical was a fitting climax to Pope John’s reign, offering a standard of human rights and world peace against which to measure the pastoral effectiveness of the changes initiated by the council. The standard of Catholic life itself could never again be simply the power and strength of the church, for the church itself would now be judged by the standards of truth, justice, charity, and freedom Pope John set forth.11

The church set forth its vision for social justice, and America had found its own breakthrough with President Kennedy’s *strategy for peace*. The speech spurred American policy in the direction towards détente. It laid out a way to think anew about the population literally on the other side of the wall. Even as church and state labored towards an understanding of what human rights meant in the nuclear age, it was not until 1990 that a *conventional* arms treaty was completed.12 The result came at the end of the

---

12 For a discussion of the Conventional Armed Forces in Europe Treaty (CFE) which was signed on 22 November 1990, see *Arms Control and Nonproliferation: A Catalog of Treaties and Agreements*,
Cold War with the signing of the Treaty on Conventional Forces in Europe. The decades after 1963 witnessed a stalemate that lasted until the 1990’s, and ushered in a decade that transitioned to the current time of new tension. Of grave concern in the Post-Cold War era is the spread of nuclear weapons beyond the nations of the Cold War.

*Pacem in Terris* and the *Commencement Address at American University* which are examined in the next two chapters provided the reader and listener a compass to navigate peace. These documents provide guidance to a world that grew apathetic about nuclear weapons and provide renewed emphasis on human rights. The renewal of focus on human rights and life in the nuclear age is critical for humanity which needed a reappraisal on the value of life after the millions who had died in the twentieth century’s wars. The public grew weary of being in a heightened state of anxiety, and the mood was characterized as such by the Kennedy Administration.

In May 1961, shortly before the Vienna summit conference, President Kennedy went on television to urge a national shelter program. A few weeks later, during a period of East-West confrontation over Berlin, Kennedy delivered an even more alarmist speech on the danger of nuclear war and the urgent necessity of civil-defense preparation. Responding to a deluge of panicky requests, the Administration hastily prepared a civil-defense booklet and distributed 35 million copies through school, post offices and newspaper supplements. The Cuban missile crises added a grim immediacy to these fears. For a few days in October 1962, Kennedy’s warnings seemed about to become reality.\(^\text{13}\)

The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientist article continued with a litany of the dangers of nuclear testing to the general public. While the dangers of a direct nuclear attack may

---

\(^{13}\) Bulletin of the Atomic Scientist, August/September 1984. *From activism to apathy: America and the nuclear issue, 1963-1980,* (accessed on December 15, 2010); available from http://web.ebscohost.com.libproxy.udayton.edu/ehost/detail?hid=119&sid=2e42af48-cdd4-423b-b320-8f22b39756e3%40sessionmgr113&vid=3&bdata=JnNpdGU9UGFzaWQ%3ddWlkTWF4eXN0cml0b3I9NzA0MjMxNzI3ODM5NTU1NzUzOTUwMDUxOTM%3d#db=a9h&AN=11077806; Internet.
have seemed abstract, the unseen danger of radioactivity was a very real concern to public safety. The dangers of nuclear testing grew in the coming years.

Further, these were years shadowed by fears of nuclear testing. The first hydrogen-bomb test in 1952 produced unexpectedly high radiation levels. The 1954 test series spread radioactive ash over 7,000 square miles of the Pacific and brought illness and death to Japanese fisherman 80 miles away. Soviet hydrogen bomb tests, begun in 1954 and continued through the decade, further contaminated the atmosphere. In 1955, radioactive rain fell on Chicago. In 1959, deadly strontium-90 began to show up in milk. A two-part Saturday Evening Post feature that year was titled “Fallout: The Silent Killer.” Linus Pauling, Barry Commoner and other scientists warned of leukemia, bone cancer and long term genetic damage from nuclear testing. A full-blown scare gripped the nation.14

One other sign that we had moved into a new era, and one that points to the message of Pacem in Terris, is the level of involvement of scientists and technical experts in political discourse.15

Both Pacem in Terris and the Commencement Address at American University contributed to changing this world that had come to fruition by the late 1950s and early 1960s. The public was aware of the collateral danger that the nuclear age presented without one shot being fired or one missile launched. Arms control negotiations during the late 1950’s revolved around technical issues that laid the foundation for the first limited test ban treaty and made it possible for the approach to peace taken by Pope John and President Kennedy. For years technical experts debated and negotiated on how to best monitor compliance with a treaty. While nations tested above ground, nations could

---


monitor the size of the test. Once nuclear testing was confined underground, nations would have more difficulty monitoring the compliance with a limited test ban treaty. Uncertainty among technical experts over how to monitor compliance was a factor for both sides in treaty negotiations, and this is a key reason underground testing was left to a future round of talks.

Without the message of the Gospel and encyclicals such as *Pacem in Terris* the world is at risk of becoming desensitized in its approach to nuclear weapons. Humanity can quickly become overwhelmed by the role science and technology now plays in our lives. Scientists and their expertise are critical to establishing compliance with arms treaties. The very scientists involved in research and development of nuclear weapons are many times the same ones working towards monitoring and control of the very weapons they create. The development of the atomic bomb did not end with the first generation of bombs—those which were dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Research into fission bombs was ongoing, research and development had already begun on the next level of nuclear weapons—the hydrogen bomb.⁶

Even before the end of the Second World War, the scientists in the Anglo-American program had begun investigating the development of thermonuclear weapons as well as fission bombs. Bombs that fused hydrogen to helium, releasing nuclear energy, would be orders of magnitude more destructive even than fission weapons, their fireballs measured in miles rather than feet, their yields measured in megatons (millions of tons of TNT equivalent). The United States tested its first thermonuclear device—a bulky two-story experimental unit named Mike—in November 1952. It yielded 10.5 megatons (seven hundred Hiroshimas). A first Soviet thermonuclear test of a yield-limited but deliverable weapon (four hundred kilotons) followed in August 1953, and of a so-called true thermonuclear—a 1.5 megaton two-stage design like Mike of potentially unlimited yield—in November 1955. Britain tested a thermonuclear

---

⁶ The first man-made nuclear explosion occurred at Trinity, New Mexico, 05:29:45 hours on July 16, 1945.
weapon in November 1957, China in June 1967, and France in August 1968.\(^\text{17}\)

Fallout—radiation released into the atmosphere from atmospheric nuclear testing—gives the nuclear age an immediate tangible threat to the average citizen everywhere. The threat to use nuclear weapons is always there, and there is a risk that nuclear weapons become abstract and seems less a threat. The average citizen cannot be 100% sure that the national leadership will not use nuclear weapons or that any system is failsafe.

Human rights defined at the national level as civil rights are only as secure as the government that citizens elected to serve them. Human Rights must be balanced against the needs of the state. The state in the early twenty-first century must balance protection of the citizens’ rights domestically with what we know as homeland security. A growing national-security state coupled with the military-industrial complex will only continue to consume the nation’s wealth. When a nation sees military might as defining its greatness, and other cultural aspects are not seen as contributing to its identity or security, choosing between domestic and military spending may even call into question a citizen’s patriotism.

\textit{Pacem in Terris} and the \textit{Commencement Address at American University} take us beyond blind patriotism which leads to nationalism. \textit{Pacem in Terris} owes no allegiance to any ideology. President Kennedy found a counterpart in Pope John, as he spoke of the Soviet Union as people and not just a faceless monolithic threat. The ability to see the

other as a part of humanity challenges the military-industrial complex. This alone should help nations examine the resources it requires to feed this complex. The inability of the Soviet Union to match arms spending with the West is one reason for its ultimate economic collapse. The end of the Cold War was seen as an arms race where the Soviet Union literally ran out of money.\footnote{Carey Goldberg, \textit{Soviet State Bank is Broke, Chairman Says}, \textit{The Los Angeles Times}, (accessed on September 8, 2011), available from \url{http://articles.latimes.com/1991-11-30/news/mn-97_1_central-state-bank}; Internet.}

**Leaders of Peace: Pope John XXIII and President John F. Kennedy**

The men who wrote \textit{Pacem in Terris} and the \textit{Commencement Address at American University} came from very different backgrounds. Pope John XXIII was born Angelo Giuseppe Roncalli on November 25, 1881 at Sotto il Monte, Italy. His parents were peasant sharecroppers. It was estimated that there were up to thirty-two extended family members living under one roof. The future pope later remembered that they were too poor to have bread as part of the family’s daily diet. His great-uncle as head of the household had a profound influence on his spiritual development, and the family made sacrifices to send Angelo to seminary. His studies were a sacrifice for the family and also meant that there was one less hand for the family to earn a living wage.\footnote{Patricia Treece, \textit{Meet John XXIII, Joyful Pope and Father to All}, (Cincinnati: Servant Books, 2008), 2.} He was admitted to the Secular Franciscan Order and made a profession of its Rule of life on May 23, 1897. He was ordained a priest on August 10, 1904. His first duty was as secretary to the Bishop of Bergamo. He was drafted to serve as a sergeant in the medical corps during World War I. After the war he served as spiritual director of the seminary in the early 1920s before being called to Rome by Pope Benedict XV to be the Italian president of the society for the Propagation of the Faith. In 1925 he began his diplomatic
career by being named Apostolic Visitator in Bulgaria, as part of the episcopate with the titular Diocese of Areopolis. For his episcopal motto he chose Oboedientia et Pax, which as the Vatican biography notes became his guiding motto for the rest of his life.

Pope John’s diplomatic career gave him political experience. He developed diplomatic skills in his career when in addition to being appointed Apostolic Delegate to Bulgaria, he moved on in 1935 to Turkey and Greece. He was appointed by Pius XII to be Nuncio in France in 1944. His main duties included visiting Catholic communities and establishing relationships with other Christian communities. He reached out to communities in need after the 1928 earthquake in Bulgaria. The Vatican biography on him states that, “He endured in silence the misunderstandings and other difficulties of a ministry on the fringes of society, and thus refined his sense of trust and abandonment to Jesus crucified.” The Vatican biography on Pope John further describes his diplomatic career.

In 1935 he was named Apostolic Delegate in Turkey and Greece. The Catholic Church was present in many ways in the young Turkish republic. His ministry among the Catholics was intense, and his respectful approach and dialogue with the worlds of Orthodoxy and Islam became a feature of his tenure. When the Second World War broke out he was in Greece. He tried to get news from the prisoners of war to their families and assisted many Jews to escape by issuing "transit visas" from the Apostolic Delegation. In December 1944 Pius XII appointed him Nuncio in France.  

During his time as Nuncio the Vatican states from the same biography that, “he aided prisoners of war and helped to normalize the ecclesiastical organization of France…His approach was always characterized by a striving for Gospel simplicity, even among the most complex diplomatic questions.”

---

As a diplomat in Bulgaria, Greece and Turkey, Pope John encountered the tensions inherent in this region where east meets west. He was a part of the Apostolic Delegation in Istanbul—this at a time when Turkey was a nation just emerging from the remnants of the Ottoman Empire. Turkey was also emerging as a secular state with Islam as a basis for its civil law. Greece during this period was occupied by Germany during World War II and was gripped by political unrest between contesting political factions. Greece and Turkey also had ongoing boundary disputes over islands in the Aegean Sea.

In *Journal of a Soul*, Pope John commented on the situation in which he worked:

> My work in Turkey is not easy, but it is coming along well and gives me great consolation. I see the charity of the Lord here, and the clergy united among themselves and with their humble pastor. The political situation does not allow me to do much, but it seems to me there is something gained if at least I do not worsen it through my own fault. My mission in Greece, on the other hand, is so full of vexations! For this very reason I love it even more and intend to go on working there with heart and soul, forcing myself to overcome all my repugnance. For me it is an order: therefore it requires obedience.\(^{21}\)

He served as Nuncio to France from 1944 to 1953. It was in 1953 that he was appointed as Patriarch of Venice where he served until elected to the papacy on October 28, 1958 succeeding Pope Pius XII. In an unpublished address in 1953 Pope John summed up the role of Vatican diplomacy.

> The goal of Vatican diplomacy is the kingdom of Jesus Christ, that is, his doctrine, and the world recreated as he wished it. It implies therefore the pursuit of the loftiest ideals which embraces true interests, including those of the temporal sphere, of nations and communities of people. Its methods of work are unconfined because Vatican diplomacy collaborates directly with the priestly and pastoral activity of the Church. The Church has both a body and a soul; but it is through the soul that she works more

---

 profoundly than is apparent, and it is thus that she pursues the perfection that is her own, in the spirit of the Gospel and in the ages yet to come.\textsuperscript{22}

Pope John’s life prepared him for the duties of the papacy. Having traveled throughout the Middle East and experiencing firsthand the delicate balance of power between Greece and Turkey he brought his knowledge of war and peace to the world and gave it a definitive statement in \textit{Pacem in Terris}.

Pope John XXIII prior to becoming pope, who as a diplomat, had little time to be a parish priest, was about to become a shepherd to the world. Pope John does not call the faithful to arms as a commander-in-chief does; his job is to be shepherd of a flock. He had a diplomatic background which made him ideal to lead the Church and preach the Gospel to the world. His personal motto \textit{Obedience and Peace} served him well in this capacity. As the Vicar of Christ, Pope John was a man of peace and represented the very highest of Christian principles. His faith was naturally public. Pope John was to some extent above the political fray in secular politics. As head of state for the Vatican City State and the Vicar of Christ he led in both political and religious realms.

President Kennedy lived a life that had its share of privileges. He was born on May 25, 1917 in Brookline, Massachusetts into new wealth. He was raised in the environment of a family that sought to make its mark in the world of power and privilege. Kennedy had an upper class life with access to the best education and the ability to move through a life that gave him access to a career of public service. President Kennedy lived and worked in the political world and to advance his career he famously declared his faith a private matter. He experienced war first hand through service in the navy. He had

fourteen years of legislative experience as a Massachusetts congressman serving as congressman from the 11th congressional district from 1947 until he won election as senator in 1952.

President Kennedy spoke of peace at the beginning of his political career. His view was significant from a political viewpoint as it proposed that we see our enemy as ourselves.

Preventing another war became John Kennedy’s main motivation for entering politics after the Second World War. When he announced his candidacy for Congress on April 22, 1946, in Boston, Kennedy sounded more like he was running for president on a peace ticket than for a first term as a Democratic member of Congress from Massachusetts: “What we do now will shape the history of civilization for many years to come. We have a weary world trying to bind the wounds of a fierce struggle. That is dire enough. What is infinitely far worse is that we have a world which has unleashed the terrible powers of atomic energy. We have a world capable of destroying itself. The days which lie ahead are most difficult ones. Above all, day and night, with every ounce of ingenuity and industry we possess, we must work for peace. We must not have another war.”

Preventing war appears to be a motivation that shaped Kennedy’s view of peace. He returned to the theme of peace throughout his political career. His approach to peace was contradictory to many—not the least those who lean toward a view of non-violence. Kennedy was known as a cold warrior—hardly the image of peace.

The president in the role of commander-in-chief can strike at a nation with military force. This option will cause property damage and loss of life, and the United States has traditionally reserved such force as retaliation for force used against its interests. As the 1960 election approached, the issue of a missile gap between the United

---

States and the Soviet Union became a major campaign issue. In a 1960 speech, then
Senator Kennedy called for a nuclear capability that was “second to none.”

We must make invulnerable a nuclear retaliatory power second to none -
by making possible now a stop-gap air alert and base dispersal program -
and by stepping up our development and production of the ultimate
missiles that can close the gap and will not be wiped out in a surprise
attack - Polaris, Minuteman, and long-range air-to-ground missiles -
meanwhile increasing our production of Atlas missiles, hardening our
bases and improving our continental defense and warning systems. As a
power which will never strike first, we require a retaliatory capacity based
on hidden, moving or invulnerable weapons in such force as to deter any
aggressor from threatening an attack he knows could not destroy enough
of our force to prevent his own destruction. And we must also critically re-
examine the far-flung overseas base structure on which much of our
present retaliatory strength is based. We must contribute to the political
and economic stability of the nations in which our vital bases are located -
and develop alternative plans for positions which may become
untenable.24

As a secular leader President Kennedy came in direct conflict with forces that
challenged his view of peace. He was also a leader who was defined as a cold warrior.
As his campaign statement shows he was not going to lead from a position of weakness.
President Kennedy was forty-three at the time of his election, and by contrast to his
predecessor was viewed as young and inexperienced. General Dwight Eisenhower was
seventy, a five-star general and at the pinnacle of his military career became president in
1953. President Eisenhower graduated from West Point in 1915, two years before
President Kennedy was born. President Kennedy may have been viewed as untested but
he showed that he had vision. In his Commencement Address at American University, he
articulated a policy that became known as détente. By articulating a vision of peace that

24 John F. Kennedy, Remarks of Senator John F. Kennedy in the Senate, June 14, 1960, (accessed
on 7 January 2011); available from
http://www.jfklibrary.org/Historical+Resources/Archives/Reference+Desk/Speeches/JFK/JFK+Pre-
Pres/1960/002PREPRES12SPEECHES_60JUN14.htm; Internet.
appealed to national and international concerns, Kennedy hoped to find a way to move beyond the Cold War and with it the need for nuclear arms.

President Kennedy translated his political words into action with the Partial Test Ban Treaty, and the long path to détente began with the commencement address. The visions of Pope John and President Kennedy are a vision of peace that transcended their time. The message of 1963 was one that called for a new way of thinking about the problems confronting humanity. In the *Commencement Address at American University* President Kennedy called on humanity to solve its problems. Humanity created its problems and it is humanity’s responsibility to solve them.

Our problems are manmade—therefore, they can be solved by man. And man can be as big as he wants. No problem of human destiny is beyond human beings. Man's reason and spirit have often solved the seemingly unsolvable--and we believe they can do it again.

The violence and open-ended commitments to war in the twenty-first century demonstrate that the message of peace in 1963 is in need of renewal.

President Kennedy spoke of peace not being static and that it must be renewed by each generation. The issue of nuclear war in 1963 just as today concerns regulating nuclear weapons, testing, and proliferation. Once a country possesses the nuclear weapons it needs to create a stockpile that it deems sufficient for its security. The larger the nuclear club the less control there is over nuclear weapons. Dialogue between the United States and the Soviet Union was only a first step.

---

25 President John F. Kennedy, *Commencement Address at American University* on June 10, 1963 (accessed on 10 January 2011); available from http://www.jfklibrary.org/Historical+Resources/Archives/Reference+Desk/Speeches/JFK/003POF03AmericanUniversity06101963.htm; Internet.

26 President John F. Kennedy, *Commencement Address at American University* on June 10, 1963 (accessed on 10 January 2011); available from http://www.jfklibrary.org/Historical+Resources/Archives/Reference+Desk/Speeches/JFK/003POF03AmericanUniversity06101963.htm; Internet.
One year after the Limited Test Ban Treaty went into effect in October 1963, China conducted its first atmospheric test of a nuclear weapon on October 16, 1964.

After China, India would follow in 1974, and Pakistan in 1998. Israel is an undeclared nuclear power, perhaps acquiring it in the late 1970s. South Africa halted its program in 1989 and dismantled all devices and production by 1991. North Korea tested a weapon in 2006, and the world now waits to see which path a nuclear Iran might take. In the decades since, the world has grown more dangerous as nuclear technology has spread beyond the first nations to possess nuclear weapons.

How each nation perceives its security needs will determine the progress humanity will make necessary for securing human rights. Pope John and President Kennedy both linked the search for long-term peace to the dignity of humanity. *Pacem in Terris* defined for the Church and the world a view of peace linked to human rights. President Kennedy’s speech while not at the same depth as an encyclical certainly gave voice to the principle idea in *Pacem in Terris* of the importance of relating to human rights. America is uniquely defined by peoples of many backgrounds and cultures and in 1963 those who were not in the majority were pushing America to live up to her promise. June 1963 is noted not only for the *Commencement Address at American University*, but also President Kennedy’s *Radio and Television Report to the American People on Civil Rights*.

President Kennedy’s address was a major policy speech regarding the inequalities which plagued Americans whose dignity was not protected. The ability to lead in regard to human rights begins at home. The United States must signal to the world that it is lifting up its citizens, particularly those who were denied full equality in their own
country. The issue of civil rights gives us an insight to how President Kennedy sought to create and implement law that would respect the dignity and protect the rights of all Americans. On the tenth and eleventh of June, President Kennedy led the world by words and action. He demonstrated clearly to the world that national security comes not from bombs but from each citizen having the rights as their neighbor to live in equality.

**President Kennedy Responds to Civil Rights**

Peace involves the protection of human rights. President Kennedy stated in his *Commencement Address at American University* that peace is after all a matter of human rights. Human rights are universal natural rights, whereas civil rights are those rights that are protected by law. Unless a nation truly recognizes human rights, its ability to create an equal and just society through civil rights will be lost. The *Commencement Address at American University* linked freedom, peace and human rights. Speaking directly about our own cities, President Kennedy stated: “The peace is not secure because the freedom is incomplete.”

He challenged America to look inward to secure peace. If progress was made on the issues as critical as the *Limited Test Ban Treaty 1963*, then progress on peace internal to American society had to be made simultaneously.

The quality and spirit of our own society must justify and support our efforts abroad. We must show it in the dedication of our own lives... we must all, in our daily lives, live up to the age-old faith that peace and freedom walk together. In too many of our cities today, the peace is not secure because the freedom is incomplete.

President Kennedy confronted the incomplete freedom in the United States the day after the *Commencement Address at American University*. On June 11, 1963, in a

---


televised speech, JFK addressed the nation on civil rights. This speech is as notable as the *Commencement Address at American University* as it puts Kennedy on record.

In 1953 John Kennedy was mildly and quietly in favor of civil rights legislation as a political necessity consistent with his moral instincts. In 1963 he was deeply and fervently committed to the cause of human rights as a moral necessity inconsistent with his political instincts... In 1963 the Negro revolution in America rose more rapidly than ever before. John Kennedy did not start that revolution and nothing he could have done could have stopped it. But in 1963 he befriended and articulated its high aspirations, and helped guide its torrential currents.29

The *Address on Civil Rights* complements President Kennedy’s speech of the day before. It was in part a response to the opposition of Governor George Wallace of Alabama (standing in the doorway) to allow two African-Americans for admission to the University of Alabama. Civil rights as an unresolved inequality in American society begged for resolution. President Kennedy was considered to be cautious in his approach and his speech on civil rights finally laid out his legislative goals for civil and voting rights.

This is not a sectional issue. Difficulties over segregation and discrimination exist in every city, in every State of the Union, producing in many cities a rising tide of discontent that threatens the public safety. Nor is this a partisan issue. In a time of domestic crisis men of good will and generosity should be able to unite regardless of party or politics. This is not even a legal or legislative issue alone. It is better to settle these matters in the courts than on the streets, and new laws are needed at every level, but law alone cannot make men see right. We are confronted primarily with a moral issue. It is as old as the scriptures and is as clear as the American Constitution.30

President Kennedy’ speeches of June 10th and 11th are critical for staking his claim to the moral high ground on the international and domestic issues facing America. President Kennedy tackled civil rights with the same urgency that he displayed pursuing

---

the *Limited Test Ban Treaty*. With these speeches the credibility of the United States in the civil rights struggle of the 1960’s was equated to peace at home and abroad.

For President Kennedy June 1963 represents a turning point in his resolve by framing issues of peace and human rights in moral terms and brings the weight of his office to the creation of law that will lay the foundation for equality among all Americans. President Kennedy framed the issue of civil rights as a moral issue and reminded Americans that we preached freedom around the world and asked what are we to say to the world if we tolerate the existence of second class citizens in our own country.

We preach freedom around the world, and we mean it, and we cherish our freedom here at home, but are we to say to the world, and much more importantly, to each other that this is a land of the free except for the Negroes; that we have no second-class citizens except Negroes; that we have no class or cast system, no ghettoes, no master race except with respect to Negroes?\(^{31}\)

The fires of frustration and discord are burning in every city, North and South, where legal remedies are not at hand. Redress is sought in the streets, in demonstrations, parades, and protests which create tensions and threaten violence and threaten lives.

We face, therefore, a moral crisis as a country and as a people. It cannot be met by repressive police action. It cannot be left to increased demonstrations in the streets. It cannot be quieted by token moves or talk. It is a time to act in the Congress, in your State and local legislative body and, above all, in all of our daily lives.\(^{32}\)

The *Partial Test Ban Treaty* reached final ratification before coming into force in October. At the same time Congress began hearings in the summer on what would become the *Civil Rights Act of 1964*. These two issues had proven that President

---


Kennedy was rising to the level of an American statesman. In his campaign for the presidency in 1960, Kennedy had to give assurances to how he would approach the office and how his Catholic values would influence him as president.

**President Kennedy’s Statements on His Faith**

The *Commencement Address to American University* is but a few words—critical words for peace—and reflect a maturing President Kennedy. The full impact of these words becomes clear when the language of President Kennedy is examined from his campaign in 1960 throughout 1963. President Kennedy walked a fine line to the presidency regarding his Catholic faith. As a senator, Kennedy laid out his position regarding the public good and conscience in a speech that used Senator John Quincy Adams (1767-1848) as an example of putting the national interest above local interest. By supporting a bill embargoing British goods in retaliation for seizing American ships and sailors, Senator Adams supported a measure that could cripple his state of Massachusetts. Senator Kennedy laid out his position five years before running for president on his approach to faith in public life.

In November 1955, he addressed a Protestant dinner gathering at the North Shore United Church Canvass in which he challenged the notion that the separation of church and state meant that religiously motivated people must shun the public realm. He noted the crucial role that religion played in the work of the founders and concluded that their religious beliefs clearly affected their attitudes toward government…Kennedy advanced an argument that would serve him well in the next five years against many of his Protestant opponents: A commitment to a specific faith tradition empowered a politician to pursue the common good of the society and not simply the private interests of that specific tradition. In fact, he argued, adherence to the high principles of a tradition make it possible for a politician to transcend parochial interest.33

---

On September 12, 1960, then Senator Kennedy addressed the Houston Ministers Conference and declared that his faith was a private matter. The speech, which has been used to either criticize or explain the separation of faith from public service, contained a statement on how Kennedy would act should he achieve the presidency. In it, Kennedy invoked the founding fathers and the Alamo. Kennedy stated he would act upon the dictates of his conscience which is a core value in Catholic doctrine. In the part of the speech that I quote below it is the statement, “I do not speak for my church on public matters—and the church does not speak for me” that gets the most attention. To get a fuller understanding of how Kennedy viewed his role in public office, the words just after his quote of the church does not speak for him must be read in context.

But let me stress again that these are my views--for contrary to common newspaper usage, I am not the Catholic candidate for President. I am the Democratic Party's candidate for President who happens also to be a Catholic.

I do not speak for my church on public matters--and the church does not speak for me.

Whatever issue may come before me as President--on birth control, divorce, censorship, gambling or any other subject--I will make my decision in accordance with these views, in accordance with what my conscience tells me to be the national interest, and without regard to outside religious pressures or dictates. And no power or threat of punishment could cause me to decide otherwise.

But if the time should ever come--and I do not concede any conflict to be even remotely possible--when my office would require me to either violate my conscience or violate the national interest, then I would resign the office; and I hope any conscientious public servant would do the same.

But I do not intend to apologize for these views to my critics of either Catholic or Protestant faith—nor do I intend to disavow either my views or my church in order to win this election.34

---

The statement subsequently has been used by Catholic political candidates as they explain their views on a variety of social issues. The address is much more than one sentence or phrase, as Kennedy gave a very detailed statement of what he believed as an American Catholic. He made a necessary statement at the time—the 1960 presidential campaign—to assure the country that he was an American whose loyalty need not be questioned. As a candidate, Kennedy stressed that he would not disavow his church and that he would follow the dictates of his conscience.

Within the next six months, President Kennedy would deliver an unforgettable inaugural address, followed a few weeks later by a speech that was delivered to an audience that included Dr. Billy Graham. As president, Kennedy would often invoke scripture. Examples of referring to God and the Word of God occur right at the beginning—in his inaugural address—right after “swearing the oath prescribed by the United States Constitution before God.”

The world is very different now. For man holds in his mortal hands the power to abolish all forms of human poverty and all forms of human life. And yet, the same revolutionary beliefs for which our forebears fought are still at issue around the globe—the belief that the rights of man come not from the generosity of the state but from the hand of God.\(^{35}\)

This is the second paragraph of the inaugural address. President Kennedy immediately makes the connection to human rights and the nuclear threat in a world that has changed. The world may have changed but beliefs that set humanity apart have not—and these beliefs—the rights of man—are transcendent.

Just a few weeks later, President Kennedy spoke at the Dedication Breakfast of International Christian Leadership, Inc. at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington, D. C. It

is now known as the National Day of Prayer Breakfast. This is a nondenominational group of laity and is now known as the Fellowship Foundation. This group has sponsored the National Day of Prayer since 1953, and every president has addressed it at least once. The forum offers the president a chance to speak on topics of a religious nature. President Kennedy, in office just twenty-one days, delivered this statement as part of his address.

But we need also to call upon our great reservoir of spiritual resources. We must recognize that human collaboration is not enough, that in times such as these we must reach beyond ourselves if we are to seek ultimate courage and infinite wisdom. It is an ironic fact that in this nuclear age, when the horizon of human knowledge and human experience has passed far beyond any that any age has ever known, that we turn back at this time to the oldest source of wisdom and strength, to the words of the prophets and the saints, who tell us that faith is more powerful than doubt, that hope is more potent than despair, and that only through 'the love that is sometimes called charity can we conquer those forces within ourselves and throughout all the world that threaten the very existence of mankind.

In his 1962 State of the Union message President Kennedy detailed what he set out to accomplish in his pursuit of peace stating that, “So long as fanaticism and fear brood over the affairs of men, we must arm to deter others from aggression.”

Negotiating or confronting an adversary from a position of strength is necessary in a world of nation-states. The Kennedy administration’s first defense budget increased spending by 15 percent over the previous defense budget. Once again, the debate is open as to the necessity of such spending. In the world of the nation-state, a leader cannot negotiate unless the other side is convinced that it is in their best interest to come to the

---

table. President Kennedy knew that he must negotiate from a position of strength, and that meant a defense budget that was increased during the Kennedy Administration. As a Catholic his position on defense policy would probably not differ from any other president.

Most presidents do not want to be seen as weak especially when it is in regard to national security. Perhaps his perceived youth may account for the increase in defense spending. Youth and the imperfect ability of intelligence to predict exactly how much of a gap existed between the Soviet Union at this time drove Kennedy to insure that he did indeed negotiate from a position of strength. He viewed the world as a dangerous place and one in which perceived weakness would itself become a threat to national survival.

Finally, to those nations who would make themselves our adversary, we offer not a pledge but a request: that both sides begin anew the quest for peace, before the dark powers of destruction unleashed by science engulf all humanity in planned or accidental self-destruction.

We dare not tempt them with weakness. For only when our arms are sufficient beyond doubt can we be certain beyond doubt that they will never be employed.  

President Kennedy as a cold warrior did not necessarily turn toward peace, but peace was his ultimate goal.

President Kennedy’s speeches are a good indicator as to how seriously he took his role in peace. Theodore Sorensen had worked for President Kennedy since 1953 starting as a legislative aid and remained as an advisor and speech writer until the end of President Kennedy’s life. In his memoirs, Sorensen commented on President Kennedy’s use of Scripture and references to God in his memoirs.

---

He routinely salted his speeches with references to God, as my father had done; but this was, I believe, for both of them more a matter of political convention than religiosity. In his inaugural address, he limited his references to God to three, one in a customary opening, one regarding the true source of human rights, and one to close. Noting these and other religious references, Arthur Schlesinger asked my brother Tom: “If you Sorensens are Unitarians, what are all these quotations from the Bible doing in speech drafts?” It is true that biblical quotations appeared throughout many of his speeches and my drafts. He and I may each have interpreted them in different ways, in our own minds giving a different power to those passages, while also satisfying his diverse audiences who also differed in their interpretation of Scripture and their individual concepts of the divine.  

President Kennedy, as almost any president, wanted to be known for promoting and keeping the peace. The position of strength for which President Kennedy strove to govern from included not just military but moral strength as well. He used scripture references to remind his audience of that there was a moral underpinning to his policies. In prepared remarks that were to be delivered at the Trade-Mart in Dallas on November 22, 1963, President Kennedy was to close with the following words.

We in this country, in this generation, are—by destiny rather than choice—the watchmen on the walls of world freedom. We ask, therefore, that we may be worthy of our power and responsibility, that we may exercise our strength with wisdom and restraint, and that we may achieve in our time and for all time the ancient vision of "peace on earth, good will toward men." That must always be our goal, and the righteousness of our cause must always underlie our strength. For as was written long ago: "except the Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain."

His closing words ironically enough about peace and the scripture to close his remarks is from Psalms 127:1. As president he had to make policy concerning national

---

security. There is no way of getting around the reality of the geopolitical world in which he lived. As a statesman he brought the language of his faith into view. By doing so he gave hope that peace could be achieved as he also was to close with words that echoed *Pacem in Terris* “peace on earth, good will toward men.”

We will probably never know if the words chosen that day were meant to echo Pope John with the opening words of *Pacem in Terris* directly. In the final words of that undelivered speech he made “peace on earth, goodwill toward men” America’s goal, righteousness as her cause always under lied by strength. President Kennedy viewed America as exercising its role in the world by destiny rather than choice. The responsibilities of the president increased with America’s role in the post-war world. President Kennedy and Pope John were two leaders who approached peace from the state and ecclesial and helped keep the world on a path eventually allowed one chapter in world history that of the Cold War to end peacefully. Pope John’s vision of peace it seems was to be backed up by a president who meant to use America’s power for advancing peace in the world.
CHAPTER II

PACEM IN TERRIS DEFINES PEACE IN THE NUCLEAR AGE

Introduction

Pope John XXIII began his papacy on October 28, 1958, and he continued his predecessor Pope Pius XII’s constant call for peace made during his nineteen year reign from March 2, 1939 to October 9, 1958. His first Christmas message broadcast on December 23, 1958 recalled the nineteen Christmas messages of Pius XII and his call for peace. Pope John XXIII saw his papacy as building on the legacy of Pius XII who faced world war. Pope Pius faced the most destructive war known to humanity; for Pope John the call of Peace on Earth was even more urgent in the face of a terrifying world of nuclear arms and tensions between nations in an ever shrinking world.

Pope John’s quest for peace did not start with Pacem in Terris. He referred constantly to peace in many of his addresses during his papacy. Examples prior to the pronouncement of the encyclical are his Christmas messages and especially his radio address on October 25, 1962, during the Cuban missile crisis. In his Christmas message delivered on December 23, 1959, Pope John stated:
From the Second World War right up to this present time, what a variety of utterance; what an abuse of this sacred word: “Peace, Peace.” [Jeremiah, vi, 14.] We pay homage to the goodwill of many guides and proclaimers of peace in the world; statesmen, experienced diplomats, influential writers. But human efforts in the matter of universal peacemaking are still far from the point where heaven and earth meet. The fact is that true peace cannot come save from God.  

The next year in his Christmas message of December 22, 1960, he continued the same theme.

During the year of 1960, events were not encouraging. France became the fourth nuclear power, and arms talks in Geneva began. The Paris summit between Eisenhower, Macmillan and Khrushchev collapsed due in part to the U-2 reconnaissance plane shot down over the Soviet Union a month earlier. In light of these events the pope’s 1960 Christmas message stated:

The ever more grave news of the storms which rage over some parts of the world, and threaten not only the social order, but more important, many souls which are weak and unstable rather than of ill will or wicked, moves us in this Christmas appeal to a direct word to those who have the highest responsibilities in the public and social sphere, and to invite them, in the name of Christ, to place their hand on their breast and act honorably in these days of general danger. In reality, there is matter of common interest; and every distinction between the great ones and the little in life should be resolved in a united effort in common.

Pope John XXIII consistently weaved the theme of world peace in his Christmas messages and homilies, seeking to be more than just a figure head confined to the Vatican.

---


Pacem in Terris put the Church at the forefront of human rights and helped shaped Catholic social teaching as we know it today. Pope John XXIII defines the starting point for peace as order in the universe and the rights that derive from natural law. From order in the universe flows natural law, truth, justice and love—order in the universe defines the basis of what is necessary for peace.

Pacem in Terris was written as a response to the tensions of the early 1960’s. Events culminating in the Cuban Missile Crisis compelled Pope John XXIII to write Pacem in Terris. Today the missile crisis of October 1962 still stands as a benchmark for how close the world came to nuclear war. The world was vulnerable to missteps that could have sparked war between the United States and the Soviet Union. Pacem in Terris is an encyclical that has not become outdated or stale with the passage of time. The words of Pope John are just as relevant in the 21st century as humanity struggles with the challenges of human rights and containing or even eliminating the nuclear threat.

The Text of Pacem in Terris

Pacem in Terris is the definitive statement of the Church to the world that it would not be passive in the nuclear age; it would engage the world and provide leadership for social justice. This leadership comes from the Pope as he intended his encyclical to reach the world beyond the Catholic Church. The Latin text of Pacem in Terris is divided numerically into five parts. These five parts correspond to the English translation, however there is no subtitle associated with the parts as there is in the English translation. The paragraphs in the Latin translation are not numbered, but the
corresponding English paragraphs are numbered. The salutation which is the first paragraph for the first time addresses those not in the Church:

To Our Venerable Brethren the Patriarchs, Primates, Archbishops, Bishops, and all other Local Ordinaries who are at Peace and in Communion with the Apostolic See, and to the Clergy and Faithful of the entire Catholic World, and to all Men of Good Will (emphasis added).

It is followed by a direct appeal to peace:

Peace on Earth—which man throughout the ages has so longed for and sought after—can never be established, never guaranteed, except by the diligent observance of the divinely established order.

The introduction of Pacem in Terris, which is comprised of paragraphs two through seven, begins with Order in the Universe and Order in Human Beings. The foundation of order is a direct result of God bringing forth creation and that, “the progress of scientific knowledge and the inventions of technology is the infinite greatness of God Himself, who created both man and the universe.” In paragraph three, Pacem in Terris underscores the incredible responsibility of humanity, reminding it that it has dominion over its affairs. The encyclical quotes Psalm 8:5-6 which praises the God the creator and the role of humanity in creation:

"Thou hast made him a little less than the angels: thou hast crowned him with glory and honor, and hast set him over the works of thy hands. Thou hast subjected all things under his feet."

Humanity has dominion over the earth and has great responsibility towards creation. To better understand how Pacem in Terris defines humanity’s role in peace, I

44 The Latin Translation is also found on the Vatican website at http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_xxiii/encyclicals/documents/hf_jxxiii_enc_11041963_pacem_it.html; Internet.
46 Ibid., paragraph 3.
turn now to an overview of the encyclical. I will follow the format of the English translation of *Pacem in Terris* as it appears on the Vatican website and summarize its five chapters.

The encyclical *Pacem in Terris* reflects the order of humanity in five parts: *Order Between Men, Relations Between Individuals and the Public Authorities, Relations Between States, Relationship of Men and of Political Communities with the World Community* and finally *Pastoral Exhortations*. The encyclical follows a path that begins with the individual, connects the individual to the local community, and finally links the individual to the global community. *Pacem in Terris* is a guide that provides the Church a vision for peace and human rights in the world and is the voice reaffirming natural law. Pope John begins the encyclical with a firm statement on natural law—law written in the heart.

*Pacem in Terris* addresses “all of goodwill” and is the first time a pope addressed an encyclical to the human family. Peace knows no barrier except those barriers imposed by humanity. *Pacem in Terris* is an all-encompassing document on social justice for society to remove any barrier to peace. Its pronouncement is on values common to all humanity regardless of political or religious system or ideology. God is the source for order in the universe and humanity. Pope John links advances in science and technology to God since Creation and humanity have their beginning in God. Pope John highlights the turmoil of humanity and “contrasts it to the perfect order of the universe.”

---

48 Since inclusive language was not widely used, I will use it when possible, using humanity, peoples etc, when referring to man. The translation of *Pacem in Terris* is from the Vatican website: http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_xxiii/encyclicals/documents/hf_j-xxiii_enc_11041963_pacem_en.html; Internet.
introduces the reader to natural law, for what else could bind us together? He quotes St. Paul and again Psalm 8:

But the Creator of the world has imprinted in man’s heart an order which his conscience reveals to him and enjoins him to obey: *This shows that the obligations of the law are written in their hearts; their conscience utters its own testimony.* And how could it be otherwise? For whatever God has made shows forth His infinite wisdom, and it is manifested more clearly in the things which have greater perfection.\(^{49}\)

Order in the universe brings order to humanity and *Pacem in Terris* underscores our common humanity, a theme that President Kennedy would pick up on in his *Commencement Address at American University* two months later. In his address President Kennedy made it clear that humanity shared the earth when he said, “our most basic common link is that we all inhabit this small planet. We all breathe the same air. We all cherish our children's future. And we are all mortal.”\(^{50}\)

The encyclical *Pacem in Terris* provides direction so that we can discern the path to non-violence. Weapons have become too terrible to use, the world is growing smaller, and we are all in closer contact than ever before with the rest of humanity.

No era will ever succeed in destroying the unity of the human family, for it consists of men who are all equal by virtue of their natural dignity. Hence there will always be an imperative need—born of man’s very nature—to promote in sufficient measure the universal common good; the good, that is, of the whole human family.\(^{51}\)

Pope John teaches us how to interact in a divided yet interconnected world. In 1963, the world was divided between the communist bloc and the so-called free world—

---


east and west. The change since then has been dramatic, but the ideas of the encyclical do not need updating. Perhaps a future encyclical will restate the ideas for a different time, but the principles will not change.

It is the task of Catholics to apply the ideas of *Pacem in Terris* to peace-making in their communities and create the path of peace. Tensions, whether in the form of a disagreement or a war, are a constant for humanity. Conflict is a constant and its effects of causing displacement, destruction of habitat and abuse of human rights are unending. Such are the effects of warfare to which the nuclear age offers no solution. Pope John highlights the role of natural law to humanity in a world quickly becoming dominated by technology.

Technology should not be viewed as a threat to humanity; rather humanity must understand the role of technology in society. Technology has many good uses, but it also can be abused at the individual and at the state level. Technology can make our lives easier in our daily lives, and it has also made war more impersonal and has detached humanity from the killing of war as it becomes something that is remote. It has allowed us to deliver destruction with just a handful of personnel compared to the large land armies of past wars. Reminding humanity that it is governed by natural law Pope John strives to keep humanity from disconnecting the spiritual from the secular. Jacques Maritain describes humanity’s relationship with the state and comments on the role of natural law within this relationship.

Jacques Maritain wrote extensively on natural law and the relationship of man and state. Cain and Abel illustrate an example from his writing on natural law. This example
speaks directly to the results of violence, the very meaning of human rights and connects it to Scripture.

Any given situation, for instance the situation of Cain with regard to Abel, implies a relation to the essence of man, and the possible murder of the one by the other is incompatible with the general ends and innermost dynamic structure of that rational essence. It is rejected by it. Hence the prohibition of murder is grounded on or required by the essence of man. The precept: thou shalt not murder, is a precept of natural law. Because a primordial and most general end of human nature is to preserve being—the being of that existent who is a person, and a universe unto himself; and because man insofar as he is man has a right to live.52

Pope John mentions the United Nation’s *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* in *Pacem in Terris* as a hopeful step in the right direction for a secular institution on a global scale.

The Lateran Treaty of 1929 solved the question of the territorial and political status between Italy and the Church. Questions resolved included sovereignty of the Holy See in the international realm as well as the jurisdiction of the Holy See over Vatican City.53 Ten years later, Jacques Maritain helped articulate the role of the Church in the twentieth century. The Church, global in reach, speaks from a position that is more spiritual than geo-political. Her interests were as Jacques Maritain described:

The Church herself is not called on to descend directly into secular tasks, to take part in the flux and reflux of political activity. As the depository of energies of quite another order, more hidden but more powerful, she watches over justice, love and Christian revelation. Once these are made part of the substance of history they act of themselves according to a measure of duration other than the rhythm of time.54

---

53 The Vatican website:
Pope John’s papacy took the Church beyond the walls of the Vatican and into the mid-twentieth century world. Vatican II would further refine the views of *Pacem in Terris* in documents such as *Gaudium et Spes*, which directly addresses peace in part five, “*The Fostering of Peace and the Promotion of a Community of Nations.*” The Church ensured that the reforms of Vatican II included the essence of *Pacem in Terris*. The encyclical as translated into English is divided into five parts and each part represents the key points of *Pacem in Terris*.

**Part One: Order between Men**

Part One, Order Between Men is comprised of paragraphs eight through forty-five. In the opening sentence which is labeled number eight, Pope John states that “we must devote our attention first of all to that order which should prevail among men.”

*Pacem in Terris* elaborates on this one sentence in paragraph nine.

Any well-regulated and productive association of men in society demands the acceptance of one fundamental principle: that each individual man is truly a person. His is a nature that is, endowed with intelligence and free will. As such he has rights and duties, which together flow as a direct consequence from his nature. These rights and duties are universal and inviolable, and therefore altogether inalienable.

This paragraph sounds very familiar and incorporates ideas that flow from the 18th century enlightenment. However Pope John goes one step further and incorporates Christ in paragraph ten.

When, furthermore, we consider man's personal dignity from the standpoint of divine revelation, inevitably our estimate of it is incomparably increased. Men have been ransomed by the blood of Jesus.

---


Christ, Grace has made them sons and friends of God, and heirs to eternal glory.57

Pope John stipulates that rights and duties are the basis of order in society. Rights and obligations are universal and apply to everyone, and in “Order Between Men” it lists the rights that are due each person. Those rights are the right to life, to bodily integrity, and the means which are suitable for the proper development of life. These are primarily food, clothing, shelter, rest, medical care, and necessary social services. Pacem in Terris annunciates the Church’s position on human rights, starting with personal dignity. Our relationship in Christ sets us apart from other philosophies that modern humanity may seek to understand the world’s condition.

The inclusive message of Pacem in Terris is directed beyond the Church and is meant to challenge the nations of the world to meet a higher standard that respects all human rights. In the 21st century divine revelation is not normally associated with statecraft. This aspect of the Church gives it unique perspective on the world. The pope as head of state for the State of Vatican City has access to the world’s governments, and his role as a head of state provides access that may not otherwise be granted to allow the Church to work with nations. The Church maintains a diplomatic presence in many countries which promotes direct dialogue.58 Order Between Men defines rights and duties that are all encompassing of people in the modern world. The encyclical covers rights that are familiar to us.

Pope John leads us through a natural progression of rights and duties by starting with the individual, the right to life, the right to worship God and maintain one’s own culture. The right to choose a station in life is followed by economic rights, the right to work and to contribute to society to the best of our ability. Pope John reaffirmed the right to private property including productive goods. By not naming economic systems, the Church wants to demonstrate that it is not in alignment with any particular system of government. Governments interpret the words of *Pacem in Terris* to suit the vision of peace on earth that they espouse.

The encyclical makes clear that we are social beings and have the right to free association with others. The right to meeting and association is followed by the right to emigrate and immigrate. The right to association and political rights are a part of participation in public life. In paragraphs twenty-eight through thirty (28-30) *Pacem in Terris* addresses duties under the subtitle *Reciprocity of Rights and Duties Between Persons*.

The natural rights of which We have so far been speaking are inextricably bound up with as many duties, all applying to one and the same person. These rights and duties derive their origin, their sustenance, and their indestructibility from the natural law, which in conferring the one imposes the other.

Thus, for example, the right to live involves the duty to preserve one's life; the right to a decent standard of living, the duty to live in a becoming fashion; the right to be free to seek out the truth, the duty to devote oneself to an ever deeper and wider search for it.

Once this is admitted, it follows that in human society one man's natural right gives rise to a corresponding duty in other men; the duty, that is, of recognizing and respecting that right. Every basic human right draws its authoritative force from the natural law, which confers it and attaches to it its respective duty.59

---

Our duties are bound up in mutual collaboration—that is, we live together and support a society based in order. Responsibility is a duty of the individual. One should not act under the threat of force. Forcefully holding a society together only acts as a detriment to fulfilling our responsibility to duty.

Necessary for performing our duty to society are truth, justice, charity and freedom. These principles are found in paragraphs thirty-five through thirty-six under the heading Social Life in Truth, Justice, Charity and Freedom.

Human society, as We here picture it, demands that men be guided by justice, respect the rights of others and do their duty. It demands, too, that they be animated by such love as will make them feel the needs of others as their own, and induce them to share their goods with others, and to strive in the world to make all men alike heirs to the noblest of intellectual and spiritual values.60

This section elaborates on these principles by stating that we are ‘endowed with reason’ and are responsible for our actions. In paragraph thirty-six, Pacem in Terris states how we should approach society.

And so, dearest sons and brothers, we must think of human society as being primarily a spiritual reality. By its means enlightened men can share their knowledge of the truth, can claim their rights and fulfill their duties, receive encouragement in their aspirations for the goods of the spirit, share their enjoyment of all the wholesome pleasures of the world, and strive continually to pass on to others all that is best in themselves and to make their own the spiritual riches of others. It is these spiritual values which exert a guiding influence on culture, economics, social institutions, political movements and forms, laws, and all the other components which go to make up the external community of men and its continual development.61

This statement on the spiritual reality of society highlights a key component of the Church’s’ mission in the world. The spiritual health of humanity is at stake in the

60Ibid. paragraph 36.
61Ibid. paragraph 35.
modern world. The distractions found in daily life can overwhelm humanity, as it faces the materialistic culture that is today’s society.

The next section is titled God and the Moral Order and is comprised of paragraphs thirty-seven and thirty-eight. The foundation of the moral order is truth.

Moral order in human society is described as:

> Now the order which prevails in human society is wholly incorporeal in nature. Its foundation is truth, and it must be brought into effect by justice. It needs to be animated and perfected by men's love for one another, and, while preserving freedom intact, it must make for an equilibrium in society which is increasingly more human in character.\(^{62}\)

The moral order is universal and absolute; the source is the true, personal and transcendent God. In paragraph thirty-seven Pope John quotes Pope Pius XII and St. Thomas to summarize order and its source.

> But such an order—universal, absolute and immutable in its principles—finds its source in the true, personal and transcendent God. He is the first truth, the sovereign good, and as such the deepest source from which human society, if it is to be properly constituted, creative, and worthy of man's dignity, draws its genuine vitality.\(^{63}\) This is what St. Thomas means when he says: "Human reason is the standard which measures the degree of goodness of the human will, and as such it derives from the eternal law, which is divine reason . . . Hence it is clear that the goodness of the human will depends much more on the eternal law than on human reason."\(^{64}\)

The words of St. Thomas stand out today as they did centuries ago. Human reason is connected to eternal law and our will must depend on eternal law than reason.

This point is very important for society as it must be reminded again of where we derive our being, where we come from—the Creator.

---


\(^{64}\) Ibid, paragraph 38, *Summa Theol. Ia-IIae*, q. 19, a.4; cf. a.9.
The next section is titled *Characteristics of the Present Day* and is found in paragraphs thirty-nine through forty-three. Pope John characterizes three things of the modern age in his encyclical. First, there is a progressive improvement in the economic and social condition of working men. The encyclical states in paragraph forty under the subtitle, *Characteristics of the Present Day*.

In the first place we notice a progressive improvement in the economic and social condition of working men. They began by claiming their rights principally in the economic and social spheres, and then proceeded to lay claim to their political rights as well. Finally, they have turned their attention to acquiring the more cultural benefits of society.  

The second point takes notice of the part women are playing in the political realm: “Women are also gaining a sense of their natural dignity” and are demanding rights and duties that belong to them. The third point states: “We are confronted in this modern age with a form of society which is evolving on entirely new social and political lines.”

Finally, the encyclical reinforces the theme of *Order Between Men* with an emphasis on the natural dignity of humanity and gives no approval to racial discrimination. Possession of rights involves respecting others who possess the same rights as fellow humans. The spiritual aspect of society is reinforced on this point in paragraph forty-five under the subheading *Equality of Men*.

When society is formed on a basis of rights and duties, men have an immediate grasp of spiritual and intellectual values, and have no difficulty in understanding what is meant by truth, justice, charity and freedom. They become, moreover, conscious of being members of such a society. And that is not all. Inspired by such principles, they attain to a better knowledge of the true God—a personal God transcending human nature. They recognize that their relationship with God forms the very foundation

---


of their life—the interior life of the spirit, and the life which they live in the society of their fellows.\textsuperscript{67}

The encyclical turns to public authority and the role it plays in a well-ordered society, and it reminds us that “God forms the very foundation of their life—the interior life of the spirit, and the life which they live in the society of their fellows.”\textsuperscript{68}

**Part Two: Relations between Individuals and the Public Authorities**

Of the relationships we observe in society one of the most visible to us are relations between individuals and public authorities. Summarizing the introduction to part two, public authority is addressed by the encyclical to give public authority proper context for its use in society and is invested with legal authority. This is necessary to preserve good order in society and to “preserve its institutions.” Public authorities derive their authority from God, because in the words of Saint Paul, Romans 13:1-6, “there is no power but from God.”\textsuperscript{69} In paragraph forty-six (46) the encyclical draws support from St. John Chrysostom.

What are you saying? Is every ruler appointed by God? No that is not what I mean, he says, for I am not now talking about individual rulers, but about authority as such. My contention is that the existence of a ruling authority—the fact that some should command and others obey, and that all things not come about as the result of blind chance—this is a provision of divine wisdom.\textsuperscript{70}

Society needs a legal framework and public authority to guide it. Authority “has its source in nature” and Pope John, quoting Leo XIII’s encyclical *Immortale Dei Acta*,

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{67} Ibid, paragraph 44.
\item \textsuperscript{68} Ibid, paragraph 45.
\end{itemize}
saying it “consequently has God for its author.” Pope John appeals to conscience and authority as authority itself is a moral force. In paragraph forty-eight, *Pacem in Terris* addresses the institutions of society; public authority is not unlimited power.

For this reason the appeal of rulers should be to the individual conscience, to the duty which every man has of voluntarily contributing to the common good. But since all men are equal in natural dignity, no man has the capacity to force internal compliance on another. Only God can do that, for He alone scrutinizes and judges the secret counsels of the heart. Authority and conscience do not operate independent of each other and must be seen as part of the other. Obedience to civil authority is not obedience to men, but an act of obedience to God.

Conscience must inform the moral order for civil authority; it cannot do as it pleases. Pope John quotes Leo XIII’s encyclical *On the Origin of Civil Power* which states that “representatives of the State have no power to bind men in conscience, unless their own authority is tied to God's authority, and is a participation in it.” In paragraphs forty-eight through fifty-two, Pope John brings conscience, public authority and natural law together. If governmental authority makes law that is contradictory to the moral order and therefore contradicts God it cannot be binding on the conscience.

Governmental authority, therefore, is a postulate of the moral order and derives from God. Consequently, laws and decrees passed in contravention of the moral order, and hence of the divine will, can have no binding force in conscience, since "it is right to obey God rather than men.”

---


73 Ibid, paragraph 51, Acts 5:29. The context is of Peter and the apostles standing before the Sanhedrin. The full quote is “But Peter and the apostles said in reply, “We must obey God rather than men.”
The encyclical quotes St. Thomas Aquinas regarding the placement of the value of natural law and its influence on human society.

In regard to the second proposition, we maintain that human law has the rationale of law in so far as it is in accordance with right reason, and as such it obviously derives from eternal law. A law which is at variance with reason is to that extent unjust and has no longer the rationale of law. It is rather an act of violence.\footnote{Paragraph fifty-two is an extrapolation of two documents from Pope Leo XIII and Pope Pius XII and reflects the continuity of modern Church teaching with roots in the Summa Theologica.}

Governmental authority is derived from God and is the foundation in the moral order and abuse of the moral order undermines authority. If governmental authority abuses the moral order, then the temporal authority certainly cannot be binding on conscience.

In paragraph fifty-three, under the sub-heading \textit{Attainment of the Common Good is the Purpose of the Public Authority, Pacem in Terris} states, “authority is tied directly to the common good since the purpose of authority is to ensure the common good.” The emphasis that \textit{Pacem in Terris} places on authority is “the attainment of the common good


is the sole reason for the existence of civil authorities.”\textsuperscript{76} It must exist for all without discrimination of any in society.

\textit{Pacem in Terris} relates the spiritual aspect of authority to the common good. The Church must remind the world that we do not exist in a solely material world. “They (those in authority) must respect the hierarchy of values, and achieve the spiritual as well as the material prosperity of their subjects.”\textsuperscript{77} Public authorities are reminded of their obligation towards the rights and duties it has to the individual, for society is best served when the individual is protected. The encyclical also emphasizes the moral obligations of valid authority and quotes Pius XI: “Thus any government which refused to recognize human rights or acted in violation of them would not only fail in its duty; its decrees would be wholly lacking in binding force.”\textsuperscript{78}

\textit{Pacem in Terris} focus on the rights and duties of individuals and the responsibilities of public authority. It also focuses our attention on reconciliation and protection of the rights and duties of individuals. The duty of public authority is to promote the rights of individuals and not to promote the rights of any one group over another. Pope John’s earlier encyclical \textit{Mater et Magistra} is quoted on this point:

\begin{quote}
For this principle must always be retained: that however extensive and far-reaching the influence of the State on the economy may be, it must never be exerted to the extent of depriving the individual citizen of his freedom of action. It must rather augment his freedom, while effectively guaranteeing the protection of everyone's essential, personal rights.\textsuperscript{79}
\end{quote}


The structure and operation of public authority is important to safeguarding human rights. *Pacem in Terris* recognizes that circumstances and conditions will drive what form public authority takes; it defines the divisions of public authority as legislative, administrative, and judicial. Speaking of “law and conscience”, the encyclical also stresses that in today’s complex world the judicial system may not be able to keep up. The concern expressed is that the fast pace of modern life moves too quickly for the judicial system to adequately address the needs of society. The encyclical calls on the prudence and foresight of public authority to do what is in the best interest of society. The citizen’s participation in public life is affirmed as well as the citizen’s right to active participation in public life. *Pacem in Terris* calls for a system where the succession of public officials is present to promote fresh ideas that keep in touch with the common good. Three points are stressed in conclusion of this section.

There is every indication at the present time that these aims and ideals are giving rise to various demands concerning the juridical organization of States. The first is this: that a clear and precisely worded charter of fundamental human rights be formulated and incorporated into the State's general constitutions.

Secondly, each State must have a public constitution, couched in juridical terms, laying down clear rules relating to the designation of public officials, their reciprocal relations, spheres of competence and prescribed methods of operation.

The final demand is that relations between citizens and public authorities be described in terms of rights and duties. It must be clearly laid down that the principal function of public authorities is to recognize, respect, coordinate, safeguard and promote citizens' rights and duties.\(^{80}\)

Part two concludes by noting that the Church rejects the will of any one individual as the source of a citizen’s rights.

We must, however, reject the view that the will of the individual or the group is the primary and only source of a citizen's rights and duties, and of the binding force of political constitutions and the government's authority.\textsuperscript{81}

\textit{Pacem in Terris} in the paragraph seventy-nine notes that personal dignity is increasingly a component of the citizen’s awareness of rights that government cannot ignore. Citizens are also demanding accountability and that their leaders (elected officials) work within the constitutional framework that is established.

\textbf{Part Three: Relations between States}

Moving beyond the individual person and states, \textit{Pacem in Terris} turns to relations between states and addresses the topic in paragraphs eighty through one-hundred twenty-nine. States are also subject to the same rights and duties that bind individuals; and “the same law of nature that governs the life and conduct of individuals must also regulate the relations of political communities with one another.”\textsuperscript{82} The appointment of public officials to public office is something seen as a unique achievement by \textit{Pacem in Terris}.\textsuperscript{83} A public official is still bound by natural law to act in public as in private. \textit{Pacem in Terris} states:

This will be readily understood when one reflects that it is quite impossible for political leaders to lay aside their natural dignity while acting in their country's name and in its interests. They are still bound by the natural law, which is the rule that governs all moral conduct, and they have no authority to depart from its slightest precepts.\textsuperscript{84}

\textsuperscript{81} Ibid. 78 and Cf. Leo XIII's apostolic letter \textit{Annum ingressi, Acta Leonis XIII, XXII}, 1902-1903, pp. 52-80, as referenced in Pacem in Terris, paragraph 78.
\textsuperscript{84} Ibid, paragraph 81.
Pacem in Terris further elaborates on this point that the appointment to public office militates against laying aside our humanity. The attainment of public office is a result of one’s “exceptional gifts and intellectual qualities and have been earned by their reputation in the body politic.”\textsuperscript{85} Natural law is binding on public officials and moral law naturally follows.

Moreover, a ruling authority is indispensable to civil society. That is a fact which follows from the moral order itself. Such authority, therefore, cannot be misdirected against the moral order. It would immediately cease to exist, being deprived of its whole raison d'être. God Himself warns us of this: "Hear, therefore, ye kings, and understand: learn, ye that are judges of the ends of the earth. Give ear, you that rule the people, and that please yourselves in multitudes of nations. For power is given you by the Lord, and strength by the Most High, who will examine your works, and search out your thoughts."\textsuperscript{86}

In paragraph eighty-two, Pacem in Terris states that a ruling authority is needed in society to function. This authority is affirmed by Scripture as quoted from the Book of Wisdom. We and those placed in authority owe their power to God and will be held accountable for how it is used.

Paragraph eighty-five, “An Imperative of the Common Good”, underscores how important moral order is to society.

But one of the principal imperatives of the common good is the recognition of the moral order and the unfailing observance of its precepts. "A firmly established order between political communities must be founded on the unshakable and unmoving rock of the moral law, that law which is revealed in the order of nature by the Creator Himself, and engraved indelibly on men's hearts... Its principles are beacon lights to guide the policies of men and nations. They are also warning lights—providential signs—which men must heed if their laborious efforts to


\textsuperscript{86} Ibid, paragraph 83. The scripture quote is from Wisdom 6:2-4.
establish a new order are not to encounter perilous storms and shipwreck.\textsuperscript{87}

Pope John firmly places, as he has since the introduction to \textit{Pacem in Terris}, the moral order as having its foundation on natural law originating with the Creator and imprinted on our hearts. He states that for the moral order to function political communities must be in harmony with the nature of moral order or their respective societies risk crisis and upheaval by ignoring or not being in concert with the moral order.

Paragraphs eighty-six through eighty-nine are titled \textit{In Truth} and address mutual ties between nations. \textit{Pacem in Terris} states that the first point to be settled is that mutual ties between nations must be governed by truth. The encyclical states in paragraph eighty-six that “truth calls for the elimination of every trace of racial discrimination, and the consequent recognition of the inviolable principle that all States are by nature equal in dignity.” Each State has the right to exist; each must eliminate discrimination, and they are by nature equal in dignity.\textsuperscript{88} \textit{Pacem in Terris} recognizes that men differ in knowledge, virtue, intelligence and wealth. It further states in keeping with the dignity which is equal for all of humanity “but that is no valid argument in favor of a system whereby those who are in a position of superiority impose their will arbitrarily on others. On the contrary, such men have a greater share in the common responsibility to help others to reach perfection by their mutual efforts.”\textsuperscript{89} In paragraphs eighty-eight and


\textsuperscript{89} Ibid, paragraph 87.
eighty-nine, *Pacem in Terris* then extrapolates what applies to humanity as individuals to the international level.

So, too, on the international level: some nations may have attained to a superior degree of scientific, cultural and economic development. But that does not entitle them to exert unjust political domination over other nations. It means that they have to make a greater contribution to the common cause of social progress.

The fact is that no one can be by nature superior to his fellows, since all men are equally noble in natural dignity. And consequently there are no differences at all between political communities from the point of view of natural dignity. Each State is like a body, the members of which are human beings. And, as we know from experience, nations can be highly sensitive in matters in any way touching their dignity and honor; and with good reason.  

*Pacem in Terris* addresses *The Question of Propaganda* in paragraph ninety. At all levels of society and government, one will always find propaganda. The encyclical emphasizes the critical nature of truth by stating, “Truth further demands an attitude of unruffled impartiality in the use of the many aids to the promotion and spread of mutual understanding between nations which modern scientific progress has made available.”

*Pacem in Terris* rejects ways of disseminating information which violate the principles of truth and justice and injure the reputation of another nation. The encyclical draws the distinction between calling attention to a way of life and outright dissemination of information which is false and leads to defamation of another—be it a person or nation.

Paragraphs ninety-one through ninety-three are under the sub-heading *In Justice*. States must always be governed by truth and justice when serving members of the

---


91 Ibid., 90.

community. *Pacem in Terris* emphasizes why public authority, conscience and natural law are linked between nations. States must not infringe upon other States in a detrimental way.

And just as individual men may not pursue their own private interests in a way that is unfair and detrimental to others, so too it would be criminal in a State to aim at improving itself by the use of methods which involve other nations in injury and unjust oppression. There is a saying of St. Augustine which has particular relevance in this context: "Take away justice, and what are kingdoms but mighty bands of robbers".

Paragraphs ninety-four through ninety-seven address and are titled *The Treatment of Minorities*.

This section addresses the need to improve human conditions. Attention should be paid to minority rights in so far as protecting culture, language, traditions and economic activity. The encyclical warns against isolation of minority groups and suggests that they should seek association with those around them.

Paragraphs ninety-eight and ninety-nine are titled *Active Solidarity*. The encyclical ties the behavior of nations into the principles of truth and justice. Nations must further collaborate and pool resources for beneficial results.

Since relationships between States must be regulated in accordance with the principles of truth and justice, States must further these relationships by taking positive steps to pool their material and spiritual resources. In many cases this can be achieved by all kinds of mutual collaboration; and this is already happening in our own day in the economic, social, political, educational, health and athletic spheres—and with beneficial results. We must bear in mind that of its very nature civil authority exists, not to confine men within the frontiers of their own nations, but primarily to protect the common good of the State, which certainly cannot be divorced from the common good of the entire human family.

---


Pacem in Terris reminds public authority that nations do not exist to confine its citizens, but the state must promote the interaction of citizens with other states as all are part of the human family. Nations must exercise its power that it does no harm, that what is beneficial for one nation may be harmful for the other.

Paragraph one-hundred is sub-titled Contacts Between Races. In this paragraph Pacem in Terris states that nothing should be done to impede the relations among people of the same ethnic origin.

Furthermore, the universal common good requires the encouragement in all nations of every kind of reciprocation between citizens and their intermediate societies. There are many parts of the world where we find groupings of people of more or less different ethnic origin. Nothing must be allowed to prevent reciprocal relations between them. Indeed such a prohibition would flout the very spirit of an age which has done so much to nullify the distances separating peoples.

The section closes with a note that those with a common background share special characteristics that distinguish them. But as part of humanity ethnic groups share traits common to all of humanity.

And these can form the basis of their progressive development and self-realization especially in regard to spiritual values. They have, therefore, the right and duty to carry on their lives with others in society.

Pacem in Terris is concerned not just with the material status of ethnic groups, as important as a decent standard of living is to all, but certainly nothing should be done to impede the development of any group spiritually.

Paragraph one-hundred and one and one-hundred two is sub-titled The Proper Balance Between Population, Land and Capital. In addition to protecting the rights of all

---


---
fairly, the encyclical seeks a balance between population, land and capital. Nations must work together to share resources and ensure fairness to transnational inhabitants. In paragraph one-hundred two the encyclical advocates for bringing work to the worker. This causes less disruption to the family.

We advocate in such cases the policy of bringing the work to the workers, wherever possible, rather than bringing workers to the scene of the work. In this way many people will be afforded an opportunity of increasing their resources without being exposed to the painful necessity of uprooting themselves from their own homes, settling in a strange environment, and forming new social contacts.  

This scenario certainly appeals to those with limited resources. The family who is struggling to makes ends meet certainly can do without the stress of moving and reestablishing themselves in a strange place away from all that is familiar.

Pacem in Terris addresses the plight of refugees in paragraphs one-hundred three and one-hundred four. This section is sub-titled The Problem of Political Refugees and illustrates the breakdown of rights and order and the need to protect those most vulnerable who are stateless.

The deep feelings of paternal love for all mankind which God has implanted in Our heart makes it impossible for Us to view without bitter anguish of spirit the plight of those who for political reasons have been exiled from their own homelands. There are great numbers of such refugees at the present time, and many are the sufferings—the incredible sufferings—to which they are constantly exposed.

Here surely is our proof that, in defining the scope of a just freedom within which individual citizens may live lives worthy of their human dignity, the rulers of some nations have been far too restrictive. Sometimes in States of this kind the very right to freedom is called in question, and even flatly denied. We have here a complete reversal of the right order of society, for the whole raison d'etre of public authority is to

---

safeguard the interests of the community. Its sovereign duty is to recognize the noble realm of freedom and protect its rights.\(^{97}\)

*Pacem in Terris* further examines refugees in paragraphs one-hundred five and one-hundred six in the section sub-titled *The Refugee’s Rights*.

For this reason, it is not irrelevant to draw the attention of the world to the fact that these refugees are persons and all their rights as persons must be recognized. Refugees cannot lose these rights simply because they are deprived of citizenship of their own States.

And among man's personal rights we must include his right to enter a country in which he hopes to be able to provide more fittingly for himself and his dependents. It is therefore the duty of State officials to accept such immigrants and—so far as the good of their own community, rightly understood, permits—to further the aims of those who may wish to become members of a new society.\(^{98}\)

Refugees have rights no matter what their status. As people they have rights which must be recognized and respected. If they are uprooted they have a right to settle and be accepted as part of a new community.

The section in paragraphs one-hundred seven and one-hundred eight is sub-titled *Commendable Efforts* and praises efforts made on behalf of refugees. Approval is given for any undertaking on the basis of the principles of human solidarity or Christian charity.

*Pacem in Terris* shifts the focus to the *Causes of the Arms Race* and in paragraphs one-hundred twelve and one-hundred thirteen the *Need for Disarmament*. Relations between States were dominated in the early 1960’s by political refugees, the arms race, and decolonization. Decolonization had a side effect of displacing people and causing social unrest, only to be compounded by tensions from the arms race. The encyclical

---


deplores the outlay of resources on arms, which takes from resources that would otherwise be available to assist with economic and social development of all peoples. In paragraph one-hundred ten *Pacem in Terris* takes issue with the position that the more arms a nation possesses the more secure it will be.

There is a common belief that under modern conditions peace cannot be assured except on the basis of an equal balance of armaments and that this factor is the probable cause of this stockpiling of armaments. Thus, if one country increases its military strength, others are immediately roused by a competitive spirit to augment their own supply of armaments. And if one country is equipped with atomic weapons, others consider themselves justified in producing such weapons themselves, equal in destructive force.\(^99\)

In the last fifty years, the proliferation of nuclear weapons has only increased since *Pacem in Terris* was released.

The arms race inspires fear—fear that at any moment these weapons will be unleashed. A regional or intercontinental exchange of nuclear weapons would expose all to the danger of immediate death or poisoning of the world. A grave concern then as now, is that in time the use of such weapons becomes thinkable. In writing *Pacem in Terris*, Pope John had hope that nuclear weapons would not be used.

While it is difficult to believe that anyone would dare to assume responsibility for initiating the appalling slaughter and destruction that war would bring in its wake, there is no denying that the conflagration could be started by some chance and unforeseen circumstance.\(^100\)

*Pacem in Terris* is against the testing of nuclear weapons, and in 1963, at the time of its writing, testing was being carried out in the atmosphere and water. The concern is


not just for the preparation of war, but these new weapons, if testing continues, “lead to serious danger for various forms of life on earth.” Even as nuclear testing continued with underground testing in the 1960’s, nations were still preparing for the use of nuclear weapons. Even if tensions were not escalating, nations were not then or today ready to give up their stockpiles of nuclear weapons.

The section sub-titled Need for Disarmament is composed of paragraphs one-hundred twelve and one-hundred thirteen (112-113) calls for not just the reduction of conventional arms, but the banning of nuclear arms.

Hence justice, right reason, and the recognition of man's dignity cry out insistently for a cessation to the arms race. The stock-piles of armaments which have been built up in various countries must be reduced all round and simultaneously by the parties concerned. Nuclear weapons must be banned. A general agreement must be reached on a suitable disarmament program, with an effective system of mutual control.\textsuperscript{102}

Pope John brings the spiritual dimension to the topic of disarmament and takes us beyond counting the number of weapons.

Everyone, however, must realize that, unless this process of disarmament be thoroughgoing and complete, and reach men's very souls, it is impossible to stop the arms race, or to reduce armaments, or—and this is the main thing—ultimately to abolish them entirely. Everyone must sincerely co-operate in the effort to banish fear and the anxious expectation of war from men's minds.\textsuperscript{103}

Everyone must sincerely co-operate in the effort to banish fear and the anxious expectation of war from men's minds. But this requires that the fundamental principles upon which peace is based in today's world be replaced by an altogether different one, namely, the realization that true and lasting peace among nations cannot consist in the possession of an equal supply of armaments but only in mutual trust.\textsuperscript{104}

\textsuperscript{101} Ibid., paragraph 111.
\textsuperscript{103} Ibid., paragraph 113.
\textsuperscript{104} Ibid., paragraph 113.
On this point *Pacem in Terris* is hopeful, and it is confident that progress can be made not only because common sense can prevail, but that reduction in arms is for the common good.

Pope John’s use of the phrase “men’s very souls” is spiritual language that must be brought into the discourse on the arms race. It reminds all parties that man is not at the center of existence but that reaching our souls places humanity on a plane above race, nationality, or economic systems.

The next section is sub-titled *Three Motives*. Relations between states—just as with individuals—should be governed not by arms. Reason and the principles of truth, justice, and sincere co-operation must replace arms. Second, a secure peace should be an objective, and finally, it is an objective “rich with the possibilities for good.”

Its advantages will be felt everywhere, by individuals, by families, by nations, by the whole human race. The warning of Pope Pius XII still rings in our ears: "Nothing is lost by peace; everything may be lost by war.“

Paragraphs one-hundred seventeen through one-hundred nineteen are sub-titled *A Call to Unsparing Effort*. The call is made for never ending efforts in the cause of disarmament. The Church has a duty to humanity and especially leaders of nations to bring attention to their efforts to the task of disarmament in a rational and dignified manner.

We therefore consider it Our duty as the vicar on earth of Jesus Christ—the Saviour of the world, the Author of peace—and as interpreter of the most ardent wishes of the whole human family, in the fatherly love We bear all mankind, to beg and beseech mankind, and above all the rulers of

---

States, to be unsparing of their labor and efforts to ensure that human affairs follow a rational and dignified course.  

In paragraph one-hundred nineteen the Church for its part will pray continuously for God’s blessing and assistance for efforts towards peace.

Paragraph one-hundred twenty is titled In Liberty.  *Pacem in Terris* links relations between nations to the principle of freedom. All interaction must be regulated by the principle of freedom. Freedom is universal as each nation must assist the other.

Furthermore, relations between States must be regulated by the principle of freedom. This means that no country has the right to take any action that would constitute an unjust oppression of other countries, or an unwarranted interference in their affairs. On the contrary, all should help to develop in others an increasing awareness of their duties, an adventurous and enterprising spirit, and the resolution to take the initiative for their own advancement in every field of endeavor.

In paragraphs one-hundred twenty-one through one-hundred twenty-five *Pacem in Terris* addresses The Evolution of Economically Under-developed Countries.

All men are united by their common origin and fellowship, their redemption by Christ, and their supernatural destiny. They are called to form one Christian family. In Our encyclical *Mater et Magistra*, therefore, We appealed to the more wealthy nations to render every kind of assistance to those States which are still in the process of economic development.

*Pacem in Terris* is optimistic that in the years ahead underdeveloped countries will develop economically and socially. It is also hoped that such countries will maintain their freedom as they move forward and take responsibility for their own growth.

---


The section *Signs of the Times* is composed of paragraphs one-hundred twenty-six through one-hundred twenty-nine and is the conclusion to part three, *Relations Between States*. Humanity is becoming more convinced that disagreements must be settled by negotiation and not by arms. In paragraph one-hundred twenty-nine, it is hoped that instead of seeking deterrence closer contact will result in recognizing our common nature.

Part three ends on a note of hope: the international community appears more willing to resolve differences by diplomacy than by war. The very prospect of nuclear war makes recourse to war a less than appealing alternative to resolving differences.

**Part Four: Relationship of Men and of Political Communities with the World Community**

Part four of *Pacem in Terris* focuses on the relationship between humanity and political communities of the world. Foreshadowing what we today call globalization, *Pacem in Terris* addresses the growing interdependence between nations in travel, information, and economies. In paragraph one-hundred thirty, *Pacem in Terris* focuses on the impact that science and technology is having on the world.

Recent progress in science and technology has had a profound influence on man's way of life. This progress is a spur to men all over the world to extend their collaboration and association with one another in these days when material resources, travel from one country to another, and technical information have so vastly increased. This has led to a phenomenal growth in relationships between individuals, families and intermediate associations belonging to the various nations, and between the public authorities of the various political communities. There is also a growing economic interdependence between States. National economies are gradually becoming so interdependent that a kind of world economy is being born from the simultaneous integration of the economies of individual States. And finally, each country's social progress, order,
security and peace are necessarily linked with the social progress, order, security and peace of every other country.109

Paragraphs one-hundred thirty-two through one-hundred thirty-five are subtitled *Inadequacy of Modern States to Ensure the Universal Good*. The context of paragraph one-hundred thirty-two speaks of humanity surviving through an era that is dominated by strife. In 1963, current readers of *Pacem in Terris* would naturally associate the words with the economic upheaval of the 1930’s and World War II.

We should look at this statement anew in our current time. The modern state has not prevented war which has dominated the first decade of the 21st century, but the impact of science and technology has for better or worse changed the way we live.

No era will ever succeed in destroying the unity of the human family, for it consists of men who are all equal by virtue of their natural dignity. Hence there will always be an imperative need—born of man’s very nature—to promote in sufficient measure the universal common good; the good, that is, of the whole human family.

In the past rulers of States seem to have been able to make sufficient provision for the universal common good through the normal diplomatic channels, or by top-level meetings and discussions, treaties and agreements; by using, that is, the ways and means suggested by the natural law, the law of nations, or international law.110

Paragraph one-hundred thirty-four highlights the problem of nations to be able to act with sufficient authority. Even with more rapid communication leaders of nations are still unable to find common ground to ensure peace and security. *Pacem in Terris* concludes that for all their intentions, the leaders of nations are unable to adequately influence the course of events for the good of humanity.

---


In our own day, however, mutual relationships between States have undergone a far reaching change. On the one hand, the universal common good gives rise to problems of the utmost gravity, complexity and urgency—especially as regards the preservation of the security and peace of the whole world. On the other hand, the rulers of individual nations, being all on an equal footing, largely fail in their efforts to achieve this, however much they multiply their meetings and their endeavors to discover more fitting instruments of justice. And this is no reflection on their sincerity and enterprise. It is merely that their authority is not sufficiently influential.

We are thus driven to the conclusion that the shape and structure of political life in the modern world, and the influence exercised by public authority in all the nations of the world are unequal to the task of promoting the common good of all peoples.111

*Pacem in Terris* expresses concern that stronger security arrangements must be in place to secure peace. Security arrangements have not proven to be sufficient in the prevention of war in the past. In the view of *Pacem in Terris*, a nation’s social progress, order, security and peace are linked to other nations’ progress in these areas. Nations will prosper or fail based on this dependence on each other, and the encyclical addresses the inability of the modern state to ensure a permanent state of peace.

Paragraphs one-hundred thirty-six and one-hundred thirty-seven are sub-titled *Connection Between the Common Good and Political Authority*. There is a direct connection between the common good and political authority. Political authority by promoting the common good also promotes the moral order.

Now, if one considers carefully the inner significance of the common good on the one hand, and the nature and function of public authority on the other, one cannot fail to see that there is an intrinsic connection between them. Public authority, as the means of promoting the common good in

---

civil society, is a postulate of the moral order. But the moral order likewise requires that this authority be effective in attaining its end.\textsuperscript{112} The civil institutions which have authority has its own interests and are thus capable of ensuring the common good and must be flexible enough to change as conditions change.

In paragraph one-hundred thirty-seven, the common good is recognized in universal terms, world-wide in dimension. Humanity’s problems are global in scope and for the moral order to function there must be some form of public authority.

Today the universal common good presents us with problems which are world-wide in their dimensions; problems, therefore, which cannot be solved except by a public authority with power, organization and means co-extensive with these problems, and with a world-wide sphere of activity. Consequently the moral order itself demands the establishment of some such general form of public authority.\textsuperscript{113}

In the section to follow, \textit{Pacem in Terris} establishes what form of public authority must be instituted among nations.

Paragraph one-hundred thirty-eight addresses the issue of a world-wide power having the power and authority in the section sub-titled \textit{Public Authority Instituted by Common Consent and Not Imposed by Force}. \textit{Pacem in Terris} states that any world-wide authority cannot be imposed by force.

If its work is to be effective, it must operate with fairness, absolute impartiality, and with dedication to the common good of all peoples. The forcible imposition by the more powerful nations of a universal authority of this kind would inevitably arouse fears of its being used as an instrument to serve the interests of the few or to take the side of a single nation, and thus the influence and effectiveness of its activity would be undermined. For even though nations may differ widely in material


progress and military strength, they are very sensitive as regards their juridical equality and the excellence of their own way of life.\textsuperscript{114}

Any nation that does not agree to a public authority that it sees as not being in its best interest will refuse to accept such authority. This is a potential issue whenever a country or organization such as the United Nations sends forces for peacekeeping missions. The mandates for such operations must always spell out what their roles are and the limits of their authority.

The inability of the current structure of political life to secure a lasting peace is addressed in paragraph one-hundred thirty-nine and sub-titled \textit{The Universal Common Good and Personal Rights}.

The common good of individual States is something that cannot be determined without reference to the human person, and the same is true of the common good of all States taken together. Hence the public authority of the world community must likewise have as its special aim the recognition, respect, safeguarding and promotion of the rights of the human person. This can be done by direct action, if need be, or by the creation throughout the world of the sort of conditions in which rulers of individual States can more easily carry out their specific functions.\textsuperscript{115}

The common good of the nation is linked to the well-being of the person. The nations of the world have a responsibility to create the conditions where the rights of people are protected and this allows the leaders of nations to more effectively carry out their duties.

\textit{Pacem in Terris} uses the Principle of Subsidiarity to draw the connection from the individual to the world community. Public authority exists to promote the common good, and by promoting the common good this is, as the encyclical states—a “postulate of the

\textsuperscript{114} Ibid, Paragraph 138.

moral order.” This authority cannot be imposed by force; imposing authority by force only engenders mistrust among other nations. The common good and public authority is based on the rights of the human person. Everything must be done to preserve human rights and create conditions for maintaining them. The Principle of Subsidiarity underscores this point in *Pacem in Terris*:

The same Principle of Subsidiarity [sic] which governs the relations between public authorities and individuals, families and intermediate societies in a single State, must also apply to the relations between the public authority of the world community and the public authorities of each political community. The special function of this universal authority must be to evaluate and find a solution to economic, social, political and cultural problems which affect the universal common good. These are problems which, because of their extreme gravity, vastness and urgency, must be considered too difficult for the rulers of individual States to solve with any degree of success.\footnote{Pope John XXIII, *Pacem in Terris*, April 11, 1963, (accessed 1 January 2010), paragraph 140; available from http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_xxiii/encyclicals/documents/hf_j-xxiii_enc_11041963_pacem_en.html; Internet.}

Subsidiarity reinforces the idea of accomplishing tasks at the local level. The State should step in only when the task is too great for any one community to accomplish on its own. Public authority must ensure that functions can be carried out locally and with security.

The final paragraphs of part four are paragraphs one-hundred forty-two through one-hundred forty-five and are sub-titled *Modern Developments*. The United Nations and the *Declaration of Human Rights* are examined. The encyclical expresses the view that the founding of the United Nations is a positive step. It also views the *Declaration on Human Rights* to be a farsighted step for the United Nations. It notes that the Declaration did not meet with approval in all quarters. The encyclical does not state what was
objectionable in it. *Pacem in Terris* states the view of the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* in paragraphs one-hundred forty-three and on-hundred forty-four.

A clear proof of the farsightedness of this organization is provided by the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* passed by the United Nations General Assembly on December 10, 1948. The preamble of this declaration affirms that the genuine recognition and complete observance of all the rights and freedoms outlined in the declaration is a goal to be sought by all peoples and all nations.

We are, of course, aware that some of the points in the declaration did not meet with unqualified approval in some quarters; and there was justification for this. Nevertheless, We think the document should be considered a step in the right direction, an approach toward the establishment of a juridical and political ordering of the world community. It is a solemn recognition of the personal dignity of every human being; an assertion of everyone's right to be free to seek out the truth, to follow moral principles, discharge the duties imposed by justice, and lead a fully human life. It also recognized other rights connected with these.  

Paragraph one-hundred forty-five expresses the hope that Pope John has for the United Nations. The United Nations it is hoped can be an organization that can safeguard human rights. However, whether it will have the authority to do so will be determined by its member nations.

It is therefore Our [sic] earnest wish that the United Nations Organization may be able progressively to adapt its structure and methods of operation to the magnitude and nobility of its tasks. May the day be not long delayed when every human being can find in this organization an effective safeguard of his personal rights; those rights, that is, which derive directly from his dignity as a human person, and which are therefore universal, inviolable and inalienable.  

*Pacem in Terris* views the United Nations as a step in the right direction towards peacekeeping. The United Nations as a new institution in 1963 is seen as a hopeful sign

---


that as humanity is drawn closer together by globalization. It is a sign that humanity is taking a more active role in the “universal family of mankind.”

**Part Five: Pastoral Exhortations**

In part five *Pastoral Exhortations*, paragraphs one-hundred forty-six through one-hundred seventy-two bring the many threads of *Pacem in Terris* to conclusion. The key point of *Pastoral Exhortations* is to engage people actively in public life.

Here once more We exhort Our sons to take an active part in public life, and to work together for the benefit of the whole human race, as well as for their own political communities. It is vitally necessary for them to endeavor, in the light of Christian faith, and with love as their guide, to ensure that every institution, whether economic, social, cultural or political, be such as not to obstruct but rather to facilitate man's self-betterment, both in the natural and in the supernatural order.\(^{119}\)

It is our duty as Christians to be a positive force in the world. We are to practice our Christian faith in the world by playing an active part and contributing to our culture. Truth, justice, love and freedom are the foundation of peace; just as it is stated in the formal title of *Pacem in Terris*. As Christians we are to bring no obstacle to these in our daily lives. Our conduct must be such that we facilitate the growth of truth, justice, love and freedom.

The section sub-titled *Scientific Competence, Technical Capacity and Professional Experience* is comprised of paragraphs one-hundred forty-seven through one-hundred fifty.

In part paragraph one-hundred fifty-two states examines why institutions that are influenced by Christians, have so little effect on their place of work.

One may well ask the reason for this, since the men who have largely contributed—and who are still contributing—to the creation of these institutions are men who are professed Christians, and who live their lives, at least in part, in accordance with the precepts of the gospels. In Our opinion the explanation lies in a certain cleavage between faith and practice. Their inner, spiritual unity must be restored, so that faith may be the light and love the motivating force of all their actions.\textsuperscript{120}

We have the most impact where we live and work. The laity works in the world, and each week after Mass goes back into the world bringing the Word to it. We are called upon to be competent in our careers of science and technology, and the practice of our own profession, the lay apostolate.\textsuperscript{121} To be successful in our apostolate, our ability to spread the Gospel, we must govern ourselves by the utmost high standard of moral conduct.

If these policies are really to become operative, men must first of all take the utmost care to conduct their various temporal activities in accordance with the laws which govern each and every such activity, observing the principles which correspond to their respective natures. Secondly, men's actions must be made to conform with the precepts of the moral order. This means that their behavior must be such as to reflect their consciousness of exercising a personal right or performing a personal duty. Reason has a further demand to make. In obedience to the providential designs and commands of God respecting our salvation and neglecting the dictates of conscience, men must conduct themselves in their temporal activity in such a way as to effect a thorough integration of the principal spiritual values with those of science, technology and the professions.\textsuperscript{122}

\textit{Pacem in Terris} emphasizes that we must conform to the natural order. We must follow reason which respects God, and our conscience must conform in such a way that our temporal activity integrates our spiritual values.


\textsuperscript{121} Ibid., paragraph 148.

In paragraphs one-hundred fifty-one and one-hundred fifty-two Pacem in Terris further develops these ideas in the section for Integration of Faith and Action. Christians live and work in a society that was formed by Christian ideas, but society no longer seems affected by those ideas. It is the view of Pope John that the inner life must be revitalized. The encyclical states:

In traditionally Christian States at the present time, civil institutions evince a high degree of scientific and technical progress and possess abundant machinery for the attainment of every kind of objective. And yet it must be owned that these institutions are often but slightly affected by Christian motives and a Christian spirit.\textsuperscript{123}

Pacem in Terris immediately follows-up by stating in paragraph one-hundred fifty-two that “one may well ask the reason for this” that these institutions are only slightly affected by the Christian spirit. Why is this, since those who live and work in these societies are Christian? The answer may lie in the modern Christian’s inner life. Spiritual unity and balance between faith and practice must be restored.

In Our opinion the explanation lies in a certain cleavage between faith and practice. Their inner, spiritual unity must be restored, so that faith may be the light and love the motivating force of all their actions.\textsuperscript{124}

The next section Integral Education is paragraph one-hundred fifty-three and begins with the observation that Christian education is lacking today as is morality. Scientific teaching has reached a high level whereas religious education and training is in decline. Religious training is static not reaching beyond the elementary level. Pope John


follows-up in the next section *Constant Endeavor* by stating how difficult it is to connect requirements and to situations.

In the section sub-titled *Constant Endeavor*, paragraph one-hundred fifty-four the difficulty of discerning the relation between the requirements of justice and situations and how to apply them in society.

In this connection We [sic] think it opportune to point out how difficult it is to understand clearly the relation between the objective requirements of justice and concrete situations; to define, that is, correctly to what degree and in what form doctrinal principles and directives must be applied in the given state of human society.\(^{125}\)

*Pacem in Terris* highlights the difficulty of connecting and understanding the relationship between objective requirements of justice and concrete situations. The age we are living in is complex and fast paced. This makes the tasks of justice more difficult.

The definition of these degrees and forms is all the more difficult in an age such as ours, driven forward by a fever of activity. And yet this is the age in which each one of us is required to make his own contribution to the universal common good. Daily is borne in on us the need to make the reality of social life conform better to the requirements of justice.\(^{126}\)

How do we apply doctrinal principles and directives? Furthermore this question is clouded by the age in which we live, as a time of much activity. It is an age to which each of us must contribute to the universal good, and we must not rest. *Pacem in Terris* gives specific detail to this abstract idea.

What has so far been achieved is insufficient compared with what needs to be done; all men must realize that. Every day provides a more important, a more fitting enterprise to which they must turn their hands—industry, trade unions, professional organizations, insurance, cultural institutions,


the law, politics, medical and recreational facilities, and other such activities. The age in which we live needs all these things. It is an age in which men, having discovered the atom and achieved the breakthrough into outer space, are now exploring other avenues, leading to almost limitless horizons.127

*Pacem in Terris* recognizes that we are living in an age where the boundaries for humanity are reaching beyond any in history. We need all the activities described, as we live in an age where humanity must remain grounded in the familiar aspects of society as change will continue to happen at a rapid pace.

Paragraph one-hundred fifty-seven is sub-titled *Relations Between Catholics and Non-Catholics in Social and Economic Affairs*. The encyclical examines relations between Catholics and Non-Catholics and its message is very pertinent to both who must examine their respective values and determine whether they may stand on common ground. It leaves no room for compromise as to how we must present ourselves to the world. The encyclical’s principles as it states are derived from “the very nature of things; the consideration of man’s natural rights.”

It even involves the cooperation of Catholics with men who may not be Christians but who nevertheless are reasonable men, and men of natural moral integrity. "In such circumstances they must, of course, bear themselves as Catholics, and do nothing to compromise religion and morality (italics mine). Yet at the same time they should show themselves animated by a spirit of understanding and unselfishness, ready to cooperate loyally in achieving objects which are good in themselves, or conducive to good."128

---


We must be ready to cooperate with Christians who are separated from us and non-Christians alike. It is important to keep a spirit that is ready and able to cooperate for the common good.

Paragraph one-hundred fifty-eight is titled *Error and the Errant*. This section teaches us to see the difference between those in error and do not know it and how they may embrace the truth.

It is always perfectly justifiable to distinguish between error as such and the person who falls into error—even in the case of men who err regarding the truth or are led astray as a result of their inadequate knowledge, in matters either of religion or of the highest ethical standards. A man who has fallen into error does not cease to be a man. He never forfeits his personal dignity; and that is something that must always be taken into account. Besides, there exists in man's very nature an undying capacity to break through the barriers of error and seek the road to truth. God, in His great providence, is ever present with His aid. Today, maybe, a man lacks faith and turns aside into error; tomorrow, perhaps, illumined by God's light, he may indeed embrace the truth.

Catholics who, in order to achieve some external good, collaborate with unbelievers or with those who through error lack the fullness of faith in Christ, may possibly provide the occasion or even the incentive for their conversion to the truth.\(^{129}\)

Our very nature causes us to seek the truth. Catholics are expected to know their faith and when occasions arise convey the truth of their faith.

Paragraphs one-hundred fifty-nine and one-hundred sixty are sub-titled *Philosophies and Historical Movements*. Unless Catholics are catechized in the basics of their faith, they could face a struggle with faith as they encounter a world that moves quickly and offers competing philosophies. *Pacem in Terris* reemphasizes “the clear distinction between a false philosophy of nature, origin and purpose of men and the

world, and economic, social, cultural, and political undertakings, even when such undertakings draw their origin and inspiration from that philosophy.\footnote{Pope John XXIII, \textit{Pacem in Terris}, April 11, 1963, (accessed 1 January 2010), paragraph 159; available from \url{http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_xxiii/encyclicals/documents/hf_jxxiii_enc_11041963_pacem_en.html}; Internet.} The encyclical does not deny that there may be good elements that conform to right reason. We must exercise prudence in such matters. The decision rests with Catholics who must engage in a leading role in the community.

They must, however, act in accordance with the principles of the natural law, and observe the Church's social teaching and the directives of ecclesiastical authority. For it must not be forgotten that the Church has the right and duty not only to safeguard her teaching on faith and morals, but also to exercise her authority over her sons by intervening in their external affairs whenever a judgment has to be made concerning the practical application of this teaching.\footnote{Pope John XXIII, \textit{Pacem in Terris}, April 11, 1963, paragraph 160, (accessed 1 January 2010), p. 456; cf. Leo XIII's encyclical epistle \textit{Immortale Dei}, \textit{Acta Leonis XIII}, V, 1885, p. 128; Pius XI's encyclical letter \textit{Ubi arcano}, AAS 14 (1922) 698; and Pius XII's address to the Union of International Sodalities of Catholic Women, Rome, Sept. 11, 1947, AAS 39 (1947) 486. AAS 39 (1947) 486. ; available from \url{http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_xxiii/encyclicals/documents/hf_jxxiii_enc_11041963_pacem_en.html}; Internet.}

\textit{Pacem in Terris} encourages gradual reform of the system in which we live and work. The encyclical recognizes that there are those who burn with desire to bring about change even to the point of political revolution. The Church continues to preach the Gospel, and will intervene when necessary to safeguard Church teaching and morals.

In the section \textit{Little by Little}, this part of our task is of immense importance. It is by establishing new relationships and opening communication with others that we are “able to bring about true peace in accordance with divinely established order.”\footnote{Pope John XXIII, \textit{Pacem in Terris}, April 11, 1963, (accessed 1 January 2010), paragraph 163; available from \url{http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_xxiii/encyclicals/documents/hf_jxxiii_enc_11041963_pacem_en.html}; Internet.} All who know Christ must be a point of light in the world. Everyone must know and
preserve the order that God has ordained. *Pacem in Terris* then poses this question from St. Augustine:

That is why St. Augustine asks the question: "Does your mind desire the strength to gain the mastery over your passions? Let it submit to a greater power, and it will conquer all beneath it. And peace will be in you—true, sure, most ordered peace. What is that order? God as ruler of the mind; the mind as ruler of the body. Nothing could be more orderly."\(^1\)

*Pacem in Terris* expands upon this point from St. Augustine in paragraph one-hundred sixty-two. As *Pacem in Terris* as stated from the introduction, the source of order is God—the Creator. As such, we must proceed cautiously. To move rashly or by inflaming others only invites destruction and not development that will lead to reconciliation.

We would remind such people that it is the law of nature that all things must be of gradual growth. If there is to be any improvement in human institutions, the work must be done slowly and deliberately from within. Pope Pius XII expressed it in these terms: "Salvation and justice consist not in the uprooting of an outdated system, but in a well-designed policy of development. Hotheadedness was never constructive; it has always destroyed everything. It has inflamed passions, but never assuaged them. It sows no seeds but those of hatred and destruction. Far from bringing about the reconciliation of contending parties, it reduces men and political parties to the necessity of laboriously redoing the work of the past, building on the ruins that disharmony has left in its wake."\(^2\)

The law of nature is the way to positive development in society. It is necessary to arrive at a consensus and build for the future and not repeat the mistakes of the past.


Paragraphs one-hundred sixty-three through one-hundred sixty-five are sub-titled *An Immense Task*. The task is immense because it is complex and there are too few to shoulder the responsibility in its leadership.

We must include the task of establishing new relationships in human society, under the mastery and guidance of truth, justice, charity and freedom—relations between individual citizens, between citizens and their respective States, between States, and finally between individuals, families, intermediate associations and States on the one hand, and the world community on the other.\(^{135}\)

*Pacem in Terris* has linked all levels of society together in the immense task—from the individual to the nation, all are involved creating new relationships for the betterment of a society that is more interconnected with each passing year.

Paragraphs one-hundred sixty-six through one-hundred seventy-two are sub-titled *The Prince of Peace* and bring *Pacem in Terris* to conclusion. The encyclical has been focused on the problems facing humanity in the present time.

Our concern here has been with problems which are causing men extreme anxiety at the present time; problems which are intimately bound up with the progress of human society. Unquestionably, the teaching We have given has been inspired by a longing which We feel most keenly, and which We know is shared by all men of good will: that peace may be assured on earth.\(^{136}\)

The goal of *Pacem in Terris* is that society work towards a lasting peace. This is inspired by a longing which is felt most keenly that peace may be assured on earth:

We who, in spite of Our inadequacy, are nevertheless the vicar of Him whom the prophet announced as the Prince of Peace,\(^{137}\) conceive of it as

---


Our duty to devote all Our thoughts and care and energy to further this common good of all mankind. Yet peace is but an empty word, if it does not rest upon that order which Our hope prevailed upon Us to set forth in outline in this encyclical. It is an order that is founded on truth, built up on justice, nurtured and animated by charity, and brought into effect under the auspices of freedom.\(^\text{138}\)

Humanity cannot do this alone. Any hope of achieving peace must be done with the help of God. We must pray bringing with us our petitions for peace on earth:

The sacred liturgy of these days reechoes the same message: "Our Lord Jesus Christ, after His resurrection stood in the midst of His disciples and said: Peace be upon you, alleluia. The disciples rejoiced when they saw the Lord."\(^\text{139}\) It is Christ, therefore, who brought us peace; Christ who bequeathed it to us: "Peace I leave with you: my peace I give unto you: not as the world giveth, do I give unto you."\(^\text{140}\)

\textit{Pacem in Terris} concludes with prayer appealing to the redeemer of humanity.

Let us, then, pray with all fervor for this peace which our divine Redeemer came to bring us. May He banish from the souls of men whatever might endanger peace. May He transform all men into witnesses of truth, justice and brotherly love. May He illumine with His light the minds of rulers, so that, besides caring for the proper material welfare of their peoples, they may also guarantee them the fairest gift of peace. Finally, may Christ inflame the desires of all men to break through the barriers which divide them, to strengthen the bonds of mutual love, to learn to understand one another, and to pardon those who have done them wrong. Through His power and inspiration may all peoples welcome each other to their hearts as brothers, and may the peace they long for ever flower and ever reign among them.\(^\text{141}\)

In conclusion, \textit{Pacem in Terris} states that “all peoples welcome each other to their hearts as brothers, and may the peace they long for ever flower and ever reign among


\(^{141}\) Ibid., paragraph 171.
them.” Pacem in Terris concludes as it began, addressed “to all men of goodwill, the Apostolic blessing, health and prosperity.”

Pacem in Terris and the World

Pope John XXIII spoke consistently on peace and human rights. His pontificate marked the beginning of Vatican diplomacy with the Soviet Union and the countries behind the Iron Curtain. The pressure on the Church when it operated under the totalitarian regimes such as Nazism and Communism was formidable, as the Vatican sought to fill its ecclesial duties to countries during World War II and in the Cold War behind the Iron Curtain. Under these regimes it was largely prevented from doing so, as bishops were imprisoned or sought refuge in Western embassies. During the Cold War the Kremlin understood the power of the “papal army” in the citizens who lived in Eastern Europe behind the Iron Curtain, particularly in Poland. Despite its attempts to suppress the Church, the Soviet Union was never completely successful. When Eastern Europe fell under the domination of the Soviet Union in 1945, the Church had to preserve the faith and advance the cause of peace and freedom.

Today the Cold War is receding into history. The struggle to preserve the faith, much less identify it in a struggle of peace and freedom is history. In a world divided between freedom and totalitarianism the concept of natural law must be communicated to the faithful and to the world and be renewed. It is recognized by anyone familiar with the prophets of the Old Testament or the letters of Saint Paul. This encyclical is a


143 Ibid., paragraph 172.
reminder to the faithful that their mission is to seek peace. Pope John XXIII used his papacy to educate the world about the Church and its engagement with the modern world.

But the mischief is often caused by erroneous opinions. Many people think that the laws which govern man's relations with the State are the same as those which regulate the blind, elemental forces of the universe. But it is not so; the laws which govern men are quite different. The Father of the universe has inscribed them in man's nature, and that is where we must look for them; there and nowhere else.\textsuperscript{144}

This statement to the world is explicitly about order. It begins at the most basic level—the individual. The individual brings together key components that are unique to humanity—intelligence, and free will, from which are derived rights and duties, which are universal and are a part of human nature. *Pacem in Terris* expresses support for those systems that uphold the dignity of the person. Economic systems as well as the political structures of democracy and communism are flawed. Often society fails to uphold the dignity and rights of people. It is the formation of conscience of those who live and work within it that underscores the success or failure of the system. Dignity in work can be found in either system. The people must address the flaws in their respective systems and address those concerns that impede a lasting peace.

The shortcomings of the American economic system must be examined in this light. America in the early 1960's was coming to grips with inequality, with civil rights reaching a watershed moment. Some Americans reading *Pacem in Terris* would equate the struggle for civil rights in the African–American community with the message of equality for all people as stated in the section *The Treatment of Minorities* (100-102). The struggle for equality and safe working conditions for migrant farmers in America

falls under this teaching of *Pacem in Terris*. Will those who are handicapped, whether physically or mentally, be accorded their rights to a life that is whole? We would immediately recognize its language as relating to decolonization in Africa and Asia that was occurring during this time. Concern for minorities in those newly formed countries is evident, but the words apply equally to the situation in America—a nation out of which many cultures thrive. The encyclical should also be read in the light of the massive dislocation of peoples during and after World War II. In the post-war world borders were redrawn, and millions were forced to relocate. The same recognition of rights must be afforded to minorities in America as well as newly independent countries if there is to be peace as stated in paragraph ninety-six of *Pacem in Terris*.

Indeed, the best interests of justice are served by those public authorities who do all they can to improve the human conditions of the members of these minority groups, especially in what concerns their language, culture, ancient traditions, and their economic activity and enterprise.\(^\text{145}\)

The Church articulates a vision of peace that is universal and encompasses all peoples. Pope John brought a vision to the papacy that reinforced and renewed the Church in the role as the advocate of peace and human rights. The message of the encyclical is clear: peace on earth encompasses the whole human family and the right to dignity and freedom to live without fear.

**Nuclear Weapons and Human Rights**

*Pacem in Terris* was motivated by the political situation of the world— and the threat of destruction by nuclear war. Conflict using nuclear weapons is the ultimate

violation of human rights. Nuclear weapons inflict massive suffering and death and do nothing to secure the peace. The twentieth century saw the battlefield expand to the civilian populace. No longer confined to an isolated region, whole populations were now under the threat of war. Weapons employing biological or chemical means could cause widespread disease and poisoning. During World War II, prior to the atomic bombing of Japan, biological or chemical weapons were not employed by the nations at war.

A nuclear exchange, even a regional one, affects a much wider area than the battlefield. We would all feel its effect. The fallout would be both physical and psychological. For millions in the immediate war zone, death, physical side effects and psychological trauma would follow. The immediate war zone would suffer the effects of displaced persons and refugees and over days and weeks that followed illness and death from radiation poisoning. The environment in the 18 years since 1945 was poisoned from the radioactive fallout of nuclear testing. *Pacem in Terris* calls for the elimination of nuclear weapons. Between 1946 and 1963, some 261 atmospheric tests were conducted by the United States.\(^{146}\) It is a document that is at odds with the doctrine of *Mutual Assured Destruction* (MAD) that would be embraced in the years that followed. Even if used as a deterrent, testing of such weapons still brought the world a step closer to thinking about their usability.

Moreover, even though the monstrous power of modern weapons does indeed act as a deterrent, there is reason to fear that the very testing of nuclear devices for war purposes can, if continued, lead to serious danger for various forms of life on earth.\(^{147}\)

---

\(^{146}\) The website referenced is linked to a non-profit called EnviroLink Network and contains various links to the subject matter, (accessed on June 25, 2010) available from http://nuclearweaponarchive.org/Usa/Tests; Internet.

 Spending resources and dollars on nuclear arms and their maintenance violates human rights by draining resources from society. Once multiple nations had nuclear weapons, was it realistic to think that any or all would give them up? The testing of nuclear devices leads to refinement and upgrades to these weapons. Pope John immediately called for a cessation to the arms race and banning of nuclear weapons.

Hence justice, right reason, and the recognition of man's dignity cry out insistentely for a cessation to the arms race. The stock-piles of armaments which have been built up in various countries must be reduced all round and simultaneously by the parties concerned. Nuclear weapons must be banned. A general agreement must be reached on a suitable disarmament program, with an effective system of mutual control.\textsuperscript{148}

*Pacem in Terris* incorporates the rights of humanity with the goal of peace, encompasses condemning nuclear arms, and links the arms race to human rights. A logical step is to redirect national resources from an arms race to providing assistance to underdeveloped countries. Technology has also made conventional weapons more horrifying and deadly. Conventional bombs known as “daisy-cutters” weigh 15,000 pounds and are employed to clear the battlefield of enemy troops (and anything else). Its descendant is the “Mother of all Bombs” (MOAB) which is a large-yield conventional bomb weighing some 22,600 thousand pounds. These conventional weapons cause death and suffering only without radiation.

The national security policy that evolved later in the decade was referred to as *mutual assured destruction*, or MAD. A strategy with the acronym MAD is the ultimate understatement for the production of arms in the nuclear age. Even with the end of the

Cold War, it can be argued that still today we live under this policy. The Cold War scenario has changed but we still have weapons that are stockpiled and useless.

Throughout much of the Cold War, U.S. declaratory policy (i.e., what policymakers said in public) closely approximated mad (mutual assured destruction). The view, most clearly articulated by then Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara, was that there was little utility in adding strategic weapons above those needed for mad, [sic] that nuclear superiority was meaningless, that defense was useless, and that this bizarre configuration was in everyone's interest.149

The presence of nuclear weapons is an item in the defense budget that for the foreseeable future will not go away. There is constant research and development towards the next generation of weapons, and there is the maintenance associated with weapons.150 Humanity will continue to divert resources to the development of nuclear weapons. The history of the Cold War has shown that nuclear weapons did not stop proxy wars between the superpowers as in Korea and Vietnam or the continuous struggle of both superpowers to supply arms to low level conflicts throughout the world. Nuclear weapons did not curtail human rights abuses in Central America, or prevent the invasion by the Soviet Union of Afghanistan, submitting that country to a guarantee of decades of continuous strife.

We can easily get caught up in the numbers associated with megatonnage and how much radiation will pollute the atmosphere. The nuclear threat thus becomes an

150 The Soviet Union tested its first atomic bomb in August 1949. Britain followed in October 1952, France in 1960, China in 1964, India in 1974, and Pakistan in May 1998. Every test was successful, and Israel and South Africa confidently built nuclear arsenals during the same period without testing at full yield. Yugoslavia, Sweden, Australia, Norway, Taiwan, South Korea, Indonesia, Turkey, Greece, Romania, Libya, Canada, Brazil, Argentina, and Switzerland interrupted weapons-development programs under diplomatic pressure. Richard Rhoades, Arsenals of Folly,
existential threat and humanity runs the risks of losing sight of the nuclear threat. It is easy to lose sight of *Pacem in Terris* as a spiritual document. It is a document to guide the spirit in a world made terrifying even by the thought of additional nations acquiring such weapons. As a document, it conveyed to the world that it recognized that efforts were underway in the secular realm as well. It makes a point to draw attention to the United Nations and the work it was undertaking in regard to human rights.

The Church is carrying out its mission as Jacques Maritain wrote in July 1939 in the journal, *Foreign Affairs*. He foresaw the role of the Church as it took shape in the second half of the twentieth century:

> It is the Gospel and the Church which have taught men respect for the human person and human life, respect for conscience, respect for poverty, the dignity of woman, the sanctity of marriage, the nobility of work, the value of freedom, the infinite worth of each soul, the essential quality of human beings of our race and condition before God. In affirming that political, economic, social and international life depends on morality just as individual, life does, and that neither peace nor prosperity is possible among men without just and equity, the Church attempts to strengthen the foundations of all human progress. In our times we see the Church responding to new needs by new undertakings on a large scale.\[^{151}\]

**Conclusion**

In this overview of *Pacem in Terris*, Pope John XXIII’s motives were his determination to move the Church into the forefront of human rights and peace. The Nuclear Age was unlike any before. Would an arms race lead to the next world war? Could politicians and military leaders speak almost casually of using atomic weapons in conflict? Getting used to the idea of nuclear arms is not in the best interests of humanity—as research and development continued, refinements of these weapons would

---

make their use in a limited or tactical role thinkable. Of graver concern is that other weapons of mass destruction—biological and chemical—are thinkable. They have not been used since World War I, but were used in the Iraq-Iran war in 1988. As technology progresses we may only see refinement in such weapons.

Nuclear weapons are the ultimate weapon devised by humanity. Can we compare the damage of nuclear weapons to that of civil war that lasts for decades, or genocide? Other forms of warfare over time can claim as many, if not more lives than a limited nuclear exchange. However once humanity crosses the threshold of using nuclear weapons again, what will be gained? Do nations today want to be in the same category as the United States for using such weapons against another? For all the rhetoric from the Cold War to today, reckless leaders do nothing to calm tensions that could lead to a misunderstanding and a more dangerous situation. Weapons of mass destruction take humanity to a new level of suffering. These weapons are the new face of war as symbolized by the mushroom cloud. The introductory words of *Pacem in Terris* immediately tell us the answer for true peace on earth.

> Peace on Earth—which man throughout the ages has so longed for and sought after—can never be established, never guaranteed, except by the diligent observance of the divinely established order.\(^{152}\)

The peace Pope John reminds the world of is the peace that is transcendent from God. *Pacem in Terris* renews and reinforces the Church’s commitment to peace and human rights. The encyclical presents the relationship of God to the human order. We can see our relationship as individuals to society and government and then nation to nation. *Pacem in Terris* reminds us that the peace of man is not perfect. It cannot last, as

---

long as we ignore the law of nature and the Creator from whom order is established.

*Pacem in Terris* serves to guide the Church in an age that presented challenges unparalleled in human history. It is still relevant in the twenty-first century and serves as a touchstone for the people of God in a world that will undoubtedly present new challenges to peace.
CHAPTER III
PRESIDENT KENNEDY’S COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS AT AMERICAN UNIVERSITY

Introduction

_Pacem in Terris_ and President Kennedy’s _Strategy for Peace_ complement each other in conveying the message of peace. The encyclical is a detailed document meant to be read. It gives us an overview of the path to peace for humanity in the modern world. As a theological document it gives us a spiritual context for achieving peace. The encyclical brings into public discourse Catholic social teaching, order in creation, human rights, values, faith, and relationships at all levels and is the framework for building peace in the nuclear age. As a speech, _A Strategy for Peace_ is much shorter, but we can view President Kennedy’s speech in the context of _Pacem in Terris_. Just as Pope John spoke of peace in many addresses prior to and after becoming pope, so did President Kennedy. As a senator he spoke out on disarmament.\(^\text{153}\) His approach has to be viewed in terms of political reality. _Pacem in Terris_ calls no one nation or political system by name, but the American perspective of peace is focused on the survival of a free and

democratic system of government. In his 1963 State of the Union address President Kennedy stated:

For we seek not the worldwide victory of one nation or system but a worldwide victory of man. The modern globe is too small, its weapons are too destructive, and its disorders are too contagious to permit any other kind of victory.  

To achieve this victory President Kennedy increased the defense budget during his time in office. The debate about defense spending is an aside to this thesis, but certainly must be touched upon. While a president sets his budget based on his administration’s priorities, Congressional input to the budget process has a huge impact as well.

President Kennedy’s challenge was to balance peace and war. He had to strike a balance with national defense priorities that would ensure peace and deter war. A *Strategy for Peace* does not stand isolated as a break in policy. It stands next to President Eisenhower’s farewell address warning the nation about the military-industry complex. It also stands alongside *Chance for Peace*, a speech President Eisenhower gave in 1953, in which he stated:

> Every gun that is made, every warship launched, every rocket fired signifies, in the final sense, a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and are not clothed. This world in arms is not spending money alone. It is spending the sweat of its laborers, the genius of its scientists, the hopes of its children. The cost of one modern heavy bomber is this: a modern brick school in more than 30 cities. It is two electric power plants, each serving a town of 60,000 population. It is two fine, fully equipped hospitals. It is some 50 miles of concrete highway. We pay for a single fighter with a half million bushels of wheat. We pay for a single destroyer with new homes that could have housed more than 8,000 people.

> This, I repeat, is the best way of life to be found on the road the world has been taking.

---

This is not a way of life at all, in any true sense. Under the cloud of threatening war, it is humanity hanging from a cross of iron. These plain and cruel truths define the peril and point to the hope that comes with this spring of 1953.

This is one of those times in the affairs of nations when the gravest choices must be made, if there is to be a turning toward a just and lasting peace. It is a moment that calls upon the governments of the world to speak their intentions with simplicity and with honesty. It calls upon them to answer the questions that stirs the hearts of all sane men: is there no other way the world may live?\textsuperscript{155}

President Kennedy maintained a continuation of policy passed from President Eisenhower. The speech given by President Eisenhower in 1953 was given by a career military man who achieved the second highest rank—that of a General of the Army, a five star rank.\textsuperscript{156} The two presidents gave bold speeches on peace. A key difference is the location of each in his time. President Kennedy, younger and with much less experience than Eisenhower risked more politically in what could be seen as an “extreme” approach to policy. He took what was perceived to be a bold step towards finding a way to reach an accommodation in a world more dangerous than at any time in human history.

Unleashing the power of the atom changed forever humanity’s perception of what defined power. Political and military power was redefined as nuclear weapons, and it changed the balance of power between nations. Scientifically the power of the atom could be used for peaceful purposes such as for use in medicine, and providing an alternative source of energy. The ability to reason and apply natural law to the human situation was now more critical than at any time. From the vantage point of 1963, the


\textsuperscript{156} Only a five people have achieved this rank: George Marshall, Douglas MacArthur, Dwight D. Eisenhower, Henry H. Arnold, and Omar Bradley. General of the Armies is the highest rank and has only been conferred on two men: George Washington and John J. Pershing. Currently no one holds either of these ranks which have been traditionally reserved for wartime. Found at: http://www.history.army.mil/faq/faq-5star.htm; (accessed on 12 October 2010), Internet.
future would only become a more challenging environment in which to confront the destructive force of nuclear power. A *Strategy for Peace* stands out as the beginning of the policy that we know as détente; the relaxing of tensions between the United States and the Soviet Union. It is a bold step to secure the future and build a consensus among nations that the nuclear age can be a peaceful one, but the threat to humanity must be answered with a unified voice of reason.

On June 10, 1963, President Kennedy addressed the graduates of American University in Washington D.C. The *Commencement Address at American University* is also known as “*A Strategy for Peace*” is President Kennedy’s peace speech. Written only two months after the release of *Pacem in Terris*, and delivered just a week after the death of Pope John XXIII on June 3rd, the address brought into statecraft key points made by *Pacem in Terris*. After his opening remarks to the university he announced the topic to be discussed—world peace. The United States during the Kennedy Administration was confronted by the Civil Rights Movement, security for Western Europe, the Bay of Pigs, confrontation over Berlin, and the Cuban missile crisis. These challenges had implications for the country in its relatively new role as a superpower. These crises tested the credibility of JFK and revealed his strategy for moving the country in a direction that would produce a new attitude towards the Soviet Union. President Kennedy’s vision for America’s role as the dominate power in the West moved the nation beyond the projection of military power. At this time there was no formal arms agreement between America and the Soviet Union. With Executive Order 10924, President Kennedy established the Peace Corps on March 1, 1961. He intended to show that America would be a catalyst for changing attitudes resulting in the lessening of
tension and laying the foundation for peace in the Nuclear Age. The Peace Corps was one way to reach out to the developing world, with Americans taking their talents overseas and working directly with people through agricultural, business, health and other projects.

President Kennedy commented on *Pacem in Terris* in remarks delivered at Boston College on April 20, 1963 on its centennial.

I speak of universities because that is what Boston College has long since become. But most of what I say applies to liberal arts colleges as well. My theme is not limited to any one class of universities, public or private, religious or secular. Our national tradition of variety in higher education shows no sign of weakening, and it remains the task of each of our institutions to shape its own role among its differing sister.

In this hope I am much encouraged by a reading in this last week of the remarkable encyclical, *"Pacem in Terris."* In its penetrating analysis of today's great problems, of social welfare and human rights, of disarmament and international order and peace, that document surely shows that on the basis of one great faith and its traditions there can be developed counsel on public affairs that is of value to all men and women of good will. As a Catholic I am proud of it; and as an American I have learned from it. It only adds to the impact of this message that it closely matches notable expressions of conviction and aspiration from churchmen of other faiths, as in recent documents of the World Council of Churches, and from outstanding world citizens with no ecclesiastical standing. We are learning to talk the language of progress and peace across the barriers of sect and creed. It seems reasonable to hope that a similar process may be taking place across the quite different barriers of higher learning.\(^{157}\)

The New York Times reported on Kennedy’s remarks as praise for the encyclical and reported on the topic of the speech. President Kennedy wove within his speech how the university would play a role in the world. His words noted that Boston College was founded in 1863 during the American Civil War in a struggle to see if the nation would remain half-slave and half free: “Now the nation is faced, Mr. Kennedy said, with the

question whether “the world will be half-slave and half-free.” “In a world growing smaller and more closely knit, he said, “cultures not our own press for understanding; crises we did not create require our participation; accelerating change is the one universal human prospect. The universities must help.”

*The Commencement Address at American University* conveyed a message that President Kennedy meant to make this a turning point in the Cold War. After years of confrontation beginning with the Berlin crisis in 1958, a solution had to be found that would lessen tension between the United States and Soviet Union. This led both superpowers to assess where these events were ultimately leading. Unique to preparation of the president’s speech, was that the text was not widely vetted through normal government channels, such as the State and Defense Departments. Normally, senior policy makers would have input as to how a speech would impact policy and even set its tone. President Kennedy returned from Hawaii early the same morning that he delivered the commencement address, which may have further limited senior officials from having input to its’ content.

The text was crafted by Theodore Sorensen, Kennedy’s chief speech writer who had worked with him since 1953, when Kennedy was elected to the senate. Sorensen’s background brought a unique perspective to the preparation of such a provocative speech. He is a Unitarian who happens to hold pacifist beliefs. In 1946 when he turned eighteen, the confidant of President Kennedy wrote a “statement of position” to his local draft

---

board in Lincoln, Nebraska when he applied for noncombatant service as a conscientious objector:

I am a Unitarian… [And I was] taught that every man is my brother, every man has within him the spark of the divine, every man bears this relationship to the totality called God. Thus it is I could kill no man…So it is I am what is called a pacifist—what Jesus called a peace maker.  

Sorenson’s commitment to his position as a conscientious objector did not negatively impact his relationship with President Kennedy. His stance as a conscientious objector was noticed by a reporter in 1961 as he transitioned to his role as Counselor to the President. His beliefs during this time even gained the attention of Senator Barry Goldwater. Sorenson’s beliefs may have become a distraction for Kennedy but the issue faded after the director of the Selective Service System in Nebraska issued a supportive statement in regard to Sorensen’s conscientious objector status. While drafting the Houston Ministers’ Association speech in September 1960, Sorenson touched on some aspects of his relationship with the future President in his autobiography.

En route to Texas on his campaign plane, as we worked side by side on the final draft of that speech, he laughingly asked whether my years of involvement in this issue on his behalf, my contacts with Catholic clergyman and reading of papal encyclicals, had influenced me: “Is any of my Catholicism rubbing off on you?” “No,” I replied, “but I think some of my Unitarianism is rubbing off on you.” Many of the speeches that I drafted reflect Unitarian principles.

In his preparation for the speech Kennedy limited the preparation to a small circle of advisors: Ted Sorensen, National Security Advisor McGeorge Bundy, Walt Rostow, Bundy’s deputy, Special Assistant to the President, Arthur Schlesinger, Deputy Special

---

160 Ibid, 77. As the Democratic nominee, the speech to the Houston Ministerʼs Association delivered on September 12, 1960 was Kennedy’s “religion” speech defining his faith as private and that it would not influence his public service.
Assistant for National Security Carl Kaysen, and Thomas Sorensen (Ted Sorensen’s brother) who was a deputy director at the United States Information Agency. The Secretaries of State and Defense Dean Rusk and Robert McNamara, as well as the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs were not informed of the speech until June 8th. By then Kennedy had left on a speaking tour that would take him to Honolulu, returning to Washington D.C. on the morning of the 10th. The *Commencement Address at American University* from draft to presentation offers insight into Kennedy’s views on peace without being filtered through the bureaucracy.

**A Chosen Place**

President Kennedy gave the commencement address at American University in Washington D.C. on June 10, 1963. American University is dedicated to the study of public affairs. The mission of American University and its location of Washington D.C. made this an ideal setting for a major foreign policy speech. President Kennedy’s opening remarks pay homage to the place and meaning of the university. His opening remarks focus on the sponsorship of American University by the Methodist Church and Woodrow Wilson’s participation in its dedication in 1914. He quoted Wilson saying “that every man sent out from a university should be a man of his nation as well as a man of his time.” He linked President Wilson’s quote to the present day graduates saying, “and I am confident that the “men” and “women” will give from their lives, from their talents, a high measure of public service and public support.” He quoted the British Poet Laureate John Masefield’s tribute to English universities, not meaning their physical attributes saying, “It was a place where those who hate ignorance may strive to know,

---

162 President Kennedy spoke at the centennial of Boston College on April 20, 1963. His remarks spoke to the importance of the university in preparing the nation for the future.
where those who perceive truth may strive to make others see.” The president introduced his vision as “a topic on which ignorance too often abounds and the truth is too rarely perceived—yet it is the most important topic on earth: world peace.” This introductory statement links the graduates to a life of public service that will serve the cause of peace. President Kennedy outlined his vision of that peace after his introductory remarks.

What kind of peace do I mean? What kind of peace do we seek? Not a Pax Americana enforced on the world by American weapons of war. Not the peace of the grave or the security of the slave. I am talking about genuine peace, the kind of peace that makes life on earth worth living, the kind that enables men and nations to grow and to hope and to build a better life for their children--not merely peace for Americans but peace for all men and women--not merely peace in our time but peace for all time.164

President Kennedy’s speech was delivered just two months after the release of Pacem in Terris, and builds on the change in the political climate that he and Pope John sought. The year 1963 became a turning point after the Berlin Crisis and the Cuban Missile Crisis and is the beginning of détente; the relaxing of tensions between the superpowers. The publication of Pacem in Terris, and the Commencement Address at American University signaled that the time was right to change the course and move towards reducing tensions and move towards peace.

The New Face of War Requires New Attitudes

President Kennedy examines attitudes that are necessary for peace. This was for an audience that was both foreign and domestic; he needed to appear conciliatory, yet


firm at the same time. He opened by saying that he did not want a “Pax Americana
enforced on the world by American weapons of war”, which clearly appealed to a foreign
audience. This a clear reference to the Roman Empire, and the idea of enforcing a “Pax
Romana” was not what Kennedy envisioned as America’s role in the world. His words
describe the kind of peace he is speaking of “as the necessary rational end of rational
men.” He is realistic that the pursuit of peace as opposed to the pursuit of war is an uphill
pursuit, and that the words of the peace seeker fall on deaf ears. The task is urgent.

The new face of war is nuclear war and President Kennedy recognized this as
total war. Nuclear war is the ultimate and final war to be waged. The image is that of the
intercontinental ballistic missile, the bomber on alert, and the nuclear submarine; armed
and ready to launch at a moment’s notice. Nuclear war involves all of humanity, whether
as a direct combatant, or civilian; all are subjected to fallout around the globe. President
Kennedy spoke directly to the cost of staying prepared for a possible nuclear
confrontation.

Today the expenditure of billions of dollars every year on weapons
acquired for the purpose of making sure we never need to use them is
essential to keeping the peace. But surely the acquisition of such idle
stockpiles—which can only destroy and never create—is not the only, much
less the most efficient, means of assuring peace. 165

To put this in perspective, President Kennedy’s defense budget for the fiscal year
of 1963 in current dollars was 52.1 billion dollars. This equates to 297.1 billion in 2009
dollars and is about 9% of the Gross Domestic Product (GDP). The Fiscal Year 2011

165 The Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments: Federal budget figures for 1961-1963 in
budget would have come in July 1961, since the FY 1961 budget was in effect from July 1, 1960 through
over FY 1961, (accessed on August 1, 2011), available from
defense budget is projected to be a total of 712 billion dollars. Defense spending as a total of the GDP is projected to be 4.8% in the FY 2011 budget request.\textsuperscript{166}

Defense budgets that pay for the stockpiles of idle weapons that “can destroy and never create” are not an efficient way to peace. Clearly the president is aware of the dichotomy of pursuing peace while increasing the defense budget. A logical conclusion to an arms race would be war. If this logic is accepted than the outcome of stockpiling nuclear weapons would be war. The missile crisis in the Caribbean that had just passed eight months prior gives this speech its sense of urgency in the pursuit of peace.

I speak of peace, therefore, as the necessary rational end of rational men. I realize that the pursuit of peace is not as dramatic as the pursuit of war-- and frequently the words of the pursuer fall on deaf ears. But we have no more urgent task.\textsuperscript{167}

President Kennedy directly addresses attitudes of humanity towards peace. His words to the domestic audience could be interpreted as taking a hard line approach to the Soviets. However, immediately in the next sentence he addresses the nation to examine its own attitudes as individuals and as a nation.

Some say that it is useless to speak of world peace or world law or world disarmament--and that it will be useless until the leaders of the Soviet Union adopt a more enlightened attitude. I hope they do. I believe we can help them do it. But I also believe that we must reexamine our own attitude--as individuals and as a Nation--for our attitude is as essential as theirs. And every graduate of this school, every thoughtful citizen who

\textsuperscript{166} From the executive summary of The Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessment: The Obama Administration’s FY 2011 budget request includes a total of $712 billion for the Department of Defense (DoD). The base budget for the Department includes $549 billion in discretionary funding and $4 billion in mandatory funding. An additional $159 billion is requested for the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq. The budget also requests $19 billion for defense-related atomic energy programs, $8 billion for defense-related activities in other agencies, and $122 billion for veterans. Together these expenses total $861 billion, or 22 percent of the total federal budget. Pg V., (accessed on August 1, 2011), available from http://www.csbaonline.org/4Publications/PubLibrary/R.20100629.Analysis of the FY/R.20100629.Analysis of the FY.pdf; Internet.

despairs of war and wishes to bring peace, should begin by looking inward--by examining his own attitude toward the possibilities of peace, toward the Soviet Union, toward the course of the cold war and toward freedom and peace here at home.\textsuperscript{168}

In mid-1963, such words bring balance to the rhetoric of war that had pervaded over the past year of 1962. The statement could be seen as condescending towards the Soviets, while at the same time focusing on Americans to look at their own perceptions of the world. It is a delicate balance to bring the same message to both audiences so that each will hear the same message. The president’s leadership, tested in recent crises can now say what in the previous year would have made him appear weak to his domestic audience. He challenges Americans to look inward and examine their attitude.

The presidents’ words are backed up, in the political world, by defense budgets that are not shrinking. If we think that peace is unattainable, we conclude that war is inevitable; and we are gripped by forces we cannot control. The president is presenting himself as a man of peace who cannot be a prophet standing on the outside, for he is the commander-in-chief as well. The president’s message may seem prophetic or have prophetic overtones, but in a secular world his words will be seen in the context of policy. As a public figure who has taken an oath, he carries the weight of his office. He must balance the security of the nation while at the same time avoid an escalation in an arms race. The President responds with how he sees the way to peace by rising above defeatist attitudes. This is a call to Americans to examine their interior selves.

First: Let us examine our attitude toward peace itself. Too many of us think it is impossible. Too many think it unreal. But that is a dangerous, defeatist belief. It leads to the conclusion that war is inevitable--that mankind is doomed--that we are gripped by forces we cannot control.

\textsuperscript{168} President John F. Kennedy the Commencement Address at American University, (accessed on May 5, 2010), available from. http://www.jfklibrary.org/Asset-Viewer/Archives/JFKPOF-045-002.aspx; Internet
We need not accept that view. Our problems are manmade—therefore, they
can be solved by man. And man can be as big as he wants. No problem of
human destiny is beyond human beings. Man's reason and spirit have
often solved the seemingly unsolvable—and we believe they can do it
again.169

President Kennedy defines a realistic approach to peace. As a leader he puts
peace within reach of everyone. The problems of the cold war, poverty, and
homelessness are all manmade. They can be solved by man. These are social justice
issues and the solutions are reachable and practical. Pacem in Terris lays before the
reader the framework of social justice. President Kennedy appeals to humanity’s reason
and spirit to solve again what has often seemed unsolvable.

Often we think of the peacemakers as the radicals on the fringe of our community.
They are in the protest march, possibly being cited for trespass or even jailed. The
peacemaker is too often seen as outside the mainstream, but the peacemaker should not
be easily characterized as an outsider. The peacemaker who holds society accountable
for its actions is often seen as the protester, the one who is willing to be arrested for his or
her actions. Peacemaking and building peace doesn’t exist in any one walk of life, but
must include anyone willing to contribute to it in their way. The president laid out his
parameters for peacemaking and defined a pragmatic and realistic approach for his role in
the world.

I am not referring to the absolute, infinite concept of peace and good will
of which some fantasies and fanatics dream.” I do not deny the value of
hopes and dreams but we merely invite discouragement and incredulity by
making that our only goal.”170

---

169 President John F. Kennedy the Commencement Address at American University, (accessed on
Internet

170 President John F. Kennedy the Commencement Address at American University, (accessed on
Internet.
The president is speaking to a secular audience so we must interpret his words broadly. They do not criticize any particular way of thinking, religious or secular when “dreaming of peace.” He is grounding his statements in realistic terms.

During the presidential campaign of 1960, presidential candidate Senator Kennedy framed his view of how peace could be secured in the environment of the Cold War. The prospect for peace rested on the ability to be ready to defend the nation. In the political world, Kennedy defined his view of peace as one cannot negotiate from a position of weakness.

Winston Churchill said: "We arm - to parley." We prepare for war - in order to deter war. We depend on the strength of armaments - to enable us to bargain for disarmament. We compare our military strength with the Soviets - not to determine whether we should use it - but to determine whether we can persuade them that to use theirs would be futile and disastrous - and to determine whether we can back up our own pledges in Berlin, Formosa and around the world.

In short, peace, not politics, is at the heart of the current debate - peace, not war is the objective of our military policy. But peace would have no meaning if the Soviet Union ever achieved the power to destroy most of our retaliatory capacity in a single blow. It would then be irrelevant as to whether the Soviets achieved our demise through massive attack, through the threat of such attack, or through nibbling away gradually at our security. 171

By quoting Churchill, Kennedy is aligning himself with an elder statesman. As he invokes Churchill he makes the statement in the heat of a campaign that peace and not politics are at the heart of the debate. It is in the midst of a campaign that he seeks to put the objective of peace above the political fray. He is also defining his world view—one that is shaped by the politics of his time but one that he will try to project beyond the

political debate of the moment. It is a world view shaped by two world wars. As a veteran of World War II, Kennedy brought those credentials to the presidential campaign as he sought to bring the focus from politics to peace.

The American University speech builds on this and other earlier statements on peace. The focus in the *Strategy for Peace* is on what he refers to as “a more attainable peace.” This speech is more nuanced than a campaign speech. He does not rely just on a military policy to ensure the peace. His approach is much broader as he includes diplomacy and flexibility in the pursuit of peace. The peace Kennedy sought must meet the demands of a changing time.

Let us focus instead on a more practical, more attainable peace—based not on a sudden revolution in human nature but on a gradual evolution in human institutions—on a series of concrete actions and effective agreements which are in the interest of all concerned.

There is no single, simple key to this peace--no grand or magic formula to be adopted by one or two powers. Genuine peace must be the product of many nations, the sum of many acts. It must be dynamic, not static, changing to meet the challenge of each new generation. For peace is a process--a way of solving problems.

With such a peace, there will still be quarrels and conflicting interests, as there are within families and nations. World peace, like community peace, does not require that each man love his neighbor--it requires only that they live together in mutual tolerance, submitting their disputes to a just and peaceful settlement. And history teaches us that enmities between nations, as between individuals, do not last forever. However fixed our likes and dislikes may seem, the tide of time and events will often bring surprising changes in the relations between nations and neighbors.\(^\text{172}\)

In any community, there are quarrels whether within families or nations. We are not required to love our neighbor—we are only required to attempt to live in harmony.

The President grounds his view of peace with a very pragmatic approach. He does not

\(^{172}\) President John F. Kennedy the *Commencement Address at American University*, (accessed on May 5, 2010), available from. http://www.jfklibrary.org/Asset-Viewer/Archives/JFKPOF-045-002.aspx; Internet
promise an immediate solution to the world’s problems, and calls for mutual tolerance, and submitting disputes to a “just and peaceful settlement.”

So let us persevere. Peace need not be impracticable, and war need not be inevitable. By defining our goal more clearly, by making it seem more manageable and less remote, we can help all peoples to see it, to draw hope from it, and to move irresistibly toward it.173

Disputes do not have to last for generations and change in conditions can be taken advantage of for the greater good. He calls on the nation to define more clearly its goals. If the United States is clear about its goal for peace, war can become more remote.

President Kennedy addressed the issue of propaganda, and the message the Soviet Union is trying to convey to the world. The second step that President Kennedy defined for peace is to examine our attitude toward the Soviet Union. President Kennedy finds it discouraging that the Soviet leadership might actually believe what their propagandists write. Each country has its own propaganda, and Kennedy cites a Soviet text on Military Strategy that refers to American imperialism. It is unfortunate in the eyes of the President that these statements are proof of the gulf between America and the Soviet Union. He urges the American people not to fall into a trap of distortion and desperate views.

Let us reexamine our attitude toward the Soviet Union. It is discouraging to think that their leaders may actually believe what their propagandists write. It is discouraging to read a recent authoritative Soviet text on Military Strategy and find, on page after page, wholly baseless and incredible claims—such as the allegation that “American imperialist circles are preparing to unleash different types of wars . . . that there is a very real threat of a preventive war being unleashed by American imperialists against the Soviet Union . . . [and that] the political aims of the American imperialists are to enslave economically and politically the European and

other capitalist countries . . . [and] to achieve world domination . . . by means of aggressive wars.\textsuperscript{174}

The use of propaganda did not mean that people could not draw attention to their way of life. To counter these statements in which America is accused of preparing to unleash war, the president quotes Proverbs 28:1: The wicked flee when no man pursueth; [but the righteous are bold as a lion].\textsuperscript{175} The president went on to state in regard to Soviet propaganda which he viewed as distorting and clouding their view of the international climate and America’s role.

Yet it is sad to read these Soviet statements--to realize the extent of the gulf between us. But it is also a warning--a warning to the American people not to fall into the same trap as the Soviets, not to see only a distorted and desperate view of the other side, not to see conflict as inevitable, accommodation as impossible, and communication as nothing more than an exchange of threats.\textsuperscript{176}

All nations engage in various forms of propaganda, Kennedy is trying to highlight that in this case the Soviet propaganda is distracting from the problems of the nuclear threat.

President Kennedy separates the Russian people from the communist system of government. Even if their government is to be considered evil, no people should be considered as lacking in virtue. The communist system has deprived the Russian people of personal freedom and dignity; but the president is quick to still respect their achievements in science and space, in economic and industrial growth, in culture and in acts of courage.


\textsuperscript{175} In this part of the speech Kennedy is countering Soviet propaganda with scripture. The notes on this particular verse from \textit{The Jewish Study Bible}, gives a clear insight to what President Kennedy wanted to convey: “The wicked live in constant fear (1.26-27; 10.24), knowing that punishment is approaching but being ignorant of when it will arrive. The rest of the verse (but the righteous are bold as a lion) which was not written into the speech, the footnotes state “that the righteous will enjoy a sense of security.” ‘The Jewish Study Bible, Tanakh Translation, Pg 1491.

\textsuperscript{176} Ibid.
No government or social system is so evil that its people must be considered as lacking in virtue. As Americans, we find communism profoundly repugnant as a negation of personal freedom and dignity. But we can still hail the Russian people for their many achievements—in science and space, in economic and industrial growth, in culture and in acts of courage.177

Striking a balance between the communist government and the people under it, in the very next breath, he acknowledges the sacrifice of the Soviet Union in World War II. He acknowledges the sacrifices of the Soviet Union in World War II to give perspective, stating, “a third of the nation's territory, including nearly two thirds of its industrial base, was turned into a wasteland—a loss equivalent to the devastation of this country east of Chicago.” President Kennedy is referring to the German invasion of the Soviet Union on June 22, 1941 and the destruction wrought by Nazi Germany. In the Cold War the United States and the Soviet Union are primary targets of each other.

Today, should total war ever break out again—no matter how—our two countries would become the primary targets. It is an ironic but accurate fact that the two strongest powers are the two in the most danger of devastation. All we have built, all we have worked for, would be destroyed in the first 24 hours. And even in the cold war, which brings burdens and dangers to so many nations, including this Nation's closest allies—our two countries bear the heaviest burdens. For we are both devoting massive sums of money to weapons that could be better devoted to combating ignorance, poverty, and disease. We are both caught up in a vicious and dangerous cycle in which suspicion on one side breeds suspicion on the other, and new weapons beget counterweapons.178 President Kennedy points to the irony that the two most powerful countries are the two most susceptible to devastation, but many nations are in danger—not just two.

Peace must break the cycle of violence on which billions are spent. President Kennedy


calls to our attention the common interest of all humanity. It is not only the United States
and the Soviet Union who have a stake in the outcome of the Cold War; all of humanity
is affected by decisions made in Washington and Moscow. President Kennedy’s “final
analysis” quote summarizes his speech. No one is excluded from the effects of the Cold
War as President Kennedy sums it up.

So, let us not be blind to our differences—but let us also direct attention to
our common interests and to the means by which those differences can be
resolved. And if we cannot end now our differences, at least we can help
make the world safe for diversity. For, in the final analysis, our most basic
common link is that we all inhabit this small planet. We all breathe the
same air. We all cherish our children's future. And we are all mortal
(italics mine). 179

With these words President Kennedy is inclusive of the whole planet. This is not
just an American and Soviet problem. Collectively, humanity has a stake in the outcome
of the nuclear policy both nations pursue. Humanity has the planet in common and we
are all caretakers of it.

The third attitude that President Kennedy calls on us to examine is our attitude
toward the cold war. The president calls on Americans to view the world as it is, not as
they would wish it to be. He calls on America not to assign blame or add up debating
points. His emphasis is not on trying to pass judgment but on dealing with the reality of
the world and not what might have been. The United States must conduct itself in such a
way that allows the Communist to see that peace is in their interest as well.

We must conduct our affairs in such a way that it becomes in the
Communists' interest to agree on a genuine peace. Above all, while
defending our own vital interests, nuclear powers must avert those
confrontations which bring an adversary to a choice of either a humiliating

179 President John F. Kennedy the Commencement Address at American University, (accessed on
Internet.
retreat or a nuclear war. To adopt that kind of course in the nuclear age would be evidence only of the bankruptcy of our policy--or of a collective death-wish for the world.  

This passage is very sobering. It shows a well thought out position and the seriousness with which President Kennedy viewed the situation. Clearly he is directing his comments to the missile crisis of the previous fall and the ongoing confrontation in Berlin. He speaks from his personal experience with failure of the Bay of Pigs in April 1961 and a very difficult summit meeting with Chairman Nikita Khrushchev. As president he knows what must be done to avert the loss of face for the leadership of the Soviet Union. The policy a nation pursues in the Nuclear Age carries far more weight and much more severe consequences than policy in past confrontations. By adopting policies that force an adversary to choose retreat or nuclear war as President Kennedy stated would be a bankrupt policy and could only be a collective death wish for the world.

President Kennedy describes a policy of restraint and acknowledges the use of military force. However, policy that is weighted too far towards the military will mean that the enforcement of a *Pax Americana* can be the only outcome. The Soviets and the world must see a balance between diplomacy and American might.

To secure these ends, America's weapons are nonprovocative, carefully controlled, designed to deter, and capable of selective use. Our military forces are committed to peace and disciplined in self-restraint. Our diplomats are instructed to avoid unnecessary irritants and purely rhetorical hostility.

---


This passage might be viewed by other nations as American propaganda in its message to the world. President Kennedy defines his view for the use of America’s weapons and military in the Nuclear Age—“committed to peace and disciplined in self-restraint.”

How our nation postures its weapons is based on what we see as threats to our security. Assessment of those threats will lead to spending the right amount to maintain a national defense—or waste billions of dollars. To this end, President Kennedy sought to show that a defense can be maintained that strikes a balance with other nations.

For we can seek a relaxation of tension without relaxing our guard. And, for our part, we do not need to use threats to prove that we are resolute. We do not need to jam foreign broadcasts out of fear our faith will be eroded. We are unwilling to impose our system on any unwilling people—but we are willing and able to engage in peaceful competition with any people on earth.\(^\text{182}\)

President Kennedy called for a strengthening of the United Nations. It is a system that has short comings—primarily financial, but it can be effective in preserving peace. It could become a world security system.

Meanwhile, we seek to strengthen the United Nations, to help solve its financial problems, to make it a more effective instrument for peace, to develop it into a genuine world security system—a system capable of resolving disputes on the basis of law, of insuring the security of the large and the small, and of creating conditions under which arms can finally be abolished.\(^\text{183}\)

How such a security system would be implemented is not answered. It is something that is beyond the bounds of this address. However, the shape and form of a

\(^{182}\) Ibid. President John F. Kennedy the *Commencement Address at American University*, (accessed on May 5, 2010), available from. [http://www.jfklibrary.org/Asset-Viewer/Archives/JFKPOF-045-002.aspx](http://www.jfklibrary.org/Asset-Viewer/Archives/JFKPOF-045-002.aspx); Internet.

\(^{183}\) Ibid.
security system would be hotly debated as each nation would certainly see such a system infringing on their sovereignty.

President Kennedy coupled his support of the United Nations with support for the non-communist world. The security of Western Europe was under constant threat and in less than two decades after World War II, alliances were still maturing. Broadening the scope of his speech beyond the East-West tension, President Kennedy mentions West New Guinea, the Congo, the Middle East and the Indian subcontinent. He mentions attending to small differences between Canada and Mexico and pays special attention to defending Western Europe and West Berlin. He singles out the communist drive to impose their political and economic system on others as the primary cause of tension in the world today. President Kennedy applies his message to all nations that pursue self-determination. No one nation should impose its will on another. Even though the message of the speech is underscored by the behavior of the Soviet Union, President Kennedy ensures his message has appeal beyond the two antagonists of the cold war. All nations have a right to self-determination. President Kennedy stated,

The Communist drive to impose their political and economic system on others is the primary cause of world tension today. For there can be no doubt that, if all nations could refrain from interfering in the self-determination of others, the peace would be much more assured.\footnote{President John F. Kennedy the \textit{Commencement Address at American University}, (accessed on May 5, 2010), available from. \url{http://www.jfklibrary.org/Asset-Viewer/Archives/JFKPOF-045-002.aspx}; Internet.}

President Kennedy does not call out the East European nations, Cuba or Southeast Asia directly. But He is clearly alluding to those countries that are dominated by communist governments. He is indirect and therefore his language remains less provocative.
A New Effort for World Discussions

In the last part of his speech, President Kennedy turns to the effort it will take to achieve world law. This will mean a new context for world discussions. Increased understanding is the first step towards this end. The process of increasing understanding will mean increased contact and communication. President Kennedy at this point proposes what becomes known as the hotline between Washington and Moscow. He calls it one step in the direction to avoiding “on each side the dangerous delays, misunderstandings, and misreading of the other's actions which might occur at a time of crisis.”  

185

The arms negotiations which have been under way for the past decade are close to bearing their first fruits. These discussions are the first step in the control of nuclear arms.

We have also been talking in Geneva about the other first-step measures of arms control designed to limit the intensity of the arms race and to reduce the risks of accidental war. Our primary long range interest in Geneva, however, is general and complete disarmament-- designed to take place by stages, permitting parallel political developments to build the new institutions of peace which would take the place of arms. The pursuit of disarmament has been an effort of this Government since the 1920's.  

186

If we place President Kennedy’s words into context we realize that he is speaking of the period of the last 40 years, which in 1963 encompasses the period from the early 1920’s. This forty year span includes the heart of the 20th century and its major events of the Great Depression, World War II and the Cold War with a nuclear threat. Against this backdrop President Kennedy states:

185 The hotline between the United and States and the Soviet Union went into operation in July 1963.
186 President John F. Kennedy the Commencement Address at American University, (accessed on May 5, 2010), available from http://www.jfklibrary.org/Asset-Viewer/Archives/JFKPOF-045-002.aspx; Internet
And however dim the prospects may be today, we intend to continue this effort—to continue it in order that all countries, including our own, can better grasp what the problems and possibilities of disarmament are.\textsuperscript{187}

One aspect of the containment of nuclear weapons that cannot be overlooked is that Kennedy is also calling for nations to pursue disarmament. The negotiations have one major area where the end is in sight; it is the treaty to outlaw nuclear testing.

The conclusion of such a treaty, so near and yet so far, would check the spiraling arms race in one of its most dangerous areas. It would place the nuclear powers in a position to deal more effectively with one of the greatest hazards which man faces in 1963, the further spread of nuclear arms. It would increase our security—it would decrease the prospects of war. Surely this goal is sufficiently important to require our steady pursuit, yielding neither to the temptation to give up the whole effort nor the temptation to give up our insistence on vital and responsible safeguards.\textsuperscript{188}

Kennedy then takes the opportunity to announce two major decisions in regard to the talks: first that Chairman Khrushchev, Prime Minister Harold Macmillan of Great Britain, and the president have agreed to high level discussions in Moscow for an early agreement on a comprehensive test ban treaty. President Kennedy’s second proposal is controversial for some as he announces that the United States will not conduct nuclear tests in the atmosphere.

To make clear our good faith and solemn convictions on the matter, I now declare that the United States does not propose to conduct nuclear tests in the atmosphere so long as other states do not do so. We will not be the first to resume. Such a declaration is no substitute for a formal binding treaty, but I hope it will help us achieve one. Nor would such a treaty be a substitute for disarmament, but I hope it will help us achieve it.\textsuperscript{189}


\textsuperscript{188} Ibid.

President Kennedy put forth a bold proposal; if it were to fail he would appear weak. He would be damaged politically and open to charges of undermining American security by not maintaining the nuclear arsenal.

President Kennedy calls for one more examination of attitudes. He calls on his fellow Americans to examine their attitude toward peace and freedom at home. Our lives must be dedicated to these qualities if we are to be successful at home as well as abroad. He urges the graduates of American University to take the opportunities afforded them in the newly created Peace Corps and the proposed National Service Corps at home. The principle of peace and freedom go hand in hand. He is direct in his remarks about making society better at home and abroad. President Kennedy anticipates his statement given the very next day on June 11, 1963 when he speaks to the American people on television regarding civil rights. In the commencement address the president states that peace cannot be found in our own cities.

But wherever we are, we must all, in our daily lives, live up to the age-old faith that peace and freedom walk together. In too many of our cities today, the peace is not secure because the freedom is incomplete. The next day on June 11th, President Kennedy addressed the nation on Civil Rights, as he confronted Alabama governor George Wallace—forcing him to comply with court orders over the registration of African-American students at the University of Alabama at Tuscaloosa. Kennedy echoes *Pacem in Terris* by defining the responsibilities of the branches of government.

---


Ibid.
It is the responsibility of the executive branch at all levels of government--local, State, and National--to provide and protect that freedom for all of our citizens by all means within their authority. It is the responsibility of the legislative branch at all levels, wherever that authority is not now adequate, to make it adequate. And it is the responsibility of all citizens in all sections of this country to respect the rights of all others and to respect the law of the land.191

The Commencement Address at American University focused not only on the nuclear threat, but it underscored the distance the nation still had to cover in its own record on human rights. President Kennedy quotes Proverbs again in his pursuit of peace and human rights as he links peace at home with peace in the world.

All this is not unrelated to world peace. "When a man's ways please the Lord," the Scriptures tell us, "he maketh even his enemies to be at peace with him." And is not peace, in the last analysis, basically a matter of human rights--the right to live out our lives without fear of devastation--the right to breathe air as nature provided it--the right of future generations to a healthy existence?192

Kennedy linked the safeguarding of our national interests with the safeguarding of human interests. A treaty can go only so far to provide the measures needed for security. It is up to the nations involved to live up to the standard that they are setting for themselves. A treaty that is honored by the signatories is the only route available that will at least begin progress towards slowing an open-ended arms race.

No treaty, however much it may be to the advantage of all, however tightly it may be worded, can provide absolute security against the risks of

191 Ibid. President John F. Kennedy the Commencement Address at American University, (accessed on May 5, 2010), available from. http://www.jfklibrary.org/Asset-Viewer/Archives/JFKPOF-045-002.aspx; Internet. In the section of the encyclical on the Structure and Operation of the Public Authority Facem in Terris stated: If, however, this juridical and political structure is to realize its potential benefits, it is absolutely essential that public officials do their utmost to solve the problems that arise; and they must do so by using policies and techniques which it is within their competence to implement, and which suit the actual condition of the State.

deception and evasion. But it can—if it is sufficiently effective in its enforcement and if it is sufficiently in the interests of its signers—offer far more security and far fewer risks than an unabated, uncontrolled, unpredictable arms race.\(^{193}\)

The president states a principle which has been one of the hallmarks of American conduct in the world—that the United States will never start a war. We should not overlook circumstances where the United States has conducted military operations and conducted war and defined it as something short of war, such as a police action. Clearly he is thinking in terms of World War II and avoiding World War III. Setting such a standard is something that should not be taken lightly. In the last paragraph of the speech, President Kennedy makes it clear that Americans have had enough of war, hate and oppression.

The United States, as the world knows, will never start a war. We do not want a war. We do not now expect a war. This generation of Americans has already had enough—more than enough—of war and hate and oppression. We shall be prepared if others wish it. We shall be alert to try to stop it. But we shall also do our part to build a world of peace where the weak are safe and the strong are just. We are not helpless before that task or hopeless of its success. Confident and unafraid, we labor on—not toward a strategy of annihilation but toward a strategy of peace.\(^{194}\)

President Kennedy set a standard for the United States that should have signaled to the world our words and actions would equate to a strategy of peace.

We cannot guarantee what other nations may do, but we can set the standards by what we do. The president stated this generation had had enough of war. As one generation passes, another comes forward that does not have the same experiences. War

---

\(^{193}\) President John F. Kennedy the *Commencement Address at American University*, (accessed on May 5, 2010), available from. [http://www.jfklibrary.org/Asset-Viewer/Archives/JFKPOF-045-002.aspx](http://www.jfklibrary.org/Asset-Viewer/Archives/JFKPOF-045-002.aspx); Internet.

\(^{194}\) President John F. Kennedy the *Commencement Address at American University*, (accessed on May 5, 2010), available from. [http://www.jfklibrary.org/Asset-Viewer/Archives/JFKPOF-045-002.aspx](http://www.jfklibrary.org/Asset-Viewer/Archives/JFKPOF-045-002.aspx); Internet.
is a fate that waits each generation if the previous generation is not successful in securing the peace. President Kennedy ends his speech as it began: “we labor on—not toward a strategy of annihilation but toward a strategy of peace.” Humanity must labor on, because as Kennedy set out in the beginning, he realized “that the pursuit of peace is not as dramatic as the pursuit of war—and frequently the words of the pursuer fall on deaf ears. But we have no more urgent task.” President Kennedy brought to his speech many of the same virtues expressed by *Pacem in Terris* and made it relevant to the American people.

Our concern here has been with problems which are causing men extreme anxiety at the present time; problems which are intimately bound up with the progress of human society. Unquestionably, the teaching We have given has been inspired by a longing which We feel most keenly, and which We know is shared by all men of good will: that peace may be assured on earth.\(^{195}\)

*Pacem in Terris* as an important social justice encyclical, and President Kennedy’s *Commencement Address at American University* which charted the course for détente, contain important values of human rights and peace. These are values that must be carried into the twenty-first century or risk the violence and destruction by weapons that could be the end of humanity. Both documents offer clear guidance to the theologian and policy maker who must operate in a diverse society that struggles with its own sense of personal rights and freedom.

CHAPTER IV
THEOLOGIANS AND THE NUCLEAR THREAT

Introduction

Theologians must take the lead in creating a climate that reduces the threat of nuclear weapons. Theologians who engage in dialogue on nuclear proliferation can reassure humanity that nuclear destruction does not have to be the earth’s ultimate fate. Theologians do not usually concern themselves with the technical aspects of the nuclear threat. However, theologians must arm themselves with the knowledge that allows them to function in the scientific world of the atom. Understanding the basics of what a weapon system such as the Intercontinental or Short Range Ballistic Missile (ICBM/SRBM) can do gives them credibility. By engaging in dialogue with the policymaker, theologians help influence the rational that some seek to show that nuclear policy must stay the course of limiting, and if possible, eliminating the nuclear threat.

Theologians have a duty to counter the language used in describing nuclear events with quasi-religious overtones. Two examples of such language being used in regard to nuclear testing are described. The first example is from Robert Oppenheimer who explains how he named the test site Trinity for the first nuclear explosion.
Planning began in March 1944 for a full-scale test of an implosion weapon. Sometime between March and October Oppenheimer proposed a code name for the test. The first man-made nuclear explosion would be a historic event and its designation therefore a name that history might remember. Oppenheimer coded the test and the test site Trinity. Groves wrote him in 1962 to find out why, speculating that he chose the name because it is common to rivers and peaks in the American West and would be inconspicuous. “I did suggest it,” Oppenheimer responded, “but not on [that] ground…Why I chose the name is not clear, but I know what thoughts were in my mind. There is a poem of John Donne, written just before his death, which I know and love. From it a quotation:

\[\text{As West and East} \]
\[\text{In all flat Maps—and I am one—are one,} \]
\[\text{So doth touch the Resurrection.”} \]

The poem was Donne’s “Hymne to God My God, in My Sicknesse,” and among its subtleties it construes a complementarity [sic] that parallels the complementarity of the bomb that Bohr had recently revealed to Oppenheimer…That dying leads to death but might also lead to resurrection—as the bomb for Bohr and Oppenheimer was a weapon of death that might end war and redeem mankind—is one way the poem expresses the paradox.  

The other example of the use of religious language to describe nuclear testing comes from the peaceful nuclear explosion (PNE) conducted by India on May 18, 1974. The reference is used in reference to Lord Krishna and the smiling Buddha.

At five minutes past eight, Pranab Revati Dastidat, BARC’s electronics expert, pushed the red button. The lack of an immediate reaction led Ramamma and Sethna to fear the device was not going to detonate, but then they saw a small mountain of sand rise from the ground before collapsing. Iyengar recalls thinking, “Now I believe all those mythological stories about Lord Krishna lifting a hill.” Legend has it that Sethna called the prime minister’s office, spoke to P.N. Dhar, her principle secretary and one of the few individuals other than those working on the

---

A theologian should have an understanding of where each nation stands and its current capabilities. Understanding the language of the nuclear scientist is crucial to dialogue in a technologically driven world. The ability of theologians to communicate in a technically advanced world will assure credibility with the policy makers of nuclear nations.

In the aftermath of World War II other nations began their pursuit of the atom. The United States was followed by Russia (1949), the United Kingdom (1952), France (1960), China (1964), India (1974) and Pakistan (1998). Upon becoming a member of the nuclear club, India is the first outside the direct East-West confrontations of the Cold War. India has an interest in acquiring nuclear technology. It conducted a peaceful nuclear explosion (PNE), which is an explosion carried out for other than military purposes, such as construction. Such a test is allowed under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty of 1968. However, no significant peaceful benefits have been derived in India or elsewhere. According to the Nuclear Threat Initiative, an organization that focuses on nuclear policy, under the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty all nuclear explosions including peaceful nuclear explosions will be banned.\(^{198}\) The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty has become very important as nuclear weapons have spread to all parts of the globe.

\(^{197}\) Jeffrey T. Richelson, *Spying on the Bomb, American Nuclear Intelligence from Nazi Germany to Iran and North Korea*, (New York: North, 2006), 232. Lord Krishna is a mythical Hindu deity who reportedly appeared in human form in 3328 BC and disappeared 125 years later.

\(^{198}\) The Nuclear Threat Initiative is an organization focused on Nuclear policy and is co-chaired by Ted Turner and former Senator Sam Nunn, (accessed on November 2, 2011), available from [www.nti.org](http://www.nti.org); Internet.
With its first nuclear test, India became the sixth declared nuclear power spreading nuclear weapons to another region of the world. The subcontinent became another potential flashpoint in the Cold War. India has territorial disputes with Pakistan and China respectively. India did not engage in a nuclear arms race, although by being a declared nuclear power in Asia it raised the specter of one. India did not engage in nuclear testing again until 1998, twenty-four years later. During this time India possessed the knowledge and capability, but did not use nuclear power for military purposes.

The government maintained the traditional commitment only to use atomic energy for peaceful purposes and declared it would not make nuclear weapons. This position reflected the Gandhian self-image of India as well as the press of competing economic and political priorities. Indira Gandhi and others hoped that self-restraint would bring respect for the nation’s moral singularity. Other states that detonated nuclear devices went on to build horrible arsenals of war; India showed it could do the same, but chose virtuously to abstain.\(^\text{199}\)

India next conducted a total of three underground nuclear tests in May 1998. These were followed by Pakistan’s first time nuclear detonation which comprised of five nuclear tests later that same month. The twentieth century closed with two self-proclaimed nuclear powers in Asia who had fought at least three wars and faced off several times over border disputes—most notable in the Kashmir region to which both countries laid claim.

Non-proliferation of nuclear weapons is a complex undertaking requiring the cooperation of a growing circle of countries. Nations and non-state actors continue their quest for nuclear power—peaceful and otherwise. Since the end of the Cold War twenty years ago, the world has witnessed the rise of non-state actors on the its’ stage. These

new actors have probably never read *Pacem in Terris*, let alone heard the call for containing the nuclear genie in the eloquent phrases of President John F. Kennedy.

Proliferation of nuclear weapons and nuclear materials will certainly lead to making the threat of nuclear terrorism a reality in the 21st century. It has been decades since a select group of countries controlled technology capable of such awful destruction. “The Introduction” to *The U.S.-Russia Joint Threat Assessment on Nuclear Terrorism*, a joint study from the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs at Harvard University and The Institute for U.S. and Canadian Studies in Moscow, states,

> Terrorists are aspiring to plot and execute attacks of increasingly catastrophic proportions. Terrorists groups have actively sought to acquire nuclear weapons. The nuclear threat is far greater today than it was during the Cold War, as a result of the confluence of four trends in the post-Cold War era; the rise of unlimited terrorism, i.e. terrorist groups who believe their objective will be served by inflicting maximum possible damage, unconstrained by inhibitions created by concern that massive attacks might undercut political objectives by inspiring revulsion; the aging nature of nuclear weapons technology, which is no longer at the leading edge of science, at least for simple but effective designs; the vulnerability of weapons-usable nuclear material to theft or diversion; and globalization, which has given terrorists increasing access to reliable information and access to materials, designs, and potential victims.

The most recent U.S. Nuclear Posture Review released by the Obama Administration in April 2010 concurs that “the threat of global nuclear war has become remote; the risk of nuclear attack has increased.” It also states that “Al Qaeda and their extremist allies are seeking nuclear weapons.”

---


rogue state or non-state actor. The United States and Russia have the know how to manage nuclear weapons, and the fall of the Soviet Union has brought cooperation between both nations. Both nations can find common cause based on shared values. In the globalized world where many cultures collide with each other, the United States and Russia have the ability to turn their shared history with nuclear weapons to the advantage of leading the world into a future secured from nuclear weapons.

Cooperation will occur on the political level, but the theologian can have invaluable input as well. The theologian can be a source for dialogue in the globalized world of the twenty-first century. Theologians can bring to bear their expertise regarding ethics and moral issues. A writer and theologian who wrote about peace, interreligious dialogue and non-violence was Thomas Merton. His approach to the issues of his day serves as a template for theologians who engage in the conversation to address nuclear issues with the policy maker.

**Thomas Merton: A Catholic Witness and the Post-Cold War World**

The American monk Thomas Merton (1915-1968) became known to the American public with the publication in 1948 of his autobiographical account titled *The Seven Storey Mountain*. Merton was a prolific writer who produced books, poetry and thousands of letters. Thomas Merton carried on interfaith dialogue through letters to Sufi Muslims, a branch of Islam, Theravada, Tibetan and the Zen schools of Buddhism, Hinduism, Judaism, Taoism, Confucianism, and Hesychasm (Eastern Orthodoxy). This correspondence occurred concurrently with his writing about peace in the Cold War. Thomas Merton was a leader in showing that interreligious dialogue can reach across cultures to play a critical role in communication at all levels of society. Pope John
demonstrated with the publication of *Pacem in Terris*, that religious leaders can have a positive impact when addressing all of humanity. Such leadership signals that Catholics ordained, consecrated religious and laity may look beyond the borders of the Church and embrace all as brothers and sisters.

In 2004, over 40 years after he was censored and forbidden to write on nuclear war, Thomas Merton’s book *Peace in the Post-Christian Era* was published. This book consists of a series of articles that evolved into a book in which Merton had formulated his ideas on the Cold War within the context of the Church. Some of his writing on the Cold War and nuclear arms he tried unsuccessfully to have included in *Seeds of Destruction* which was published in 1964. *Peace in the Post-Christian Era* was published 21 years after the American bishops’ pastoral letter, *The Challenge of Peace: God’s Promise and Our Response*, and over a decade after the end of the Cold War in 1991. Catholic social teaching about peace as exemplified by *Pacem in Terris* teaches that we have a duty to peace that may run counter to the priorities of the state. In the years of tension leading to 1963, Merton stands out as a singular voice when few Catholics of stature were speaking out on peace or war.

We live at a time when it is not uncommon for Roman Catholics to protest against war and to lobby for peace. In 1961, however, the situation was quite different. At that time no Catholic priest or bishop (at least none well known) had raised his voice against war. Certainly no monk had done so. Merton was a well-known Catholic priest and monk whose reputation had been established by his writings on spirituality.202

Pope John and President Kennedy were public figures who occupied high public office with the responsibilities that are a part of their duties. Thomas Merton and other Catholic figures, such as Dorothy Day, were private citizens. Unencumbered by the

---

duties and responsibilities of public office they were free to focus their energy and talents on promoting the Gospel.

Even as a monk with limited access to the world at large, Thomas Merton had a sense of the crisis facing the world. It is this very limited access to news and events that helped him to focus and produce the powerful witness that came out of his writing. A critical point in Merton’s career was his censure for writing about the issue of war and peace. Gabriel Sortais, Abbot General of the Order of the Cistercians of the Strict Observance—Merton’s superior—was of the opinion that war and peace were not suitable topics for a monk. Merton was silenced virtually at the moment when peace between the United States and the Soviet Union was also at a critical turning point. His book *Peace in a Post-Christian World* was originally scheduled to be published in 1962 before being suppressed by Dom Gabriel Sortais.

The decision reflected an astounding incomprehension of the seriousness of the present crisis in its religious aspect. It reflects insensitivity to Christian and Ecclesiastical [sic] values, and to the real sense of monastic vocation. The reason given is that it is not the right kind of work for a monk and that it “falsifies the monastic message” Imagine that: the thought that a monk might be deeply enough concerned with the issue of nuclear war to voice a protest against the arms race, is supposed to bring the monastic life into disrepute.203

Merton continued to write letters and manuscripts that remained unpublished, and were mimeographed and sent to various friends. As a monk he was doing what most monks do not do, i.e., writing not for his Order, but for the outside world. His time in the monastery coincides with change in the Church and society. Merton finds his predicament is much like that of contemporaries such as theologian Henri du Lubac, who was suppressed in the 1950s—and then became a participant at Vatican II. Thomas

Merton got his message out, and his influence was felt by those in the wider peace movement that flourished in the 1960’s and beyond.

Thomas Merton wrote extensively and communicated not only through published works, but through letters. His letters were written as personal correspondence and not published. He was able to circulate his views to those of influence during his time of censure. Merton’s letter writing on war and peace between October 1961 and October 1962 was bound and circulated privately, and was not published until 2006 as the Cold War Letters.\(^\text{204}\) The ban on Merton writing on war and peace was not lifted with the publication of *Pacem in Terris*.

Merton consoled himself by exercising his influence in a letter, sending a copy to Ethel Kennedy, sister-in-law of the president of the United States, on May 4, 1963: “I wrote a book on peace which the Superiors decided I ought to bury about ten feet deep behind the monastery someplace, but I still don’t think it is that bad. I mimeographed it and am sending you a copy, just for the files, or, who knows, maybe the President might have five minutes to spare looking at it. If you think he would, I will even send him a copy.\(^\text{205}\)

In another letter written in December, 1961 to Ethel Kennedy, Merton states his position on relations with the Russians and nuclear testing. In the letter excerpted here, Merton speaks of the interior self, and he speaks of fighting a war within ourselves—both as Americans and Russians.

It seems to me that the great problem we face is not Russia but war itself. War is the main enemy and we are not going to fully make sense unless we see that. Unless we fight war, both in ourselves and in the Russians, and wherever else it may be, we are purely and simply going to be wrecked by the forces that are in us. The great illusion is to assume that we are perfectly innocent, peace-loving and right while the communists are devils incarnate. I admit they are no angels and they have been guilty of some frightful crimes against humanity. They are without doubt a terrible menace, and a permanent one, to the safety of the human race. I

\(^\text{204}\) Thomas Merton, *Cold War Letters*, (Maryknoll: Orbis, 2006).
admit also that we must not go to the extreme of condemning ourselves without reason. We have made mistakes and will make more of them, but I hope we can learn to be a bit more realistic about all that, as long as we avoid the biggest mistake of all: plunging the world into nuclear war by any deliberate decision of our own. I think also it is tremendously important for us to work out a collaborative control scheme with the U.S.S.R. to check on various possible accidents that might trigger a nuclear war.\textsuperscript{206}

Merton’s words were written about a year and half prior to the publication of \textit{Pacem in Terris} and the \textit{Commencement Address at American University}. Merton’s writing shows that he was an astute observer of the times. After years of protracted crisis and tension between America and Russia, Merton cuts through the rhetoric of both sides and gets to the point that war, and not Russia is the bigger threat. In his book, \textit{Seeds of Destruction} Merton wrote a response to \textit{Pacem in Terris}. The analysis is the same—Christians must examine their conscience and are obligated to work towards collaboration in the cause of peace.

If we understand the nature of this document and its profound seriousness, we can see that certain deeply Christian obligations begin to emerge from the world crisis in which we live. The obligation to work for collaboration and harmony among nations, to respect the rights of small and emergent nations and of racial minorities, to collaborate actively and generously in helping these nations and races to attain full development and to enjoy their full rights as members of the human race. The obligation to work for peace and the need for a clear and forthright protest of the Christian conscience against the abuse of authority which marshals men more and more under the command of those who explicitly announce their intention to make use of brute force in order to gain or to maintain a position of power for themselves or for the social and political system which they represent. All this implies a willing and intelligent participation of the Christian in civil and public life, to the extent that it fits in with his other duties.\textsuperscript{207}

In his writing, Thomas Merton takes a very uncompromising stand towards Christians and their support of the Cold War policies of the state. His view is that Christianity is yielding too much to the state. Christians should think critically and by failing to do so are failing in their moral obligation to do what is right. Thomas Merton’s perspective on the world crisis is his fear that the Cold War would soon consume humanity and overwhelm our moral judgment.

Precisely the greatest danger of “Cold War religion” is that it provides these destructive tendencies with an apparent ethical and religious justification. It makes nuclear war look like spiritual heroism, and justifies global suicide as sacrifice and martyrdom. If we had not almost completely lost our innate Christian and religious sense we would be utterly aghast at the perversion of the deepest and most sacred of realities. We would be able to see the awful truth in many ways the Cold War is systematically perverting and eroding the Christian conscience. This is the climate in which all Christians are facing (or refusing to face) the most crucial moral and religious problem in twenty centuries of history.  

Merton wrote about the nuclear bomb and its power, and ties its power directly to the mistake humanity would make about its use. Merton is a prophetic voice of the Cold War, his words still speaking to us today, as concerns shift from a global nuclear war to that of proliferation.

He struggled to use his monastic gift in the way he saw fit. From focusing his talent on the Cold War to interfaith contact, Merton teaches that our values must not become lost in a world that quickly overwhelms our interior lives and thereby our conscience. Merton’s words only serve to highlight the challenge that faced the world in 1963. His words remind us of the road we travel in a world of nuclear proliferation:

This does not mean we blithely assume that God has given the power of the bomb into our hands with a mandate to use according to our fantasy. If we are now in possession of atomic power, we have the moral obligation to make a good and peaceful use of it, rather than turning it to  

---

our own destruction. But we will not be able to do this without an interior revolution that abandons the quest for brute power and submits to the wisdom of love and of the Cross.\footnote{Thomas Merton, \textit{Peace in the Post-Christian Era}, (Maryknoll: Orbis, 2004), 89.}

These words are consistent with what is an extraordinary call to build and preserve peace. Merton simply states that without Christ, our pursuit of peace is in vain. Merton gives America a public conscience and calls for it to look inward. He is not a public official, but a private citizen. His agenda may have political overtones, but it is a spiritual calling for America to experience an interior change of heart that places Christ at the center.

\textbf{American Leadership and Nuclear Weapons}

President Kennedy would not criticize his administration in such a public way that would undermine his own authority as President. \textit{The Commencement Address at American University} warns however of dire consequences if humanity stayed on a path that led to war. Former Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara wrote in 2005 how he as Secretary of Defense, had to keep personal views out of public policy. He was Secretary of Defense from 1961 to 1968. In this statement McNamara shows that public officials must support public policy even when it conflicts with their personal views.

I have worked on issues relating to U.S. and NATO nuclear strategy and war plans for more than 40 years. During that time, I have never seen a piece of paper that outlined a plan for the United States or NATO to initiate the use of nuclear weapons with any benefit for the United States or senior military leaders, many times. No one has ever refuted it. To launch weapons against a nuclear-equipped opponent would be suicidal. To do so against a nonnuclear enemy would be militarily unnecessary, morally repugnant, and politically indefensible. I have reached these conclusions very soon after becoming secretary of defense. Although I believe Presidents John F. Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson shared my view,
it was impossible for any of us to make such statements publicly because they were totally contrary to established NATO policy.210

President Kennedy and his Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara worked in a very complex government. The Defense Department was created from the National Security Act of 1947 and consolidated the armed services and was subordinate to the secretary of defense. The president also had a national security council and the Central Intelligence Agency was created from the same act. These were dramatic changes for the United States as it faced a world unlike any that existed prior to 1945. Just as Robert McNamara expressed his views (and believed President Kennedy and Johnson would too), Thomas Merton expressed his views on the defense establishment which echoed concern for the moral judgments of war.

Not only is war increasingly a matter for pure specialists operating with fantastically complex machinery, but above all there is the question of absolute secrecy regarding everything that seriously affects defense policy. We may amuse ourselves by reading the reports in the mass media and imagine that these “facts” provide sufficient basis for moral judgments for and against war. But in reality, we are simply elaborating moral fantasies in a vacuum. Whatever we may decide, we remain completely at the mercy of the governmental power, or rather the anonymous power of managers and generals who stand behind the façade of government. We have no way of directly influencing the decisions taken by these people.211

Merton’s statement is as relevant today as it was during the Cold War. It should serve as a warning to Americans involved in the wars of the 21st century as those same structures Merton warned about have only grown.


Merton’s words define exactly why theologians must engage in dialogue with the nation’s policy makers. It is true that we may not be able to directly influence decisions, but only if nothing is done to directly address the policies being carried out in our name. The 1983 pastoral letter *The Challenge of Peace: God’s Promise and Our Response* was a significant attempt in this direction. The bishops are the voice of the Roman Catholic Church in America.

A statement such as this pastoral letter can be seen as being critical of American nuclear policy. In 1988, a committee of American Catholic bishops reaffirmed the pastoral letter and went further by issuing a statement criticizing the “Star Wars” proposal. This proposal was the plan to deploy a space-based defense missile shield, and was put forward by the Reagan Administration in 1983, as the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI). In the *New York Times*, Peter Steinfels reported on President Ronald Reagan and Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger regarding the missile defense system.

The bishops noted that he and former Secretary of Defense Caspar W. Weinberger had argued that a missile defense system was morally superior to relying on deterrence through threats. The seven bishops admitted that the officially stated objective of moving away from deterrence and protecting civilian populations from attack corresponded to "key themes" of their own pastoral letter.

But the bishops' report also mentioned official ambiguity on whether the space missile program was meant to replace or enhance nuclear deterrence. The bishops argued that the moral significance of the proposals had to be judged not only by their intended objectives but also by their likely consequences.²¹²

Since 1963, nine men, including Barack Obama have occupied the office of President of the United States.\(^{213}\) Sometimes a president came to office to repudiate what his successor stood for, and several months would pass before that new president’s new policy took shape. This was especially true after the election of 1980, when Ronald Reagan defeated President Carter. Nuclear funding dramatically increased under President Reagan. In the fiscal year 1983, 22 billion dollars were spent on strategic forces, compared to 12 billion dollars in 1979 under President Carter.\(^{214}\) This is one example of how policies are subject to change as the occupant of the presidency changes. The new century would show that policy between former rivals in the Cold War would appear to be taking a new direction. The United States under George W. Bush began to more openly pursue missile defense technology. The Bush Administration also began to review the position of the United States on the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty of 1972. Ultimately in June 2002 the United States unilaterally withdrew from the ABM Treaty to further research on the missile defense program.

The complete record, to include classified documents, of the administration of President George W. Bush (2001-2009) will not be released for decades. Historians will have to wait to fully assess the impact of his administration on nuclear arms control.\(^{215}\) A positive step was taken when President Bush signed the Moscow Treaty on May 24, 2002

\(^{213}\) Presidents included from President Kennedy through Barack Obama; Popes included in this time frame start with John XXIII through Benedict XVI.


\(^{215}\) Presidential Records Act (PRA) of 1978. Access to records under the Freedom of Information Act is allowed beginning five years after the end of an Administration. It also allows the President to invoke as many as six specific restrictions to public access for up to twelve years (accessed on June 12, 2011), available from http://www.archives.gov/presidential-libraries/laws/1978-act.html; Internet.
to continue reducing nuclear warhead arsenals through 2012. Even with a new arms control treaty the continued push for a non-nuclear “missile defense shield” caused concern that it may not be viable and years away from being operationally capable. The concept behind a missile defense shield is to counter an incoming missile strike by intercepting those already launched. Research and development of a missile defense program has continued under President Obama. Justification for such a shield lies in the fact that other countries are pursuing missile as well as nuclear programs. States such as North Korea and Iran are aggressively pursuing nuclear programs that could include weapons development. These countries are also pursuing development of missiles. Nuclear proliferation has replaced global nuclear war as a threat to humanity.

Nuclear proliferation poses the very serious threat of weapon-grade nuclear material coming into the possession of non-state actors or terrorists. Nations must now put into force agreements which take the control of this technology seriously. Those who see themselves outside the bounds of a moral code, whether Christian, Muslim, Jewish, Hindi, or non-believer certainly do not care what is written about peace or the attempts to secure it. Acting alone or as a group without affiliation to any state, the threat of any weapon of mass destruction should be sufficient enough to unite people of all faiths for a peace that is common to all. The balance of terror has shifted, and now we face a world where there may not be a hot line to the actors who possess weapons of mass destruction. The moral code found in Catholic social teaching is the foundation for building a world in which the risks of war can be reduced. How we act in the world as a nation may


\[217\] For a discussion of ‘who is trying to obtain Nuclear weapons’ see the Nuclear Threat Initiative, (accessed on July 4, 2011), available from: http://www.nti.org/f_wmd411/f1a4_1.html; Internet.
determine if we will live in constant fear of weapons of mass destruction that may target an American city.

Humanity must cross all barriers whether cultural, religious, or otherwise and work continually towards establishing and nurturing peace. President Kennedy saw this as an ongoing process in the commencement address.

Genuine peace must be the product of many nations, the sum of many acts. It must be dynamic, not static, changing to meet the challenge of each new generation. For peace is a process—a way of solving problems.²¹⁸

President Kennedy expressed sentiments certainly shared by Pope John by seeing the continuing need to work at nurturing peace. At the same Pope John gave an in depth view of the impact of change beyond 1963. The uses of social media through the internet, the personal computer and smart phones have literally brought to our homes an interconnected world. He observed the growing interdependence of people and nations through the technological advancements.

Recent progress in science and technology has had a profound influence on man's way of life. This progress is a spur to men all over the world to extend their collaboration and association with one another in these days when material resources, travel from one country to another, and technical information have so vastly increased. This has led to a phenomenal growth in relationships between individuals, families and intermediate associations belonging to the various nations, and between the public authorities of the various political communities. There is also a growing economic interdependence between States. National economies are gradually becoming so interdependent that a kind of world economy is being born from the simultaneous integration of the economies of individual States. And finally, each country's social progress, order, security and peace are necessarily linked with the social progress, order, security and peace of every other country.²¹⁹


Incrementally change foreseen by Pope John has occurred. It is only in the first decade of the twenty-first century that the impact of the words of *Pacem in Terris* is truly being felt. With the advent of social media in the hands of the individual, society has become truly interconnected. Pope John emphasizes that humanity shares a common link as social progress, order, security and peace bind us to our neighbor across all borders. It is in this shrinking world that President Barack Obama delivered one of his first major addresses on nuclear arms control in the Czech Republic.

**The Twenty-First Century and the Relevance of *Pacem in Terris* and the Commencement Address at American University**

President Barack Obama’s new administration struck a definitive tone about where he would direct nuclear arms control. On April 5, 2009, in Prague, the Czech Republic, he delivered an address outlining his vision for reducing the nuclear threat. In the address he discussed the concerns facing the world in the twenty-first century. Those concerns were of black-marketed nuclear material and the threat of the nuclear or dirty (radioactive) bomb that could threaten major cities, or anywhere else terrorists choose to attack. President Obama’s argument strikes at the very heart of the issue, that is, if we believe that the spread of these weapons cannot be stopped, then we are resigning ourselves to their eventual use. President Obama stated in part:

> Some argue that the spread of these weapons cannot be stopped, cannot be checked—that we are destined to live in a world where more nations and more people possess the ultimate tools of destruction. Such fatalism is a deadly adversary, for if we believe that the spread of nuclear weapons is inevitable, then in some way we are admitting to ourselves that the use of nuclear weapons is inevitable. Just as we stood for freedom in the 20th century, we must stand together for the right of people everywhere to live free from fear in the 21st century. And as a nuclear power, as the only nuclear power to have used a nuclear weapon, the United States has a moral responsibility to act. We cannot succeed in this endeavor alone, but
we can lead it, we can start it. So today, I state clearly and with conviction America's commitment to seek the peace and security of a world without nuclear weapons.  

President Obama’s speech in 2009 echoes President Kennedy’s *Commencement Address at American University*. President Kennedy used language that spoke to the individual citizen, while President Obama’s language speaks more to the collective audience. President Obama’s speech is delivered overseas, while Kennedy’s is a domestic speech. This may account for the different emphasis. It may also be a matter of style and how each president reached out to his respective audience. Both men insist that it is not a foregone conclusion that humanity is forever destined to live in the shadow of the nuclear threat.

Some say that it is useless to speak of world peace or world law or world disarmament—and that it will be useless until the leaders of the Soviet Union adopt a more enlightened attitude. I hope they do. I believe we can help them do it. But I also believe that we must reexamine our own attitude—as individuals and as a Nation—for our attitude is as essential as theirs. And every graduate of this school, every thoughtful citizen who despairs of war and wishes to bring peace, should begin by looking inward—by examining his own attitude toward the possibilities of peace, toward the Soviet Union, toward the course of the cold war and toward freedom and peace here at home.  

President Obama’s call for a world without nuclear weapons may remain only a call. The chances are highly unlikely, if not impossible that all nuclear weapons will be abolished during an Obama presidency. His successor may wish to continue reducing nuclear weapons, but not their outright abolition, seeing utility in keeping a small stockpile as a part of defense. The threat of nuclear weapons continues as nations who are

\footnote{Remarks by President Barack Obama, Hradcany Square Prague, Czech Republic, (accessed on 22 Jan 2011) available from http://www.whitehouse.gov/the_press_office/Remarks-By-President-Barack-Obama-In-Prague-As-Delivered/; Internet.}

\footnote{President Kennedy, The *Commencement Address at American University*, (accessed on May 5, 2010), available from http://www.jfklibrary.org/Asset-Viewer/Archives/JFKPOF-045-002.aspx; Internet.}
not signatories to agreements regarding nuclear weapons cannot be trusted to not develop them. Only one-hundred percent compliance with protocols established for governing nuclear weapons will suffice. Until nations can trust and accept intrusive means of verifying their compliance with treaties on nuclear weapons, the world will have to wait for the complete eradication of the nuclear threat.

*Pacem in Terris* and the *Commencement Address at American University* both championed peace and provided a voice to challenge national attitudes that war is a viable solution. *Pacem in Terris* put the Church at the forefront in support of human rights and cooperation among nations to achieve peace. The *Commencement Address at American University* not only calls for world peace but also provides concrete steps to lessen tensions. It announced the intention of completing the first treaty to limit nuclear weapons testing as well as increased communication between Washington and Moscow through a hot-line that would prevent a crisis from escalating.

Fifty years later, the words of *Pacem in Terris* and the *Commencement Address* are not historic documents gathering dust; they are statements of hope that bring the pursuit of peace to the public conscience. Pope John and President Kennedy showed that there was an alternative to preparing for total war. Building fall-out shelters and practicing “duck and cover” drills as was done during this time isn’t preparation for peace; constructing peace is what Pope John and President Kennedy envisioned.

Monsignor Joseph Gremillion, who served on the Pontifical Commission on Peace and Justice and was a University of Norte Dame Professor, writing in the early 1970s described the climate a decade after the release of *Pacem in Terris* in 1963. Looking back on a turbulent decade, he was writing in the waning days of the Vietnam conflict,
after the hot summers of protests that were anti-war and for civil rights and political assassination.

It was *Pacem in Terris* (Peace on Earth) which won for John and his aggiornamento [sic] a universal hearing. Millions who had never paid the least attention to popes and their jaw-breaker encyclicals suddenly sat up and listened. Here for the first time a pope was addressing himself “to all men of goodwill.” And his message responded to deep longing shared by all. Rather it was clergy and faithful who were taken aback. Peace had become an object of suspicion in many Catholic circles, especially in the United States, the Western nation capable of waging war. The “peace offensive” of the communists, identified with their Stockholm conferences of the 1950s and with Picasso’s dove, had given the lovely word a bad name. Peace was a dove that went “Boom”! Pacifism was viewed as a quaint aberration of Quakers and Mennonite sects. US Catholics, on the other hand, were patriots through and through. We fought just wars—when our President told us to. President-heroes, who debated rolling back the communists, unleashing Chiang Kai-shek, and closing the missile gap. Many abhorred the United Nations and all its works because it brought real live Russian Reds into New York City. Dorothy Day’s forlorn Catholic peace movement was swallowed up among the skyscrapers and cathedrals—until Viet Nam.222

Peace was challenged on many fronts during the 1960’s as the struggle for civil rights continued, and peace activists were galvanized by the war in Viet Nam. Catholics participated in actions against the war, but the Church did not independently sponsor them; there was no separate Catholic peace movement in the United States. For example, the international Catholic peace organization *Pax Christi*, founded in 1945, was not established in the United States until 1972. In the decade to follow, the American bishops in 1983 released the pastoral letter, *The Challenge of Peace: God’s Promise and Our Response*. This letter was published against the backdrop of the nuclear freeze movement and increased defense spending in the early 1980s. During this period there were calls to negotiate a freeze on nuclear weapons with the Soviet Union.

Prior to the 1980s, participation in protests or a peace movement could result in suspicion and accusations of undermining America. In the early twenty-first century, Catholics are not bound by such constraints. Over the decades the Church has found its voice and established a clear vision on its stand regarding nuclear weapons. The public voices of several Catholics from the past have today helped prepare the way for Catholics to be outspoken in matters of peace and even civil disobedience. The witness of Thomas Merton, for example, was not bound by political or social constraints, and his writing on peace is a guide for us today. His only constraint was speaking as a monk bound by the monastic culture in which he chose to live. This included having his work pass through the censors of his order. He had to conform to what his order the Cistercians deemed appropriate for publication by a monk. Perhaps because Merton was subjected to censorship we pay attention to what he had to say. We look closer at his work for the ideas that may threaten the status quo. The Gospel in Matthew 5:15 applies to all of goodwill in peace: “Nor do they light a lamp and then put it under a bushel basket; it is set on a lampstand, where it gives light to all in the house.”

**Conclusion—Impact of the Encyclical and the Commencement Address**

There is no doubt that the way we wage war and keep the peace has changed since 1945. Since the First World War, conflict had spread beyond the confines of the battlefield. In the twentieth century civilian populations were no longer immune to the horror of war, especially with the advent of air power and the development of the modern rocket. Only 27 years separate the end of World War I and the end of World War II in 1945. During those decades the Church orientated itself to grapple with the diplomatic issues of the twentieth century. In the first half of the twentieth century the Church
confronted the totalitarian political systems of Communism and Nazism and now confronted the force of the atom. The Church’s witness to the faith has a clear mission in the post-Christian world, a world in which it may not be the center of influence.

We live with the most destructive force that can be unleashed. Does humanity now refine those weapons for precision, as was the case for the neutron bomb in the 1970s, to make a cleaner kill? *Pacem in Terris* and *The Commencement Address at American University* become nothing more than a letter and eloquent speech if humanity finds ways to skirt around the work of peacemaking. Nonetheless, both documents have produced results. There were immediate political results for Kennedy the policymaker, with the Washington to Moscow hotline, and the Limited Test Ban Treaty. The Church too, has built on *Pacem in Terris* over the last fifty years as a framework for constructive dialogue on human rights and peace in an environment of a more interconnected world, where multiple voices clamor for attention.

The Church now competes with other institutions to be heard in our interconnected world where dialogue is critical. For over a decade in the 1950’s, the United States and the Soviet Union conducted atmospheric testing releasing radiation into the environment. The citizens of other countries had no voice concerning the fallout that resulted. *Pacem in Terris* is a fundamental statement by the Church that it matters how we treat our brother or sister on the other side of the globe. Long before the word globalization came into common usage, Pope John presented the message of *Pacem in Terris* to humanity with a message for the future beyond a world locked into a struggle between two nuclear superpowers. The message of *Pacem in Terris* is current in today’s
world just as President Kennedy’s speech provided the sense of urgency that is relevant today, as concern of nuclear proliferation has not decreased but increased.

It makes no sense in an age when the deadly poisons produced by a nuclear exchange would be carried by wind and water and soil and seed to the far corners of the globe and to generations yet unborn.223

The post-Christian world, where Christian values have receded, may have a more difficult time arriving at a consensus about nuclear proliferation. Competing value systems may make it difficult to arrive at a consensus on critical issues. Nations that may want to limit nuclear proliferation would find it difficult to communicate if underlying issues cannot be resolved. For example, common values regarding human rights may differ and impede progress in areas such as nuclear proliferation. This is especially true in regional disputes where each side may have animosity towards the other such as is the case with India and Pakistan. Concerns about a Middle-east arms race are valid should Iran develop a nuclear capability beyond peaceful means. Would Arab be able to communicate with Persian much less the Israeli? If the core values of peace and human rights as expressed in Pacem in Terris are not adopted, than humanity will face a future that is bleak. It will mean that efforts toward peace will face a growing military-industrial complex that will continue to consume valuable resources. However, Thomas Merton made the point that all is not lost in such a world.

The future of the Church, the Body of Christ, is not in the hands of men. It is not subject to the vagaries of political history. There is and there can be no ambiguity and no uncertainty about the Church’s fulfillment of her appointed task on earth. For the Church is Christ himself, present in the world he has redeemed, present in mystery, in poverty, in ways that are a scandal to human wisdom, in modes that confound the clever, the mighty, the affluent and the ruthless leaders of men. Just as “the world” defeated

itself in condemning the Lord of glory, so now also worldly power works for its own confusion and for the establishment of the kingdom of God even when it attacks the kingdom most savagely and, it would seem, with the greatest chance of final success.\footnote{224 Thomas Merton, \textit{Peace in the Post-Christian Era}, (New York: Orbis, 2004), 71.}

Thomas Merton speaking as a private citizen can speak to the laity in a more candid way as opposed to a person speaking from the role of a public official. Pope John wrote \textit{Pacem in Terris} to clarify that \textit{true peace} is not in the hands of men, but comes from God. National leadership would do well to heed Merton’s commentary on \textit{Pacem in Terris}. As Merton states, Christ himself is present in the world, present in mystery, in poverty, in ways that human wisdom cannot comprehend. A nuclear free world would change the balance of power as humanity has known it since 1945. If there were to be a “nuclear free peace”, it would succeed only by a planet acknowledging Christ presence in the world.

The impact of \textit{Pacem in Terris} as a key teaching of the Church and \textit{The Commencement Address at American University} as statements on peace will depend on Christians who live the Gospel every day. In light of technology and machinery that threaten to overwhelm our humanity, the Christian with a well-formed conscience will give hope to a Post-Christian world that can never know lasting peace. It is the Christian living in Christ that can ultimately provide hope for \textit{Pacem in Terris}.

From the \textit{Commencement Address at American University} to the call by President Obama to secure a nuclear weapons free world, we are far from secure as a world while technology to build a nuclear bomb exists. Since then, the \textit{Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty} (1970) and the \textit{Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty} (1996) are just two of several agreements designed to curb nuclear proliferation. In 2009, President Obama
proposed more financial resources aid to the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, which is in force. He also stated that he would submit the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty to the United States Senate for ratification.

I have sought to show the relevancy of two distinct public voices of the last half of the 20th century—President John F. Kennedy and Pope John XXIII. I also introduced the prophetic voice of Thomas Merton. The nuclear threat that the advent of the nuclear age gave us is more complicated than fifty years ago. Twenty-First century America does not go forward without guidance. From the moral vantage point of Pacem in Terris and the political vision of the Commencement Address at American University, several agreements and treaties have since borne fruit over the past five decades. We do not yet have a nuclear weapons free world, and nuclear proliferation will continue to be a concern as non-state actors seek to acquire them. To achieve the elimination of nuclear weapons, President Obama must have the support of the American people and that of like-minded nations. He must also have a nation that has an undisputed moral standing in matters regarding national security. Only with a concerted effort involving all of humanity which has looked inward and concluded that the nuclear threat is not worth our resources, can we move toward a world free of nuclear weapons. Politically a president can provide a voice and leadership for his nation’s policies. Pacem in Terris will stand as a guide to the Church and humanity in the twenty-first century and beyond.

All peace is local, as is a non-violent approach that each of us must take to the problem of nuclear proliferation. Any action taken in this regard is done in our name as Americans. Catholic social teaching begins with each one of us; we do not have to wait for the next encyclical or pastoral letter from the bishops. Catholics at the local level can
influence what happens at the national level. Communicating from the parish to their bishop, Catholics as the people of God make their voice heard. The Catholic Church has thrived in American democracy and Catholics hold values that must be brought to bear on the issues that affect our standing in the world. We ultimately determine what kind of peace we create—a fragile peace or a durable peace that can be passed to future generations. For the policymaker there is a template to be found in President Kennedy’s *Commence Address at American University* as way to create the conditions that can lead to peace. For Catholics and all of goodwill, *Pacem in Terris* encapsulates values grounded in Holy Scripture as the basis for peace. *Pacem in Terris* is a living document that addresses our time. It serves as a guide for generations to come as they strive as we have, to secure a lasting and renewable peace. By living the Gospel and being a light to the world, we live the Gospel so others may see that peace is possible. Without a firm foundation for peace and human rights as envisioned by President Kennedy and Pope John, humanity would be at risk of repeating the violent history of the twentieth century.
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APPENDIX A

PACEM IN TERRIS

ENCYCLICAL OF POPE JOHN XXIII

ON ESTABLISHING UNIVERSAL PEACE IN TRUTH,
JUSTICE, CHARITY, AND LIBERTY

APRIL 11, 1963

To Our Venerable Brethren the Patriarchs, Primates, Archbishops, Bishops, and all other Local Ordinaries who are at Peace and in Communion with the Apostolic See, and to the Clergy and Faithful of the entire Catholic World, and to all Men of Good Will.

Venerable Brethren and Dearest Sons Health and Apostolic Benediction.

Peace on Earth—which man throughout the ages has so longed for and sought after—can never be established, never guaranteed, except by the diligent observance of the divinely established order.

Order in the Universe

2. That a marvelous order predominates in the world of living beings and in the forces of nature, is the plain lesson which the progress of modern research and the discoveries of technology teach us. And it is part of the greatness of man that he can appreciate that order, and devise the means for harnessing those forces for his own benefit.
3. But what emerges first and foremost from the progress of scientific knowledge and the inventions of technology is the infinite greatness of God Himself, who created both man and the universe. Yes; out of nothing He made all things, and filled them with the fullness of His own wisdom and goodness. Hence, these are the words the holy psalmist used in praise of God: "O Lord, our Lord: how admirable is thy name in the whole earth!" And elsewhere he says: "How great are thy works, O Lord! Thou hast made all things in wisdom."

Moreover, (2a) God created man "in His own image and likeness," endowed him with intelligence and freedom, and made him lord of creation. All this the psalmist proclaims when he says: "Thou hast made him a little less than the angels: thou hast crowned him with glory and honor, and hast set him over the works of thy hands. Thou hast subjected all things under his feet."

Order in Human Beings

4. And yet there is a disunity among individuals and among nations which is in striking contrast to this perfect order in the universe. One would think that the relationships that bind men together could only be governed by force.

5. But the world's Creator has stamped man's inmost being with an order revealed to man by his conscience; and his conscience insists on his preserving it. Men "show the work of the law written in their hearts. Their conscience bears witness to them." And how could it be otherwise? All created being reflects the infinite wisdom of God. It reflects it all the more clearly, the higher it stands in the scale of perfection.

6. But the mischief is often caused by erroneous opinions. Many people think that the laws which govern man's relations with the State are the same as those which regulate
the blind, elemental forces of the universe. But it is not so; the laws which govern men are quite different. The Father of the universe has inscribed them in man's nature, and that is where we must look for them; there and nowhere else.

7. These laws clearly indicate how a man must behave toward his fellows in society, and how the mutual relationships between the members of a State and its officials are to be conducted. They show too what principles must govern the relations between States; and finally, what should be the relations between individuals or States on the one hand, and the world-wide community of nations on the other. Men's common interests make it imperative that at long last a world-wide community of nations be established.

I. ORDER BETWEEN MEN

8. We must devote our attention first of all to that order which should prevail among men.

9. Any well-regulated and productive association of men in society demands the acceptance of one fundamental principle: that each individual man is truly a person. His is a nature, that is, endowed with intelligence and free will. As such he has rights and duties, which together flow as a direct consequence from his nature. These rights and duties are universal and inviolable, and therefore altogether inalienable.

10. When, furthermore, we consider man's personal dignity from the standpoint of divine revelation, inevitably our estimate of it is incomparably increased. Men have been ransomed by the blood of Jesus Christ. Grace has made them sons and friends of God, and heirs to eternal glory.
Rights

11. But first We must speak of man's rights. Man has the right to live. He has the right to bodily integrity and to the means necessary for the proper development of life, particularly food, clothing, shelter, medical care, rest, and, finally, the necessary social services. In consequence, he has the right to be looked after in the event of ill health; disability stemming from his work; widowhood; old age; enforced unemployment; or whenever through no fault of his own he is deprived of the means of livelihood.

Rights Pertaining to Moral and Cultural Values

12. Moreover, man has a natural right to be respected. He has a right to his good name. He has a right to freedom in investigating the truth, and—within the limits of the moral order and the common good—to freedom of speech and publication, and to freedom to pursue whatever profession he may choose. He has the right, also, to be accurately informed about public events.

13. He has the natural right to share in the benefits of culture, and hence to receive a good general education, and a technical or professional training consistent with the degree of educational development in his own country. Furthermore, a system must be devised for affording gifted members of society the opportunity of engaging in more advanced studies, with a view to their occupying, as far as possible, positions of responsibility in society in keeping with their natural talent and acquired skill.

The Right to Worship God According to One's Conscience

14. Also among man's rights is that of being able to worship God in accordance with the right dictates of his own conscience, and to profess his religion both in private and in public. According to the clear teaching of Lactantius, "this is the very condition of
our birth, that we render to the God who made us that just homage which is His due; that we acknowledge Him alone as God, and follow Him. It is from this ligature of piety, which binds us and joins us to God, that religion derives its name."

Hence, too, Pope Leo XIII declared that "true freedom, freedom worthy of the sons of God, is that freedom which most truly safeguards the dignity of the human person. It is stronger than any violence or injustice. Such is the freedom which has always been desired by the Church, and which she holds most dear. It is the sort of freedom which the Apostles resolutely claimed for themselves. The apologists defended it in their writings; thousands of martyrs consecrated it with their blood."

The Right to Choose Freely One's State in Life

15. Human beings have also the right to choose for themselves the kind of life which appeals to them: whether it is to found a family—in the founding of which both the man and the woman enjoy equal rights and duties—or to embrace the priesthood or the religious life.

16. The family, founded upon marriage freely contracted, one and indissoluble, must be regarded as the natural, primary cell of human society. The interests of the family, therefore, must be taken very specially into consideration in social and economic affairs, as well as in the spheres of faith and morals. For all of these have to do with strengthening the family and assisting it in the fulfilment of its mission.

17. Of course, the support and education of children is a right which belongs primarily to the parents.
Economic Rights

18. In the economic sphere, it is evident that a man has the inherent right not only to be given the opportunity to work, but also to be allowed the exercise of personal initiative in the work he does.

19. The conditions in which a man works form a necessary corollary to these rights. They must not be such as to weaken his physical or moral fibre, or militate against the proper development of adolescents to manhood. Women must be accorded such conditions of work as are consistent with their needs and responsibilities as wives and mothers.

20. A further consequence of man's personal dignity is his right to engage in economic activities suited to his degree of responsibility. The worker is likewise entitled to a wage that is determined in accordance with the precepts of justice. This needs stressing. The amount a worker receives must be sufficient, in proportion to available funds, to allow him and his family a standard of living consistent with human dignity. Pope Pius XII expressed it in these terms:

"Nature imposes work upon man as a duty, and man has the corresponding natural right to demand that the work he does shall provide him with the means of livelihood for himself and his children. Such is nature's categorical imperative for the preservation of man."

21. As a further consequence of man's nature, he has the right to the private ownership of property, including that of productive goods. This, as We have said elsewhere, is "a right which constitutes so efficacious a means of asserting one's
personality and exercising responsibility in every field, and an element of solidity and security for family life, and of greater peace and prosperity in the State."

22. Finally, it is opportune to point out that the right to own private property entails a social obligation as well.

The Right of Meeting and Association

23. Men are by nature social, and consequently they have the right to meet together and to form associations with their fellows. They have the right to confer on such associations the type of organization which they consider best calculated to achieve their objectives. They have also the right to exercise their own initiative and act on their own responsibility within these associations for the attainment of the desired results.

24. As We insisted in Our encyclical Mater et Magistra, the founding of a great many such intermediate groups or societies for the pursuit of aims which it is not within the competence of the individual to achieve efficiently, is a matter of great urgency. Such groups and societies must be considered absolutely essential for the safeguarding of man's personal freedom and dignity, while leaving intact a sense of responsibility.

The Right to Emigrate and Immigrate

25. Again, every human being has the right to freedom of movement and of residence within the confines of his own State. When there are just reasons in favor of it, he must be permitted to emigrate to other countries and take up residence there. The fact that he is a citizen of a particular State does not deprive him of membership in the human family, nor of citizenship in that universal society, the common, world-wide fellowship of men.
Political Rights

26. Finally, man's personal dignity involves his right to take an active part in public life, and to make his own contribution to the common welfare of his fellow citizens. As Pope Pius XII said, "man as such, far from being an object or, as it were, an inert element in society, is rather its subject, its basis and its purpose; and so must he be esteemed."

27. As a human person he is entitled to the legal protection of his rights, and such protection must be effective, unbiased, and strictly just. To quote again Pope Pius XII: "In consequence of that juridical order willed by God, man has his own inalienable right to juridical security. To him is assigned a certain, well-defined sphere of law, immune from arbitrary attack."

Duties

28. The natural rights of which We have so far been speaking are inextricably bound up with as many duties, all applying to one and the same person. These rights and duties derive their origin, their sustenance, and their indestructibility from the natural law, which in conferring the one imposes the other.

29. Thus, for example, the right to live involves the duty to preserve one's life; the right to a decent standard of living, the duty to live in a becoming fashion; the right to be free to seek out the truth, the duty to devote oneself to an ever deeper and wider search for it.

Reciprocity of Rights and Duties Between Persons

30. Once this is admitted, it follows that in human society one man's natural right gives rise to a corresponding duty in other men; the duty, that is, of recognizing and
respecting that right. Every basic human right draws its authoritative force from the natural law, which confers it and attaches to it its respective duty. Hence, to claim one's rights and ignore one's duties, or only half fulfill them, is like building a house with one hand and tearing it down with the other.

**Mutual Collaboration**

31. Since men are social by nature, they must live together and consult each other's interests. That men should recognize and perform their respective rights and duties is imperative to a well ordered society. But the result will be that each individual will make his whole-hearted contribution to the creation of a civic order in which rights and duties are ever more diligently and more effectively observed.

32. For example, it is useless to admit that a man has a right to the necessities of life, unless we also do all in our power to supply him with means sufficient for his livelihood.

33. Hence society must not only be well ordered, it must also provide men with abundant resources. This postulates not only the mutual recognition and fulfillment of rights and duties, but also the involvement and collaboration of all men in the many enterprises which our present civilization makes possible, encourages or indeed demands.

**An Attitude of Responsibility**

34. Man's personal dignity requires besides that he enjoy freedom and be able to make up his own mind when he acts. In his association with his fellows, therefore, there is every reason why his recognition of rights, observance of duties, and many-sided collaboration with other men, should be primarily a matter of his own personal decision. Each man should act on his own initiative, conviction, and sense of responsibility, not
under the constant pressure of external coercion or enticement. There is nothing human about a society that is welded together by force. Far from encouraging, as it should, the attainment of man's progress and perfection, it is merely an obstacle to his freedom.

**Social Life in Truth, Justice, Charity and Freedom**

35. Hence, before a society can be considered well-ordered, creative, and consonant with human dignity, it must be based on truth. St. Paul expressed this as follows: "Putting away lying, speak ye the truth every man with his neighbor, for we are members one of another." And so will it be, if each man acknowledges sincerely his own rights and his own duties toward others.

Human society, as We here picture it, demands that men be guided by justice, respect the rights of others and do their duty. It demands, too, that they be animated by such love as will make them feel the needs of others as their own, and induce them to share their goods with others, and to strive in the world to make all men alike heirs to the noblest of intellectual and spiritual values. Nor is this enough; for human society thrives on freedom, namely, on the use of means which are consistent with the dignity of its individual members, who, being endowed with reason, assume responsibility for their own actions.

36. And so, dearest sons and brothers, we must think of human society as being primarily a spiritual reality. By its means enlightened men can share their knowledge of the truth, can claim their rights and fulfill their duties, receive encouragement in their aspirations for the goods of the spirit, share their enjoyment of all the wholesome pleasures of the world, and strive continually to pass on to others all that is best in themselves and to make their own the spiritual riches of others. It is these spiritual values
which exert a guiding influence on culture, economics, social institutions, political movements and forms, laws, and all the other components which go to make up the external community of men and its continual development.

**God and the Moral Order**

37. Now the order which prevails in human society is wholly incorporeal in nature. Its foundation is truth, and it must be brought into effect by justice. It needs to be animated and perfected by men's love for one another, and, while preserving freedom intact, it must make for an equilibrium in society which is increasingly more human in character.

38. But such an order—universal, absolute and immutable in its principles—finds its source in the true, personal and transcendent God. He is the first truth, the sovereign good, and as such the deepest source from which human society, if it is to be properly constituted, creative, and worthy of man's dignity, draws its genuine vitality. This is what St. Thomas means when he says: "Human reason is the standard which measures the degree of goodness of the human will, and as such it derives from the eternal law, which is divine reason . . . Hence it is clear that the goodness of the human will depends much more on the eternal law than on human reason."

**Characteristics of the Present Day**

39. There are three things which characterize our modern age.

40. In the first place we notice a progressive improvement in the economic and social condition of working men. They began by claiming their rights principally in the economic and social spheres, and then proceeded to lay claim to their political rights as
well. Finally, they have turned their attention to acquiring the more cultural benefits of society.

Today, therefore, working men all over the world are loud in their demands that they shall in no circumstances be subjected to arbitrary treatment, as though devoid of intelligence and freedom. They insist on being treated as human beings, with a share in every sector of human society: in the socio-economic sphere, in government, and in the realm of learning and culture.

41. Secondly, the part that women are now playing in political life is everywhere evident. This is a development that is perhaps of swifter growth among Christian nations, but it is also happening extensively, if more slowly, among nations that are heirs to different traditions and imbued with a different culture. Women are gaining an increasing awareness of their natural dignity. Far from being content with a purely passive role or allowing themselves to be regarded as a kind of instrument, they are demanding both in domestic and in public life the rights and duties which belong to them as human persons.

42. Finally, we are confronted in this modern age with a form of society which is evolving on entirely new social and political lines. Since all peoples have either attained political independence or are on the way to attaining it, soon no nation will rule over another and none will be subject to an alien power.

43. Thus all over the world men are either the citizens of an independent State, or are shortly to become so; nor is any nation nowadays content to submit to foreign domination. The longstanding inferiority complex of certain classes because of their economic and social status, sex, or position in the State, and the corresponding superiority complex of other classes, is rapidly becoming a thing of the past.
Equality of Men

44. Today, on the contrary the conviction is widespread that all men are equal in natural dignity; and so, on the doctrinal and theoretical level, at least, no form of approval is being given to racial discrimination. All this is of supreme significance for the formation of a human society animated by the principles We have mentioned above, for man's awareness of his rights must inevitably lead him to the recognition of his duties. The possession of rights involves the duty of implementing those rights, for they are the expression of a man's personal dignity. And the possession of rights also involves their recognition and respect by other people.

45. When society is formed on a basis of rights and duties, men have an immediate grasp of spiritual and intellectual values, and have no difficulty in understanding what is meant by truth, justice, charity and freedom. They become, moreover, conscious of being members of such a society. And that is not all. Inspired by such principles, they attain to a better knowledge of the true God—a personal God transcending human nature. They recognize that their relationship with God forms the very foundation of their life—the interior life of the spirit, and the life which they live in the society of their fellows.

II. RELATIONS BETWEEN INDIVIDUALS AND THE PUBLIC AUTHORITIES

46. Human society can be neither well-ordered nor prosperous without the presence of those who, invested with legal authority, preserve its institutions and do all that is necessary to sponsor actively the interests of all its members. And they derive their authority from God, for, as St. Paul teaches, "there is no power but from God".
In his commentary on this passage, St. John Chrysostom writes: "What are you saying? Is every ruler appointed by God? No, that is not what I mean, he says, for I am not now talking about individual rulers, but about authority as such. My contention is that the existence of a ruling authority—the fact that some should command and others obey, and that all things not come about as the result of blind chance—this is a provision of divine wisdom."

God has created men social by nature, and a society cannot "hold together unless someone is in command to give effective direction and unity of purpose. Hence every civilized community must have a ruling authority, and this authority, no less than society itself, has its source in nature, and consequently has God for its author."

47. But it must not be imagined that authority knows no bounds. Since its starting point is the permission to govern in accordance with right reason, there is no escaping the conclusion that it derives its binding force from the moral order, which in turn has God as its origin and end.

Hence, to quote Pope Pius XII, "The absolute order of living beings, and the very purpose of man—an autonomous being, the subject of duties and inviolable rights, and the origin and purpose of human society—have a direct bearing upon the State as a necessary community endowed with authority. Divest it of this authority, and it is nothing, it is lifeless.... But right reason, and above all Christian faith, make it clear that such an order can have no other origin but in God, a personal God, our Creator. Hence it is from Him that State officials derive their dignity, for they share to some extent in the authority of God Himself."
An Appeal to Conscience

48. Hence, a regime which governs solely or mainly by means of threats and intimidation or promises of reward, provides men with no effective incentive to work for the common good. And even if it did, it would certainly be offensive to the dignity of free and rational human beings. Authority is before all else a moral force. For this reason the appeal of rulers should be to the individual conscience, to the duty which every man has of voluntarily contributing to the common good. But since all men are equal in natural dignity, no man has the capacity to force internal compliance on another. Only God can do that, for He alone scrutinizes and judges the secret counsels of the heart.

49. Hence, representatives of the State have no power to bind men in conscience, unless their own authority is tied to God's authority, and is a participation in it.

50. The application of this principle likewise safeguards the dignity of citizens. Their obedience to civil authorities is never an obedience paid to them as men. It is in reality an act of homage paid to God, the provident Creator of the universe, who has decreed that men's dealings with one another be regulated in accordance with that order which He Himself has established. And we men do not demean ourselves in showing due reverence to God. On the contrary, we are lifted up and ennobled in spirit, for to serve God is to reign.

51. Governmental authority, therefore, is a postulate of the moral order and derives from God. Consequently, laws and decrees passed in contravention of the moral order, and hence of the divine will, can have no binding force in conscience, since "it is right to obey God rather than men".
Indeed, the passing of such laws undermines the very nature of authority and results in shameful abuse. As St. Thomas teaches, "In regard to the second proposition, we maintain that human law has the rationale of law in so far as it is in accordance with right reason, and as such it obviously derives from eternal law. A law which is at variance with reason is to that extent unjust and has no longer the rationale of law. It is rather an act of violence."

52. The fact that authority comes from God does not mean that men have no power to choose those who are to rule the State, or to decide upon the type of government they want, and determine the procedure and limitations of rulers in the exercise of their authority. Hence the above teaching is consonant with any genuinely democratic form of government.

**Attainment of the Common Good is the Purpose of the Public Authority**

53. Men, both as individuals and as intermediate groups, are required to make their own specific contributions to the general welfare. The main consequence of this is that they must harmonize their own interests with the needs of others, and offer their goods and services as their rulers shall direct—assuming, of course, that justice is maintained and the authorities are acting within the limits of their competence. Those who have authority in the State must exercise that authority in a way which is not only morally irreproachable, but also best calculated to ensure or promote the State's welfare.

54. The attainment of the common good is the sole reason for the existence of civil authorities. In working for the common good, therefore, the authorities must obviously respect its nature, and at the same time adjust their legislation to meet the requirements of the given situation.
Essentials of the Common Good

55. Among the essential elements of the common good one must certainly include the various characteristics distinctive of each individual people. But these by no means constitute the whole of it. For the common good, since it is intimately bound up with human nature, can never exist fully and completely unless the human person is taken into account at all times. Thus, attention must be paid to the basic nature of the common good and what it is that brings it about.

56. We must add, therefore, that it is in the nature of the common good that every single citizen has the right to share in it—although in different ways, depending on his tasks, merits and circumstances. Hence every civil authority must strive to promote the common good in the interest of all, without favoring any individual citizen or category of citizen. As Pope Leo XIII insisted: "The civil power must not be subservient to the advantage of any one individual, or of some few persons; inasmuch as it was established for the common good of all."

Nevertheless, considerations of justice and equity can at times demand that those in power pay more attention to the weaker members of society, since these are at a disadvantage when it comes to defending their own rights and asserting their legitimate interests.

The Spiritual, Too

57. In this connection, We would draw the attention of Our own sons to the fact that the common good is something which affects the needs of the whole man, body and soul. That, then, is the sort of good which rulers of States must take suitable measure to
ensure. They must respect the hierarchy of values, and aim at achieving the spiritual as well as the material prosperity of their subjects.

58. These principles are clearly contained in that passage in Our encyclical Mater et Magistra where We emphasized that the common good "must take account of all those social conditions which favor the full development of human personality.

59. Consisting, as he does, of body and immortal soul, man cannot in this mortal life satisfy his needs or attain perfect happiness. Thus, the measures that are taken to implement the common good must not jeopardize his eternal salvation; indeed, they must even help him to obtain it.

Responsibilities of the Public Authority, and Rights and Duties of Individuals

60. It is generally accepted today that the common good is best safeguarded when personal rights and duties are guaranteed. The chief concern of civil authorities must therefore be to ensure that these rights are recognized, respected, co-ordinated, defended and promoted, and that each individual is enabled to perform his duties more easily. For "to safeguard the inviolable rights of the human person, and to facilitate the performance of his duties, is the principal duty of every public authority."

61. Thus any government which refused to recognize human rights or acted in violation of them, would not only fail in its duty; its decrees would be wholly lacking in binding force.

Reconciliation and Protection of Rights and Duties of Individuals

62. One of the principal duties of any government, moreover, is the suitable and adequate superintendence and co-ordination of men's respective rights in society. This must be done in such a way 1) that the exercise of their rights by certain citizens does not
obstruct other citizens in the exercise of theirs; 2) that the individual, standing upon his own rights, does not impede others in the performance of their duties; 3) that the rights of all be effectively safeguarded, and completely restored if they have been violated.

**Duty of Promoting the Rights of Individuals**

63. In addition, heads of States must make a positive contribution to the creation of an overall climate in which the individual can both safeguard his own rights and fulfill his duties, and can do so readily. For if there is one thing we have learned in the school of experience, it is surely this: that, in the modern world especially, political, economic and cultural inequities among citizens become more and more widespread when public authorities fail to take appropriate action in these spheres. And the consequence is that human rights and duties are thus rendered totally ineffective.

64. The public administration must therefore give considerable care and thought to the question of social as well as economic progress, and to the development of essential services in keeping with the expansion of the productive system. Such services include road-building, transportation, communications, drinking-water, housing, medical care, ample facilities for the practice of religion, and aids to recreation. The government must also see to the provision of insurance facilities, to obviate any likelihood of a citizen's being unable to maintain a decent standard of living in the event of some misfortune, or greatly increased family responsibilities.

The government is also required to show no less energy and efficiency in the matter of providing opportunities for suitable employment, graded to the capacity of the workers. It must make sure that working men are paid a just and equitable wage, and are allowed a sense of responsibility in the industrial concerns for which they work. It must
facilitate the formation of intermediate groups, so that the social life of the people may become more fruitful and less constrained. And finally, it must ensure that everyone has the means and opportunity of sharing as far as possible in cultural benefits.

**Harmonious Relations Between Public Authority’s Two Forms of Intervention**

65. The common welfare further demands that in their efforts to co-ordinate and protect, and their efforts to promote, the rights of citizens, the civil authorities preserve a delicate balance. An excessive concern for the rights of any particular individuals or groups might well result in the principal advantages of the State being in effect monopolized by these citizens. Or again, the absurd situation can arise where the civil authorities, while taking measures to protect the rights of citizens, themselves stand in the way of the full exercise of these rights. "For this principle must always be retained: that however extensive and far-reaching the influence of the State on the economy may be, it must never be exerted to the extent of depriving the individual citizen of his freedom of action. It must rather augment his freedom, while effectively guaranteeing the protection of everyone's essential, personal rights."

66. And the same principle must be adopted by civil authorities in their various efforts to facilitate the exercise of rights and performance of duties in every department of social life.

**Structure and Operation of the Public Authority**

67. For the rest, it is not possible to give a general ruling on the most suitable form of government, or the ways in which civil authorities can most effectively fulfill their legislative, administrative, and judicial functions.
68. In determining what form a particular government shall take, and the way in which it shall function, a major consideration will be the prevailing circumstances and the condition of the people; and these are things which vary in different places and at different times.

We think, however, that it is in keeping with human nature for the State to be given a form which embodies a threefold division of public office properly corresponding to the three main functions of public authority. In such a State a precise legal framework is provided, not only for the official functions of government, but also for the mutual relations between citizens and public officials. This will obviously afford sure protection to citizens, both in the safeguarding of their rights and in the fulfilment of their duties.

69. If, however, this juridical and political structure is to realize its potential benefits, it is absolutely essential that public officials do their utmost to solve the problems that arise; and they must do so by using policies and techniques which it is within their competence to implement, and which suit the actual condition of the State. It is also essential that, despite constantly changing conditions, legislators never disregard the moral law or constitutional provision, nor act at variance with the exigencies of the common good. And as justice must be the guiding principle in the administration of the State, and executives must thoroughly understand the law and carefully weigh all attendant circumstances, so too in the courts: justice must be administered impartially, and judges must be wholly incorrupt and uninfluenced by the solicitations of interested parties. The good order of society also requires that individuals and subsidiary groups within the State be effectively protected by law in the affirmation of their rights and the
Law and Conscience

70. There can be no doubt that a State juridical system which conforms to the principles of justice and rightness, and corresponds to the degree of civic maturity evinced by the State in question, is highly conducive to the attainment of the common good.

71. And yet social life is so complex, varied and active in this modern age, that even a juridical system which has been established with great prudence and foresight often seems inadequate to the need.

72. Moreover, the relations of citizens with each other, of citizens and intermediate groups with public authorities, and the relations between public authorities of the same State, are sometimes seen to be of so ambiguous and explosive a nature, that they are not susceptible of being regulated by any hard and fast system of laws.

In such cases, if the authorities want to preserve the State's juridical system intact—in itself and in its application to specific cases—and if they want to minister to the principal needs of society, adapt the laws to the conditions of modern life and seek solutions to new problems, then it is essential that they have a clear idea of the nature and limits of their own legitimate spheres of action. Their calmness, integrity, clear sightedness and perseverance must be such that they will recognize at once what is needed in a given situation, and act with promptness and efficiency.
Citizens' Participation in Public Life

73. A natural consequence of men's dignity is unquestionably their right to take an active part in government, though their degree of participation will necessarily depend on the stage of development reached by the political community of which they are members.

74. For the rest, this right to take part in government opens out to men a new and extensive field of opportunity for service. A situation is created in which civic authorities can, from the greater frequency of their contacts and discussions with the citizens, gain a clearer idea of what policies are in fact effectual for the common good; and in a system which allows for a regular succession of public officials, the authority of these officials, far from growing old and feeble, takes on a new vitality in keeping with the progressive development of human society.

Characteristics of the Present Day

75. There is every indication at the present time that these aims and ideals are giving rise to various demands concerning the juridical organization of States. The first is this: that a clear and precisely worded charter of fundamental human rights be formulated and incorporated into the State's general constitutions.

76. Secondly, each State must have a public constitution, couched in juridical terms, laying down clear rules relating to the designation of public officials, their reciprocal relations, spheres of competence and prescribed methods of operation.

77. The final demand is that relations between citizens and public authorities be described in terms of rights and duties. It must be clearly laid down that the principal function of public authorities is to recognize, respect, co-ordinate, safeguard and promote citizens' rights and duties.
78. We must, however, reject the view that the will of the individual or the group is the primary and only source of a citizen's rights and duties, and of the binding force of political constitutions and the government's authority.

79. But the aspirations We have mentioned are a clear indication of the fact that men, increasingly aware nowadays of their personal dignity, have found the incentive to enter government service and demand constitutional recognition for their own inviolable rights. Not content with this, they are demanding, too, the observance of constitutional procedures in the appointment of public authorities, and are insisting that they exercise their office within this constitutional framework.

III. RELATIONS BETWEEN STATES

80. With respect to States themselves, Our predecessors have constantly taught, and We wish to lend the weight of Our own authority to their teaching, that nations are the subjects of reciprocal rights and duties. Their relationships, therefore, must likewise be harmonized in accordance with the dictates of truth, justice, willing cooperation, and freedom. The same law of nature that governs the life and conduct of individuals must also regulate the relations of political communities with one another.

81. This will be readily understood when one reflects that it is quite impossible for political leaders to lay aside their natural dignity while acting in their country's name and in its interests. They are still bound by the natural law, which is the rule that governs all moral conduct, and they have no authority to depart from its slightest precepts.

82. The idea that men, by the fact of their appointment to public office, are compelled to lay aside their own humanity, is quite inconceivable. Their very attainment
to this high-ranking office was due to their exceptional gifts and intellectual qualities, which earned for them their reputation as outstanding representatives of the body politic.

83. Moreover, a ruling authority is indispensable to civil society. That is a fact which follows from the moral order itself. Such authority, therefore, cannot be misdirected against the moral order. It would immediately cease to exist, being deprived of its whole raison d'être. God Himself warns us of this: "Hear, therefore, ye kings, and understand: learn, ye that are judges of the ends of the earth. Give ear, you that rule the people, and that please yourselves in multitudes of nations. For power is given you by the Lord, and strength by the Most High, who will examine your works, and search out your thoughts."

84. And lastly one must bear in mind that, even when it regulates the relations between States, authority must be exercised for the promotion of the common good. That is the primary reason for its existence.

**An Imperative of the Common Good**

85. But one of the principal imperatives of the common good is the recognition of the moral order and the unfailing observance of its precepts. "A firmly established order between political communities must be founded on the unshakable and unmoving rock of the moral law, that law which is revealed in the order of nature by the Creator Himself, and engraved indelibly on men's hearts . . . Its principles are beacon lights to guide the policies of men and nations. They are also warning lights—providential signs—which men must heed if their laborious efforts to establish a new order are not to encounter perilous storms and shipwreck."
In Truth

86. The first point to be settled is that mutual ties between States must be governed by truth. Truth calls for the elimination of every trace of racial discrimination, and the consequent recognition of the inviolable principle that all States are by nature equal in dignity.

Each of them accordingly has the right to exist, to develop, and to possess the necessary means and accept a primary responsibility for its own development. Each is also legitimately entitled to its good name and to the respect which is its due.

87. As we know from experience, men frequently differ widely in knowledge, virtue, intelligence and wealth, but that is no valid argument in favor of a system whereby those who are in a position of superiority impose their will arbitrarily on others. On the contrary, such men have a greater share in the common responsibility to help others to reach perfection by their mutual efforts.

88. So, too, on the international level: some nations may have attained to a superior degree of scientific, cultural and economic development. But that does not entitle them to exert unjust political domination over other nations. It means that they have to make a greater contribution to the common cause of social progress.

89. The fact is that no one can be by nature superior to his fellows, since all men are equally noble in natural dignity. And consequently there are no differences at all between political communities from the point of view of natural dignity. Each State is like a body, the members of which are human beings. And, as we know from experience, nations can be highly sensitive in matters in any way touching their dignity and honor; and with good reason.
The Question of Propaganda

90. Truth further demands an attitude of unruffled impartiality in the use of the many aids to the promotion and spread of mutual understanding between nations which modern scientific progress has made available. This does not mean that people should be prevented from drawing particular attention to the virtues of their own way of life, but it does mean the utter rejection of ways of disseminating information which violate the principles of truth and justice, and injure the reputation of another nation.

In Justice

91. Relations between States must furthermore be regulated by justice. This necessitates both the recognition of their mutual rights, and, at the same time, the fulfilment of their respective duties.

92. States have the right to existence, to self development, and to the means necessary to achieve this. They have the right to play the leading part in the process of their own development, and the right to their good name and due honors. Consequently, States are likewise in duty bound to safeguard all such rights effectively, and to avoid any action that could violate them. And just as individual men may not pursue their own private interests in a way that is unfair and detrimental to others, so too it would be criminal in a State to aim at improving itself by the use of methods which involve other nations in injury and unjust oppression. There is a saying of St. Augustine which has particular relevance in this context: "Take away justice, and what are kingdoms but mighty bands of robbers".

93. There may be, and sometimes is, a clash of interests among States, each striving for its own development. When differences of this sort arise, they must be settled
in a truly human way, not by armed force nor by deceit or trickery. There must be a mutual assessment of the arguments and feelings on both sides, a mature and objective investigation of the situation, and an equitable reconciliation of opposing views.

The Treatment of Minorities

94. A special instance of this clash of interests is furnished by that political trend (which since the nineteenth century has become widespread throughout the world and has gained in strength) as a result of which men of similar ethnic background are anxious for political autonomy and unification into a single nation. For many reasons this cannot always be effected, and consequently minority peoples are often obliged to live within the territories of a nation of a different ethnic origin. This situation gives rise to serious problems.

95. It is quite clear that any attempt to check the vitality and growth of these ethnic minorities is a flagrant violation of justice; the more so if such perverse efforts are aimed at their very extinction.

96. Indeed, the best interests of justice are served by those public authorities who do all they can to improve the human conditions of the members of these minority groups, especially in what concerns their language, culture, ancient traditions, and their economic activity and enterprise. (57)

97. It is worth noting, however, that these minority groups, in reaction, perhaps, to the what concerns their language, culture, ancient traditions, and their economic activity and enterprise.

A Cautionary Note enforced hardships of their present situation, or to historical circumstances, frequently tend to magnify unduly characteristics proper to their own
people. They even rate them above those human values which are common to all mankind, as though the good of the entire human family should subserve the interests of their own particular groups. A more reasonable attitude for such people to adopt would be to recognize the advantages, too, which accrue to them from their own special situation. They should realize that their constant association with a people steeped in a different civilization from their own has no small part to play in the development of their own particular genius and spirit. Little by little they can absorb into their very being those virtues which characterize the other nation. But for this to happen these minority groups must enter into some kind of association with the people in whose midst they are living, and learn to share their customs and way of life. It will never happen if they sow seeds of disaffection which can only produce a harvest of evils, stifling the political development of nations.

**Active Solidarity**

98. Since relationships between States must be regulated in accordance with the principles of truth and justice, States must further these relationships by taking positive steps to pool their material and spiritual resources. In many cases this can be achieved by all kinds of mutual collaboration; and this is already happening in our own day in the economic, social, political, educational, health and athletic spheres—and with beneficial results. We must bear in mind that of its very nature civil authority exists, not to confine men within the frontiers of their own nations, but primarily to protect the common good of the State, which certainly cannot be divorced from the common good of the entire human family.
99. Thus, in pursuing their own interests, civil societies, far from causing injury to others, must join plans and forces whenever the efforts of particular States cannot achieve the desired goal. But in doing so great care must be taken. What is beneficial to some States may prove detrimental rather than advantageous to others.

Contacts Between Races

100. Furthermore, the universal common good requires the encouragement in all nations of every kind of reciprocation between citizens and their intermediate societies. There are many parts of the world where we find groupings of people of more or less different ethnic origin. Nothing must be allowed to prevent reciprocal relations between them. Indeed such a prohibition would flout the very spirit of an age which has done so much to nullify the distances separating peoples.

Nor must one overlook the fact that whatever their ethnic background, men possess, besides the special characteristics which distinguish them from other men, other very important elements in common with the rest of mankind. And these can form the basis of their progressive development and self-realization especially in regard to spiritual values. They have, therefore, the right and duty to carry on their lives with others in society.

The Proper Balance Between Population, Land and Capital

101. As everyone is well aware, there are some countries where there is an imbalance between the amount of arable land and the number of inhabitants; others where there is an imbalance between the richness of the resources and the instruments of agriculture available. It is imperative, therefore, that nations enter into collaboration with each other, and facilitate the circulation of goods, capital and manpower.
102. We advocate in such cases the policy of bringing the work to the workers, wherever possible, rather than bringing workers to the scene of the work. In this way many people will be afforded an opportunity of increasing their resources without being exposed to the painful necessity of uprooting themselves from their own homes, settling in a strange environment, and forming new social contacts.

**The Problem of Political Refugees**

103. The deep feelings of paternal love for all mankind which God has implanted in Our heart makes it impossible for Us to view without bitter anguish of spirit the plight of those who for political reasons have been exiled from their own homelands. There are great numbers of such refugees at the present time, and many are the sufferings—the incredible sufferings—to which they are constantly exposed.

104. Here surely is our proof that, in defining the scope of a just freedom within which individual citizens may live lives worthy of their human dignity, the rulers of some nations have been far too restrictive. Sometimes in States of this kind the very right to freedom is called in question, and even flatly denied. We have here a complete reversal of the right order of society, for the whole raison d'être of public authority is to safeguard the interests of the community. Its sovereign duty is to recognize the noble realm of freedom and protect its rights.

**The Refugee's Rights**

105. For this reason, it is not irrelevant to draw the attention of the world to the fact that these refugees are persons and all their rights as persons must be recognized. Refugees cannot lose these rights simply because they are deprived of citizenship of their own States.
106. And among man's personal rights we must include his right to enter a country in which he hopes to be able to provide more fittingly for himself and his dependents. It is therefore the duty of State officials to accept such immigrants and—so far as the good of their own community, rightly understood, permits—to further the aims of those who may wish to become members of a new society.

**Commendable Efforts**

107. We therefore take this opportunity of giving Our public approval and commendation to every undertaking, founded on the principles of human solidarity or of Christian charity, which aims at relieving the distress of those who are compelled to emigrate from their own country to another.

108. And We must indeed single out for the praise of all right-minded men those international agencies which devote all their energies to this most important work.

**Causes of the Arms Race**

109. On the other hand, We are deeply distressed to see the enormous stocks of armaments that have been, and continue to be, manufactured in the economically more developed countries. This policy is involving a vast outlay of intellectual and material resources, with the result that the people of these countries are saddled with a great burden, while other countries lack the help they need for their economic and social development.

110. There is a common belief that under modern conditions peace cannot be assured except on the basis of an equal balance of armaments and that this factor is the probable cause of this stockpiling of armaments. Thus, if one country increases its military strength, others are immediately roused by a competitive spirit to augment their
own supply of armaments. And if one country is equipped with atomic weapons, others consider themselves justified in producing such weapons themselves, equal in destructive force.

111. Consequently people are living in the grip of constant fear. They are afraid that at any moment the impending storm may break upon them with horrific violence. And they have good reasons for their fear, for there is certainly no lack of such weapons. While it is difficult to believe that anyone would dare to assume responsibility for initiating the appalling slaughter and destruction that war would bring in its wake, there is no denying that the conflagration could be started by some chance and unforeseen circumstance. Moreover, even though the monstrous power of modern weapons does indeed act as a deterrent, there is reason to fear that the very testing of nuclear devices for war purposes can, if continued, lead to serious danger for various forms of life on earth.

Need for Disarmament

112. Hence justice, right reason, and the recognition of man's dignity cry out insistently for a cessation to the arms race. The stock-piles of armaments which have been built up in various countries must be reduced all round and simultaneously by the parties concerned. Nuclear weapons must be banned. A general agreement must be reached on a suitable disarmament program, with an effective system of mutual control. In the words of Pope Pius XII: "The calamity of a world war, with the economic and social ruin and the moral excesses and dissolution that accompany it, must not on any account be permitted to engulf the human race for a third time."

113. Everyone, however, must realize that, unless this process of disarmament be thoroughgoing and complete, and reach men's very souls, it is impossible to stop the arms
...race, or to reduce armaments, or—and this is the main thing—ultimately to abolish them entirely. Everyone must sincerely co-operate in the effort to banish fear and the anxious expectation of war from men's minds. But this requires that the fundamental principles upon which peace is based in today's world be replaced by an altogether different one, namely, the realization that true and lasting peace among nations cannot consist in the possession of an equal supply of armaments but only in mutual trust. And We are confident that this can be achieved, for it is a thing which not only is dictated by common sense, but is in itself most desirable and most fruitful of good.

**Three Motives**

114. Here, then, we have an objective dictated first of all by reason. There is general agreement—or at least there should be—that relations between States, as between individuals, must be regulated not by armed force, but in accordance with the principles of right reason: the principles, that is, of truth, justice and vigorous and sincere co-operation.

115. Secondly, it is an objective which We maintain is more earnestly to be desired. For who is there who does not feel the craving to be rid of the threat of war, and to see peace preserved and made daily more secure?

116. And finally it is an objective which is rich with possibilities for good. Its advantages will be felt everywhere, by individuals, by families, by nations, by the whole human race. The warning of Pope Pius XII still rings in our ears: "Nothing is lost by peace; everything may be lost by war."
A Call to Unsparing Effort

117. We therefore consider it Our duty as the vicar on earth of Jesus Christ—the Saviour of the world, the Author of peace—and as interpreter of the most ardent wishes of the whole human family, in the fatherly love We bear all mankind, to beg and beseech mankind, and above all the rulers of States, to be unsparing of their labor and efforts to ensure that human affairs follow a rational and dignified course.

118. In their deliberations together, let men of outstanding wisdom and influence give serious thought to the problem of achieving a more human adjustment of relations between States throughout the world. It must be an adjustment that is based on mutual trust, sincerity in negotiation, and the faithful fulfilment of obligations assumed. Every aspect of the problem must be examined, so that eventually there may emerge some point of agreement from which to initiate treaties which are sincere, lasting, and beneficial in their effects.

119. We, for Our part, will pray unceasingly that God may bless these labors by His divine assistance, and make them fruitful.

In Liberty

120. Furthermore, relations between States must be regulated by the principle of freedom. This means that no country has the right to take any action that would constitute an unjust oppression of other countries, or an unwarranted interference in their affairs. On the contrary, all should help to develop in others an increasing awareness of their duties, an adventurous and enterprising spirit, and the resolution to take the initiative for their own advancement in every field of endeavor.
The Evolution of Economically Under-developed Countries

121. All men are united by their common origin and fellowship, their redemption by Christ, and their supernatural destiny. They are called to form one Christian family. In Our encyclical Mater et Magistra, therefore, We appealed to the more wealthy nations to render every kind of assistance to those States which are still in the process of economic development.

122. It is no small consolation to Us to be able to testify here to the wide acceptance of Our appeal, and We are confident that in the years that lie ahead it will be accepted even more widely. The result We look for is that the poorer States shall in as short a time as possible attain to a degree of economic development that enables their citizens to live in conditions more in keeping with their human dignity.

123. Again and again We must insist on the need for helping these peoples in a way which guarantees to them the preservation of their own freedom. They must be conscious that they are themselves playing the major role in their economic and social development; that they are themselves to shoulder the main burden of it.

124. Hence the wisdom of Pope Pius XII's teaching: "A new order founded on moral principles is the surest bulwark against the violation of the freedom, integrity and security of other nations, no matter what may be their territorial extension or their capacity for defense. For although it is almost inevitable that the larger States, in view of their greater power and vaster resources, will themselves decide on the norms governing their economic associations with small States, nevertheless these smaller States cannot be denied their right, in keeping with the common good, to political freedom, and to the adoption of a position of neutrality in the conflicts between nations. No State can be
denied this right, for it is a postulate of the natural law itself, as also of international law. These smaller States have also the right of assuring their own economic development. It is only with the effective guaranteeing of these rights that smaller nations can fittingly promote the common good of all mankind, as well as the material welfare and the cultural and spiritual progress of their own people”.

125. The wealthier States, therefore, while providing various forms of assistance to the poorer, must have the highest possible respect for the latter’s national characteristics and time honored civil institutions. They must also repudiate any policy of domination. If this can be achieved, then "a precious contribution will have been made to the formation of a world community, in which each individual nation, conscious of its rights and duties, can work on terms of equality with the rest for the attainment of universal prosperity."

**Signs of the Times**

126. Men nowadays are becoming more and more convinced that any disputes which may arise between nations must be resolved by negotiation and agreement, and not by recourse to arms.

127. We acknowledge that this conviction owes its origin chiefly to the terrifying destructive force of modern weapons. It arises from fear of the ghastly and catastrophic consequences of their use. Thus, in this age which boasts of its atomic power, it no longer makes sense to maintain that war is a fit instrument with which to repair the violation of justice.

128. And yet, unhappily, we often find the law of fear reigning supreme among nations and causing them to spend enormous sums on armaments. Their object is not
aggression, so they say—and there is no reason for disbelieving them—but to deter others from aggression.

129. Nevertheless, We are hopeful that, by establishing contact with one another and by a policy of negotiation, nations will come to a better recognition of the natural ties that bind them together as men. We are hopeful, too, that they will come to a fairer realization of one of the cardinal duties deriving from our common nature: namely, that love, not fear, must dominate the relationships between individuals and between nations. It is principally characteristic of love that it draws men together in all sorts of ways, sincerely united in the bonds of mind and matter; and this is a union from which countless blessings can flow.

IV. RELATIONSHIP OF MEN AND OF POLITICAL COMMUNITIES WITH THE WORLD COMMUNITY

130. Recent progress in science and technology has had a profound influence on man's way of life. This progress is a spur to men all over the world to extend their collaboration and association with one another in these days when material resources, travel from one country to another, and technical information have so vastly increased. This has led to a phenomenal growth in relationships between individuals, families and intermediate associations belonging to the various nations, and between the public authorities of the various political communities. There is also a growing economic interdependence between States. National economies are gradually becoming so interdependent that a kind of world economy is being born from the simultaneous integration of the economies of individual States. And finally, each country's social
progress, order, security and peace are necessarily linked with the social progress, order, security and peace of every other country.

131. From this it is clear that no State can fittingly pursue its own interests in isolation from the rest, nor, under such circumstances, can it develop itself as it should. The prosperity and progress of any State is in part consequence, and in part cause, of the prosperity and progress of all other States.

**Inadequacy of Modern States to Ensure the Universal Common Good**

132. No era will ever succeed in destroying the unity of the human family, for it consists of men who are all equal by virtue of their natural dignity. Hence there will always be an imperative need—born of man’s very nature—to promote in sufficient measure the universal common good; the good, that is, of the whole human family.

133. In the past rulers of States seem to have been able to make sufficient provision for the universal common good through the normal diplomatic channels, or by top-level meetings and discussions, treaties and agreements; by using, that is, the ways and means suggested by the natural law, the law of nations, or international law.

134. In our own day, however, mutual relationships between States have undergone a far reaching change. On the one hand, the universal common good gives rise to problems of the utmost gravity, complexity and urgency—especially as regards the preservation of the security and peace of the whole world. On the other hand, the rulers of individual nations, being all on an equal footing, largely fail in their efforts to achieve this, however much they multiply their meetings and their endeavors to discover more fitting instruments of justice. And this is no reflection on their sincerity and enterprise. It is merely that their authority is not sufficiently influential.
135. We are thus driven to the conclusion that the shape and structure of political life in the modern world, and the influence exercised by public authority in all the nations of the world are unequal to the task of promoting the common good of all peoples.

Connection Between the Common Good and Political Authority

136. Now, if one considers carefully the inner significance of the common good on the one hand, and the nature and function of public authority on the other, one cannot fail to see that there is an intrinsic connection between them. Public authority, as the means of promoting the common good in civil society, is a postulate of the moral order. But the moral order likewise requires that this authority be effective in attaining its end. Hence the civil institutions in which such authority resides, becomes operative and promotes its ends, are endowed with a certain kind of structure and efficacy: a structure and efficacy which make such institutions capable of realizing the common good by ways and means adequate to the changing historical conditions.

137. Today the universal common good presents us with problems which are world-wide in their dimensions; problems, therefore, which cannot be solved except by a public authority with power, organization and means co-extensive with these problems, and with a world-wide sphere of activity. Consequently the moral order itself demands the establishment of some such general form of public authority.

Public Authority Instituted by Common Consent and Not Imposed by Force

138. But this general authority equipped with world-wide power and adequate means for achieving the universal common good cannot be imposed by force. It must be set up with the consent of all nations. If its work is to be effective, it must operate with fairness, absolute impartiality, and with dedication to the common good of all peoples.
The forcible imposition by the more powerful nations of a universal authority of this kind would inevitably arouse fears of its being used as an instrument to serve the interests of the few or to take the side of a single nation, and thus the influence and effectiveness of its activity would be undermined. For even though nations may differ widely in material progress and military strength, they are very sensitive as regards their juridical equality and the excellence of their own way of life. They are right, therefore, in their reluctance to submit to an authority imposed by force, established without their co-operation, or not accepted of their own accord.

The Universal Common Good and Personal Rights

139. The common good of individual States is something that cannot be determined without reference to the human person, and the same is true of the common good of all States taken together. Hence the public authority of the world community must likewise have as its special aim the recognition, respect, safeguarding and promotion of the rights of the human person. This can be done by direct action, if need be, or by the creation throughout the world of the sort of conditions in which rulers of individual States can more easily carry out their specific functions.

The Principle of Subsidiarity

140. The same principle of subsidiarity which governs the relations between public authorities and individuals, families and intermediate societies in a single State, must also apply to the relations between the public authority of the world community and the public authorities of each political community. The special function of this universal authority must be to evaluate and find a solution to economic, social, political and cultural problems which affect the universal common good. These are problems which,
because of their extreme gravity, vastness and urgency, must be considered too difficult for the rulers of individual States to solve with any degree of success.

141. But it is no part of the duty of universal authority to limit the sphere of action of the public authority of individual States, or to arrogate any of their functions to itself. On the contrary, its essential purpose is to create world conditions in which the public authorities of each nation, its citizens and intermediate groups, can carry out their tasks, fulfill their duties and claim their rights with greater security.

**Modern Developments**

142. The United Nations Organization (U.N.) was established, as is well known, on June 26, 1945. To it were subsequently added lesser organizations consisting of members nominated by the public authority of the various nations and entrusted with highly important international functions in the economics, social, cultural, educational and health fields. The United Nations Organization has the special aim of maintaining and strengthening peace between nations, and of encouraging and assisting friendly relations between them, based on the principles of equality, mutual respect, and extensive cooperation in every field of human endeavor.

143. A clear proof of the farsightedness of this organization is provided by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights passed by the United Nations General Assembly on December 10, 1948. The preamble of this declaration affirms that the genuine recognition and complete observance of all the rights and freedoms outlined in the declaration is a goal to be sought by all peoples and all nations.

144. We are, of course, aware that some of the points in the declaration did not meet with unqualified approval in some quarters; and there was justification for this.
Nevertheless, We think the document should be considered a step in the right direction, an approach toward the establishment of a juridical and political ordering of the world community. It is a solemn recognition of the personal dignity of every human being; an assertion of everyone's right to be free to seek out the truth, to follow moral principles, discharge the duties imposed by justice, and lead a fully human life. It also recognized other rights connected with these.

145. It is therefore Our earnest wish that the United Nations Organization may be able progressively to adapt its structure and methods of operation to the magnitude and nobility of its tasks. May the day be not long delayed when every human being can find in this organization an effective safeguard of his personal rights; those rights, that is, which derive directly from his dignity as a human person, and which are therefore universal, inviolable and inalienable. This is all the more desirable in that men today are taking an ever more active part in the public life of their own nations, and in doing so they are showing an increased interest in the affairs of all peoples. They are becoming more and more conscious of being living members of the universal family of mankind.

V. PASTORAL EXHORTATIONS

146. Here once more We exhort Our sons to take an active part in public life, and to work together for the benefit of the whole human race, as well as for their own political communities. It is vitally necessary for them to endeavor, in the light of Christian faith, and with love as their guide, to ensure that every institution, whether economic, social, cultural or political, be such as not to obstruct but rather to facilitate man's self betterment, both in the natural and in the supernatural order.
Scientific Competence, Technical Capacity and Professional Experience

147. And yet, if they are to imbue civilization with right ideals and Christian principles, it is not enough for Our sons to be illumined by the heavenly light of faith and to be fired with enthusiasm for a cause; they must involve themselves in the work of these institutions, and strive to influence them effectively from within.

148. But in a culture and civilization like our own, which is so remarkable for its scientific knowledge and its technical discoveries, clearly no one can insinuate himself into public life unless he be scientifically competent, technically capable, and skilled in the practice of his own profession. Apostolate of a Trained Laity

149. And yet even this must be reckoned insufficient to bring the relationships of daily life into conformity with a more human standard, based, as it must be, on truth, tempered by justice, motivated by mutual love, and holding fast to the practice of freedom.

150. If these policies are really to become operative, men must first of all take the utmost care to conduct their various temporal activities in accordance with the laws which govern each and every such activity, observing the principles which correspond to their respective natures. Secondly, men's actions must be made to conform with the precepts of the moral order. This means that their behavior must be such as to reflect their consciousness of exercising a personal right or performing a personal duty. Reason has a further demand to make. In obedience to the providential designs and commands of God respecting our salvation and neglecting the dictates of conscience, men must conduct themselves in their temporal activity in such a way as to effect a thorough integration of the principal spiritual values with those of science, technology and the professions.
Integration of Faith and Action

151. In traditionally Christian States at the present time, civil institutions evince a high degree of scientific and technical progress and possess abundant machinery for the attainment of every kind of objective. And yet it must be owned that these institutions are often but slightly affected by Christian motives and a Christian spirit.

152. One may well ask the reason for this, since the men who have largely contributed—and who are still contributing—to the creation of these institutions are men who are professed Christians, and who live their lives, at least in part, in accordance with the precepts of the gospels. In Our opinion the explanation lies in a certain cleavage between faith and practice. Their inner, spiritual unity must be restored, so that faith may be the light and love the motivating force of all their actions.

Integral Education

153. We consider too that a further reason for this very frequent divorce between faith and practice in Christians is an inadequate education in Christian teaching and Christian morality. In many places the amount of energy devoted to the study of secular subjects is all too often out of proportion to that devoted to the study of religion. Scientific training reaches a very high level, whereas religious training generally does not advance beyond the elementary stage. It is essential, therefore, that the instruction given to our young people be complete and continuous, and imparted in such a way that moral goodness and the cultivation of religious values may keep pace with scientific knowledge and continually advancing technical progress. Young people must also be taught how to carry out their own particular obligations in a truly fitting manner.
Constant Endeavor

154. In this connection We think it opportune to point out how difficult it is to understand clearly the relation between the objective requirements of justice and concrete situations; to define, that is, correctly to what degree and in what form doctrinal principles and directives must be applied in the given state of human society.

155. The definition of these degrees and forms is all the more difficult in an age such as ours, driven forward by a fever of activity. And yet this is the age in which each one of us is required to make his own contribution to the universal common good. Daily is borne in on us the need to make the reality of social life conform better to the requirements of justice. Hence Our sons have every reason for not thinking that they can relax their efforts and be satisfied with what they have already achieved.

156. What has so far been achieved is insufficient compared with what needs to be done; all men must realize that. Every day provides a more important, a more fitting enterprise to which they must turn their hands—industry, trade unions, professional organizations, insurance, cultural institutions, the law, politics, medical and recreational facilities, and other such activities. The age in which we live needs all these things. It is an age in which men, having discovered the atom and achieved the breakthrough into outer space, are now exploring other avenues, leading to almost limitless horizons.

Relations Between Catholics and Non-Catholics in Social and Economic Affairs

157. The principles We have set out in this document take their rise from the very nature of things. They derive, for the most part, from the consideration of man's natural rights. Thus the putting of these principles into effect frequently involves extensive co-operation between Catholics and those Christians who are separated from this Apostolic
See. It even involves the cooperation of Catholics with men who may not be Christians but who nevertheless are reasonable men, and men of natural moral integrity. "In such circumstances they must, of course, bear themselves as Catholics, and do nothing to compromise religion and morality. Yet at the same time they should show themselves animated by a spirit of understanding and unselfishness, ready to co-operate loyally in achieving objects which are good in themselves, or conducive to good."

**Error and the Errant**

158. It is always perfectly justifiable to distinguish between error as such and the person who falls into error—even in the case of men who err regarding the truth or are led astray as a result of their inadequate knowledge, in matters either of religion or of the highest ethical standards. A man who has fallen into error does not cease to be a man. He never forfeits his personal dignity; and that is something that must always be taken into account. Besides, there exists in man's very nature an undying capacity to break through the barriers of error and seek the road to truth. God, in His great providence, is ever present with His aid. Today, maybe, a man lacks faith and turns aside into error; tomorrow, perhaps, illumined by God's light, he may indeed embrace the truth.

Catholics who, in order to achieve some external good, collaborate with unbelievers or with those who through error lack the fullness of faith in Christ, may possibly provide the occasion or even the incentive for their conversion to the truth.

**Philosophies and Historical Movements**

159. Again it is perfectly legitimate to make a clear distinction between a false philosophy of the nature, origin and purpose of men and the world, and economic, social, cultural, and political undertakings, even when such undertakings draw their origin and
inspiration from that philosophy. True, the philosophic formula does not change once it has been set down in precise terms, but the undertakings clearly cannot avoid being influenced to a certain extent by the changing conditions in which they have to operate. Besides, who can deny the possible existence of good and commendable elements in these undertakings, elements which do indeed conform to the dictates of right reason, and are an expression of man's lawful aspirations?

160. It may sometimes happen, therefore, that meetings arranged for some practical end—though hitherto they were thought to be altogether useless—may in fact be fruitful at the present time, or at least offer prospects of success. But whether or not the moment for such cooperation has arrived, and the manner and degree of such cooperation in the attainment of economic, social, cultural and political advantages—these are matters for prudence to decide; prudence, the queen of all the virtues which rule the lives of men both as individuals and in society.

As far as Catholics are concerned, the decision rests primarily with those who take a leading part in the life of the community, and in these specific fields. They must, however, act in accordance with the principles of the natural law, and observe the Church's social teaching and the directives of ecclesiastical authority. For it must not be forgotten that the Church has the right and duty not only to safeguard her teaching on faith and morals, but also to exercise her authority over her sons by intervening in their external affairs whenever a judgment has to be made concerning the practical application of this teaching.
Little by Little

161. There are indeed some people who, in their generosity of spirit, burn with a desire to institute wholesale reforms whenever they come across situations which show scant regard for justice or are wholly out of keeping with its claims. They tackle the problem with such impetuosity that one would think they were embarking on some political revolution.

162. We would remind such people that it is the law of nature that all things must be of gradual growth. If there is to be any improvement in human institutions, the work must be done slowly and deliberately from within. Pope Pius XII expressed it in these terms: "Salvation and justice consist not in the uprooting of an outdated system, but in a well designed policy of development. Hotheadedness was never constructive; it has always destroyed everything. It has inflamed passions, but never assuaged them. It sows no seeds but those of hatred and destruction. Far from bringing about the reconciliation of contending parties, it reduces men and political parties to the necessity of laboriously redoing the work of the past, building on the ruins that disharmony has left in its wake."

An Immense Task

163. Hence among the very serious obligations incumbent upon men of high principles, We must include the task of establishing new relationships in human society, under the mastery and guidance of truth, justice, charity and freedom—relations between individual citizens, between citizens and their respective States, between States, and finally between individuals, families, intermediate associations and States on the one hand, and the world community on the other. There is surely no one who will not
consider this a most exalted task, for it is one which is able to bring about true peace in accordance with divinely established order.

164. Considering the need, the men who are shouldering this responsibility are far too few in number, yet they are deserving of the highest recognition from society, and We rightfully honor them with Our public praise. We call upon them to persevere in their ideals, which are of such tremendous benefit to mankind. At the same time We are encouraged to hope that many more men, Christians especially, will join their cause, spurred on by love and the realization of their duty. Everyone who has joined the ranks of Christ must be a glowing point of light in the world, a nucleus of love, a leaven of the whole mass. He will be so in proportion to his degree of spiritual union with God.

165. The world will never be the dwelling place of peace, till peace has found a home in the heart of each and every man, till every man preserves in himself the order ordained by God to be preserved. That is why St. Augustine asks the question: "Does your mind desire the strength to gain the mastery over your passions? Let it submit to a greater power, and it will conquer all beneath it. And peace will be in you—true, sure, most ordered peace. What is that order? God as ruler of the mind; the mind as ruler of the body. Nothing could be more orderly."

The Prince of Peace

166. Our concern here has been with problems which are causing men extreme anxiety at the present time; problems which are intimately bound up with the progress of human society. Unquestionably, the teaching We have given has been inspired by a longing which We feel most keenly, and which We know is shared by all men of good will: that peace may be assured on earth.
167. We who, in spite of Our inadequacy, are nevertheless the vicar of Him whom 
the prophet announced as the Prince of Peace,  conceive of it as Our duty to devote all 
Our thoughts and care and energy to further this common good of all mankind. Yet peace 
is but an empty word, if it does not rest upon that order which Our hope prevailed upon 
Us to set forth in outline in this encyclical. It is an order that is founded on truth, built up 
on justice, nurtured and animated by charity, and brought into effect under the auspices of 
freedom.

168. So magnificent, so exalted is this aim that human resources alone, even 
though inspired by the most praiseworthy good will, cannot hope to achieve it. God 
Himself must come to man's aid with His heavenly assistance, if human society is to bear 
the closest possible resemblance to the kingdom of God.

169. The very order of things therefore, demands that during this sacred season 
we pray earnestly to Him who by His bitter passion and death washed away men's sins, 
which are the fountainhead of discord, misery and inequality; to Him who shed His blood 
to reconcile the human race to the heavenly Father, and bestowed the gifts of peace. "For 
He is our peace, who hath made both one . . . And coming, He preached peace to you that 
were afar off; and peace to them that were nigh."

170. The sacred liturgy of these days reechoes the same message: "Our Lord Jesus 
Christ, after His resurrection stood in the midst of His disciples and said: Peace be upon 
you, alleluia. The disciples rejoiced when they saw the Lord."  It is Christ, therefore, 
who brought us peace; Christ who bequeathed it to us: "Peace I leave with you: my peace 
I give unto you: not as the world giveth, do I give unto you."
171. Let us, then, pray with all fervor for this peace which our divine Redeemer came to bring us. May He banish from the souls of men whatever might endanger peace. May He transform all men into witnesses of truth, justice and brotherly love. May He illumine with His light the minds of rulers, so that, besides caring for the proper material welfare of their peoples, they may also guarantee them the fairest gift of peace.

Finally, may Christ inflame the desires of all men to break through the barriers which divide them, to strengthen the bonds of mutual love, to learn to understand one another, and to pardon those who have done them wrong. Through His power and inspiration may all peoples welcome each other to their hearts as brothers, and may the peace they long for ever flower and ever reign among them.

172. And so, dear brothers, with the ardent wish that peace may come upon the flocks committed to your care, for the special benefit of those who are most lowly and in the greatest need of help and defense, lovingly in the Lord We bestow on you, on Our priests both secular and regular, on religious both men and women, on all the faithful and especially those who give wholehearted obedience to these Our exhortations, Our Apostolic Blessing. And upon all men of good will, to whom We also address this encyclical, We implore from God health and prosperity.

Given at Rome, at St. Peter's, on Holy Thursday, the eleventh day of April, in the year 1963, the fifth of Our Pontificate.

JOHN XXIII
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President Anderson, members of the faculty, board of trustees, distinguished guests, my old colleague, Senator Bob Byrd, who has earned his degree through many years of attending night law school, while I am earning mine in the next 30 minutes, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen:

It is with great pride that I participate in this ceremony of the American University, sponsored by the Methodist Church, founded by Bishop John Fletcher Hurst, and first opened by President Woodrow Wilson in 1914. This is a young and growing university, but it has already fulfilled Bishop Hurst's enlightened hope for the study of history and public affairs in a city devoted to the making of history and the conduct of the public's business. By sponsoring this institution of higher learning for all who wish to learn, whatever their color or their creed, the Methodists of this area and the Nation deserve the Nation's thanks, and I commend all those who are today graduating
Professor Woodrow Wilson once said that every man sent out from a university should be a man of his nation as well as a man of his time, and I am confident that the men and women who carry the honor of graduating from this institution will continue to give from their lives, from their talents, a high measure of public service and public support.

"There are few earthly things more beautiful than a university," wrote John Masefield in his tribute to English universities--and his words are equally true today. He did not refer to spires and towers, to campus greens and ivied walls. He admired the splendid beauty of the university, he said, because it was "a place where those who hate ignorance may strive to know, where those who perceive truth may strive to make others see."

I have, therefore, chosen this time and this place to discuss a topic on which ignorance too often abounds and the truth is too rarely perceived--yet it is the most important topic on earth: world peace.

What kind of peace do I mean? What kind of peace do we seek? Not a Pax Americana enforced on the world by American weapons of war. Not the peace of the grave or the security of the slave. I am talking about genuine peace, the kind of peace that makes life on earth worth living, the kind that enables men and nations to grow and to hope and to build a better life for their children--not merely peace for Americans but peace for all men and women--not merely peace in our time but peace for all time.
I speak of peace because of the new face of war. Total war makes no sense in an age when great powers can maintain large and relatively invulnerable nuclear forces and refuse to surrender without resort to those forces. It makes no sense in an age when a single nuclear weapon contains almost ten times the explosive force delivered by all the allied air forces in the Second World War. It makes no sense in an age when the deadly poisons produced by a nuclear exchange would be carried by wind and water and soil and seed to the far corners of the globe and to generations yet unborn.

Today the expenditure of billions of dollars every year on weapons acquired for the purpose of making sure we never need to use them is essential to keeping the peace. But surely the acquisition of such idle stockpiles--which can only destroy and never create--is not the only, much less the most efficient, means of assuring peace.

I speak of peace, therefore, as the necessary rational end of rational men. I realize that the pursuit of peace is not as dramatic as the pursuit of war--and frequently the words of the pursuer fall on deaf ears. But we have no more urgent task.

Some say that it is useless to speak of world peace or world law or world disarmament--and that it will be useless until the leaders of the Soviet Union adopt a more enlightened attitude. I hope they do. I believe we can help them do it. But I also believe that we must reexamine our own attitude--as individuals and as a Nation--for our attitude is as essential as theirs. And every graduate of this school, every thoughtful citizen who despairs of war and wishes to bring peace, should begin by looking inward--
by examining his own attitude toward the possibilities of peace, toward the Soviet Union, toward the course of the cold war and toward freedom and peace here at home.

First: Let us examine our attitude toward peace itself. Too many of us think it is impossible. Too many think it unreal. But that is a dangerous, defeatist belief. It leads to the conclusion that war is inevitable—that mankind is doomed—that we are gripped by forces we cannot control.

We need not accept that view. Our problems are manmade—therefore, they can be solved by man. And man can be as big as he wants. No problem of human destiny is beyond human beings. Man's reason and spirit have often solved the seemingly unsolvable—and we believe they can do it again.

I am not referring to the absolute, infinite concept of peace and good will of which some fantasies and fanatics dream. I do not deny the value of hopes and dreams but we merely invite discouragement and incredulity by making that our only and immediate goal.

Let us focus instead on a more practical, more attainable peace—based not on a sudden revolution in human nature but on a gradual evolution in human institutions—on a series of concrete actions and effective agreements which are in the interest of all concerned. There is no single, simple key to this peace—no grand or magic formula to be adopted by one or two powers. Genuine peace must be the product of many nations, the
sum of many acts. It must be dynamic, not static, changing to meet the challenge of each new generation. For peace is a process—a way of solving problems.

With such a peace, there will still be quarrels and conflicting interests, as there are within families and nations. World peace, like community peace, does not require that each man love his neighbor—it requires only that they live together in mutual tolerance, submitting their disputes to a just and peaceful settlement. And history teaches us that enmities between nations, as between individuals, do not last forever. However fixed our likes and dislikes may seem, the tide of time and events will often bring surprising changes in the relations between nations and neighbors.

So let us persevere. Peace need not be impracticable, and war need not be inevitable. By defining our goal more clearly, by making it seem more manageable and less remote, we can help all peoples to see it, to draw hope from it, and to move irresistibly toward it.

Second: Let us reexamine our attitude toward the Soviet Union. It is discouraging to think that their leaders may actually believe what their propagandists write. It is discouraging to read a recent authoritative Soviet text on Military Strategy and find, on page after page, wholly baseless and incredible claims—such as the allegation that "American imperialist circles are preparing to unleash different types of wars . . . that there is a very real threat of a preventive war being unleashed by American imperialists against the Soviet Union . . . [and that] the political aims of the American imperialists are
to enslave economically and politically the European and other capitalist countries . . . [and] to achieve world domination . . . by means of aggressive wars."

Truly, as it was written long ago: "The wicked flee when no man pursueth."

Yet it is sad to read these Soviet statements--to realize the extent of the gulf between us. But it is also a warning--a warning to the American people not to fall into the same trap as the Soviets, not to see only a distorted and desperate view of the other side, not to see conflict as inevitable, accommodation as impossible, and communication as nothing more than an exchange of threats.

No government or social system is so evil that its people must be considered as lacking in virtue. As Americans, we find communism profoundly repugnant as a negation of personal freedom and dignity. But we can still hail the Russian people for their many achievements--in science and space, in economic and industrial growth, in culture and in acts of courage.

Among the many traits the peoples of our two countries have in common, none is stronger than our mutual abhorrence of war. Almost unique among the major world powers, we have never been at war with each other. And no nation in the history of battle ever suffered more than the Soviet Union suffered in the course of the Second World War. At least 20 million lost their lives. Countless millions of homes and farms were burned or sacked. A third of the nation's territory, including nearly two thirds of its
industrial base, was turned into a wasteland—a loss equivalent to the devastation of this country east of Chicago.

Today, should total war ever break out again—no matter how—our two countries would become the primary targets. It is an ironic but accurate fact that the two strongest powers are the two in the most danger of devastation. All we have built, all we have worked for, would be destroyed in the first 24 hours. And even in the cold war, which brings burdens and dangers to so many nations, including this Nation's closest allies—our two countries bear the heaviest burdens. For we are both devoting massive sums of money to weapons that could be better devoted to combating ignorance, poverty, and disease. We are both caught up in a vicious and dangerous cycle in which suspicion on one side breeds suspicion on the other, and new weapons beget counterweapons.

In short, both the United States and its allies, and the Soviet Union and its allies, have a mutually deep interest in a just and genuine peace and in halting the arms race. Agreements to this end are in the interests of the Soviet Union as well as ours—and even the most hostile nations can be relied upon to accept and keep those treaty obligations, and only those treaty obligations, which are in their own interest.

So, let us not be blind to our differences—but let us also direct attention to our common interests and to the means by which those differences can be resolved. And if we cannot end now our differences, at least we can help make the world safe for diversity. For, in the final analysis, our most basic common link is that we all inhabit this
small planet. We all breathe the same air. We all cherish our children's future. And we are all mortal.

Third: Let us reexamine our attitude toward the cold war, remembering that we are not engaged in a debate, seeking to pile up debating points. We are not here distributing blame or pointing the finger of judgment. We must deal with the world as it is, and not as it might have been had the history of the last 18 years been different.

We must, therefore, persevere in the search for peace in the hope that constructive changes within the Communist bloc might bring within reach solutions which now seem beyond us. We must conduct our affairs in such a way that it becomes in the Communists' interest to agree on a genuine peace. Above all, while defending our own vital interests, nuclear powers must avert those confrontations which bring an adversary to a choice of either a humiliating retreat or a nuclear war. To adopt that kind of course in the nuclear age would be evidence only of the bankruptcy of our policy—or of a collective death-wish for the world.

To secure these ends, America's weapons are nonprovocative, carefully controlled, designed to deter, and capable of selective use. Our military forces are committed to peace and disciplined in self-restraint. Our diplomats are instructed to avoid unnecessary irritants and purely rhetorical hostility.
For we can seek a relaxation of tension without relaxing our guard. And, for our part, we do not need to use threats to prove that we are resolute. We do not need to jam foreign broadcasts out of fear our faith will be eroded. We are unwilling to impose our system on any unwilling people--but we are willing and able to engage in peaceful competition with any people on earth.

Meanwhile, we seek to strengthen the United Nations, to help solve its financial problems, to make it a more effective instrument for peace, to develop it into a genuine world security system--a system capable of resolving disputes on the basis of law, of insuring the security of the large and the small, and of creating conditions under which arms can finally be abolished.

At the same time we seek to keep peace inside the non-Communist world, where many nations, all of them our friends, are divided over issues which weaken Western unity, which invite Communist intervention or which threaten to erupt into war. Our efforts in West New Guinea, in the Congo, in the Middle East, and in the Indian subcontinent, have been persistent and patient despite criticism from both sides. We have also tried to set an example for others--by seeking to adjust small but significant differences with our own closest neighbors in Mexico and in Canada.

Speaking of other nations, I wish to make one point clear. We are bound to many nations by alliances. Those alliances exist because our concern and theirs substantially overlap. Our commitment to defend Western Europe and West Berlin, for
example, stands undiminished because of the identity of our vital interests. The United States will make no deal with the Soviet Union at the expense of other nations and other peoples, not merely because they are our partners, but also because their interests and ours converge.

Our interests converge, however, not only in defending the frontiers of freedom, but in pursuing the paths of peace. It is our hope--and the purpose of allied policies--to convince the Soviet Union that she, too, should let each nation choose its own future, so long as that choice does not interfere with the choices of others. The Communist drive to impose their political and economic system on others is the primary cause of world tension today. For there can be no doubt that, if all nations could refrain from interfering in the self-determination of others, the peace would be much more assured.

This will require a new effort to achieve world law--a new context for world discussions. It will require increased understanding between the Soviets and ourselves. And increased understanding will require increased contact and communication. One step in this direction is the proposed arrangement for a direct line between Moscow and Washington, to avoid on each side the dangerous delays, misunderstandings, and misreadings of the other's actions which might occur at a time of crisis.

We have also been talking in Geneva about the other first-step measures of arms control designed to limit the intensity of the arms race and to reduce the risks of
accidental war. Our primary long range interest in Geneva, however, is general and complete disarmament-- designed to take place by stages, permitting parallel political developments to build the new institutions of peace which would take the place of arms. The pursuit of disarmament has been an effort of this Government since the 1920's. It has been urgently sought by the past three administrations. And however dim the prospects may be today, we intend to continue this effort--to continue it in order that all countries, including our own, can better grasp what the problems and possibilities of disarmament are.

The one major area of these negotiations where the end is in sight, yet where a fresh start is badly needed, is in a treaty to outlaw nuclear tests. The conclusion of such a treaty, so near and yet so far, would check the spiraling arms race in one of its most dangerous areas. It would place the nuclear powers in a position to deal more effectively with one of the greatest hazards which man faces in 1963, the further spread of nuclear arms. It would increase our security--it would decrease the prospects of war. Surely this goal is sufficiently important to require our steady pursuit, yielding neither to the temptation to give up the whole effort nor the temptation to give up our insistence on vital and responsible safeguards.

I am taking this opportunity, therefore, to announce two important decisions in this regard.
First: Chairman Khrushchev, Prime Minister Macmillan, and I have agreed that high-level discussions will shortly begin in Moscow looking toward early agreement on a comprehensive test ban treaty. Our hopes must be tempered with the caution of history--but with our hopes go the hopes of all mankind.

Second: To make clear our good faith and solemn convictions on the matter, I now declare that the United States does not propose to conduct nuclear tests in the atmosphere so long as other states do not do so. We will not be the first to resume. Such a declaration is no substitute for a formal binding treaty, but I hope it will help us achieve one. Nor would such a treaty be a substitute for disarmament, but I hope it will help us achieve it.

Finally, my fellow Americans, let us examine our attitude toward peace and freedom here at home. The quality and spirit of our own society must justify and support our efforts abroad. We must show it in the dedication of our own lives--as many of you who are graduating today will have a unique opportunity to do, by serving without pay in the Peace Corps abroad or in the proposed National Service Corps here at home.

But wherever we are, we must all, in our daily lives, live up to the age-old faith that peace and freedom walk together. In too many of our cities today, the peace is not secure because the freedom is incomplete.
It is the responsibility of the executive branch at all levels of government--local, State, and National--to provide and protect that freedom for all of our citizens by all means within their authority. It is the responsibility of the legislative branch at all levels, wherever that authority is not now adequate, to make it adequate. And it is the responsibility of all citizens in all sections of this country to respect the rights of all others and to respect the law of the land.

All this is not unrelated to world peace. "When a man's ways please the Lord," the Scriptures tell us, "he maketh even his enemies to be at peace with him." And is not peace, in the last analysis, basically a matter of human rights--the right to live out our lives without fear of devastation--the right to breathe air as nature provided it--the right of future generations to a healthy existence?

While we proceed to safeguard our national interests, let us also safeguard human interests. And the elimination of war and arms is clearly in the interest of both. No treaty, however much it may be to the advantage of all, however tightly it may be worded, can provide absolute security against the risks of deception and evasion. But it can--if it is sufficiently effective in its enforcement and if it is sufficiently in the interests of its signers--offer far more security and far fewer risks than an unabated, uncontrolled, unpredictable arms race.

The United States, as the world knows, will never start a war. We do not want a war. We do not now expect a war. This generation of Americans has already had
enough--more than enough--of war and hate and oppression. We shall be prepared if others wish it. We shall be alert to try to stop it. But we shall also do our part to build a world of peace where the weak are safe and the strong are just. We are not helpless before that task or hopeless of its success. Confident and unafraid, we labor on--not toward a strategy of annihilation but toward a strategy of peace.
President John F. Kennedy

The White House

June 11, 1963

Good evening my fellow citizens:

This afternoon, following a series of threats and defiant statements, the presence of Alabama National Guardsmen was required on the University of Alabama to carry out the final and unequivocal order of the United States District Court of the Northern District of Alabama. That order called for the admission of two clearly qualified young Alabama residents who happened to have been born Negro.

That they were admitted peacefully on the campus is due in good measure to the conduct of the students of the University of Alabama, who met their responsibilities in a constructive way.

I hope that every American, regardless of where he lives, will stop and examine his conscience about this and other related incidents. This Nation was founded by men of many nations and backgrounds. It was founded on the principle that all men are created equal, and that the rights of every man are diminished when the rights of one man are
threatened. Today we are committed to a worldwide struggle to promote and protect the rights of all who wish to be free. And when Americans are sent to Viet-Nam or West Berlin, we do not ask for whites only. It ought to be possible, therefore, for American students of any color to attend any public institution they select without having to be backed up by troops.

It ought to be possible for American consumers of any color to receive equal service in places of public accommodation, such as hotels and restaurants and theaters and retail stores, without being forced to resort to demonstrations in the street, and it ought to be possible for American citizens of any color to register to vote in a free election without interference or fear of reprisal.

It ought to be possible, in short, for every American to enjoy the privileges of being American without regard to his race or his color. In short, every American ought to have the right to be treated as he would wish to be treated, as one would wish his children to be treated. But this is not the case.

The Negro baby born in America today, regardless of the section of the Nation in which he is born, has about one-half as much chance of completing a high school as a white baby born in the same place on the same day, one-third as much chance of completing college, one-third as much chance of becoming a professional man, twice as much chance of becoming unemployed, about one-seventh as much chance of earning $10,000 a year, a life expectancy which is 7 years shorter, and the prospects of earning only half as much.

This is not a sectional issue. Difficulties over segregation and discrimination exist in every city, in every State of the Union, producing in many cities a rising tide of
discontent that threatens the public safety. Nor is this a partisan issue. In a time of
domestic crisis men of good will and generosity should be able to unite regardless of
party or politics. This is not even a legal or legislative issue alone. It is better to settle
these matters in the courts than on the streets, and new laws are needed at every level, but
law alone cannot make men see right.

We are confronted primarily with a moral issue. It is as old as the scriptures and is
as clear as the American Constitution.

The heart of the question is whether all Americans are to be afforded equal rights
and equal opportunities, whether we are going to treat our fellow Americans as we want
to be treated. If an American, because his skin is dark, cannot eat lunch in a restaurant
open to the public, if he cannot send his children to the best public school available, if he
cannot vote for the public officials who will represent him, if, in short, he cannot enjoy
the full and free life which all of us want, then who among us would be content to have
the color of his skin changed and stand in his place? Who among us would then be
content with the counsels of patience and delay?

One hundred years of delay have passed since President Lincoln freed the slaves,
yet their heirs, their grandsons, are not fully free. They are not yet freed from the bonds
of injustice. They are not yet freed from social and economic oppression. And this
Nation, for all its hopes and all its boasts, will not be fully free until all its citizens are
free.

We preach freedom around the world, and we mean it, and we cherish our
freedom here at home, but are we to say to the world, and much more importantly, to
each other that this is the land of the free except for the Negroes; that we have no second-
class citizens except Negroes; that we have no class or caste system, no ghettos, no master race except with respect to Negroes?

Now the time has come for this Nation to fulfill its promise. The events in Birmingham and elsewhere have so increased the cries for equality that no city or State or legislative body can prudently choose to ignore them.

The fires of frustration and discord are burning in every city, North and South, where legal remedies are not at hand. Redress is sought in the streets, in demonstrations, parades, and protests which create tensions and threaten violence and threaten lives.

We face, therefore, a moral crisis as a country and as a people. It cannot be met by repressive police action. It cannot be left to increased demonstrations in the streets. It cannot be quieted by token moves or talk. It is time to act in the Congress, in your State and local legislative body and, above all, in all of our daily lives.

It is not enough to pin the blame on others, to say this is a problem of one section of the country or another, or deplore the fact that we face. A great change is at hand, and our task, our obligation, is to make that revolution, that change, peaceful and constructive for all.

Those who do nothing are inviting shame as well as violence. Those who act boldly are recognizing right as well as reality.

Next week I shall ask the Congress of the United States to act, to make a commitment it has not fully made in this century to the proposition that race has no place in American life or law. The Federal judiciary has upheld that proposition in the conduct of its affairs, including the employment of Federal personnel, the use of Federal facilities, and the sale of federally financed housing.
But there are other necessary measures which only the Congress can provide, and they must be provided at this session. The old code of equity law under which we live commands for every wrong a remedy, but in too many communities, in too many parts of the country, wrongs are inflicted on Negro citizens and there are no remedies at law. Unless the Congress acts, their only remedy is in the street.

I am, therefore, asking the Congress to enact legislation giving all Americans the right to be served in facilities which are open to the public--hotels, restaurants, theaters, retail stores, and similar establishments.

This seems to me to be an elementary right. Its denial is an arbitrary indignity that no American in 1963 should have to endure, but many do.

I have recently met with scores of business leaders urging them to take voluntary action to end this discrimination and I have been encouraged by their response, and in the last 2 weeks over 75 cities have seen progress made in desegregating these kinds of facilities. But many are unwilling to act alone, and for this reason, nationwide legislation is needed if we are to move this problem from the streets to the courts.

I am also asking the Congress to authorize the Federal Government to participate more fully in lawsuits designed to end segregation in public education. We have succeeded in persuading many districts to desegregate voluntarily. Dozens have admitted Negroes without violence. Today a Negro is attending a State-supported institution in every one of our 50 States, but the pace is very slow.

Too many Negro children entering segregated grade schools at the time of the Supreme Court's decision 9 years ago will enter segregated high schools this fall, having
suffered a loss which can never be restored. The lack of an adequate education denies the Negro a chance to get a decent job.

The orderly implementation of the Supreme Court decision, therefore, cannot be left solely to those who may not have the economic resources to carry the legal action or who may be subject to harassment.

Other features will also be requested, including greater protection for the right to vote. But legislation, I repeat, cannot solve this problem alone. It must be solved in the homes of every American in every community across our country.

In this respect I want to pay tribute to those citizens North and South who have been working in their communities to make life better for all. They are acting not out of a sense of legal duty but out of a sense of human decency.

Like our soldiers and sailors in all parts of the world they are meeting freedom's challenge on the firing line, and I salute them for their honor and their courage.

My fellow Americans, this is a problem which faces us all—in every city of the North as well as the South. Today there are Negroes unemployed, two or three times as many compared to whites, inadequate in education, moving into the large cities, unable to find work, young people particularly out of work without hope, denied equal rights, denied the opportunity to eat at a restaurant or lunch counter or go to a movie theater, denied the right to a decent education, denied almost today the right to attend a State university even though qualified. It seems to me that these are matters which concern us all, not merely Presidents or Congressmen or Governors, but every citizen of the United States.
This is one country. It has become one country because all of us and all the people who came here had an equal chance to develop their talents.

We cannot say to 10 percent of the population that you can't have that right; that your children cannot have the chance to develop whatever talents they have; that the only way that they are going to get their rights is to go into the streets and demonstrate. I think we owe them and we owe ourselves a better country than that.

Therefore, I am asking for your help in making it easier for us to move ahead and to provide the kind of equality of treatment which we would want ourselves; to give a chance for every child to be educated to the limit of his talents.

As I have said before, not every child has an equal talent or an equal ability or an equal motivation, but they should have an equal right to develop their talent and their ability and their motivation, to make something of themselves.

We have a right to expect that the Negro community will be responsible, will uphold the law, but they have a right to expect that the law will be fair, that the Constitution will be color blind, as Justice Harlan said at the turn of the century.

This is what we are talking about and this is a matter which concerns this country and what it stands for, and in meeting it I ask the support of all our citizens.

Thank you very much.