

Catholic Association for International

The obligation of Catholics ^{Peace} ...

ABG 3691

PAMPHLET NO. 27

c.2

The Obligation of Catholics to Promote Peace

A Report of the Ethics Committee



The Rights of Peoples

A Report of the Ethics and Joint Policy Committees

Price 10 cents



THE CATHOLIC ASSOCIATION FOR
INTERNATIONAL PEACE

1312 Massachusetts Avenue NW.
Washington, D. C.

1940

APPRECIATION is expressed to Nazareth College, Rochester, N. Y., for sponsoring the publication of this pamphlet, thereby helping to promote that condition and aim of peace described by His Holiness, Pope Pius XII:

"The more Christian justice, fraternity and charity animate and guide individuals and groups, so much more also is established among nations, a spiritual atmosphere making possible, indeed easy, the solution of many problems which today appear, or really are, insolvable."

THE OBLIGATION OF CATHOLICS TO PROMOTE PEACE

RT. REV. JOHN A. RYAN, D.D.

and

THE ETHICS COMMITTEE

A Report of the Ethics Committee



THE RIGHTS OF PEOPLES

FRANCIS E. McMAHON, PH.D.

and

THE COMMITTEES ON ETHICS AND JOINT POLICY

*A Report of the Ethics and Joint Policy
Committees*

Price 10 cents

THE CATHOLIC ASSOCIATION FOR
INTERNATIONAL PEACE

1312 Massachusetts Avenue NW.

Washington, D. C.

THE PAULIST PRESS
401 West 59th Street
New York

THE theme of the Fourteenth Annual Conference of the Catholic Association for International Peace, March 25, 26, 1940, at which these two Committee Reports were first presented was "American Catholics and World Peace Today." The guide of the meeting was the five conditions for peace laid down by His Holiness, Pope Pius XII, in his Christmas Message, 1939:

1. "The right to life and independence" of all nations.
2. Disarmament and liberation from the rule of force.
3. International organization, avoiding past errors with provision for carrying out treaties and, if necessary, revising them.
4. Fulfillment of needs and just demands of peoples.
5. Observance of principles of justice and charity by statesmen and peoples.

The full text of the Pope's Christmas Message is available in "Pius XII and Peace," National Catholic Welfare Conference, Washington.

“THE Obligation of Catholics to Promote Peace” is issued as a report of the Committee on Ethics of the Catholic Association for International Peace. “The Rights of Peoples” is issued as a report of the Committee on Ethics and the Joint Policy Committee. These studies were presented and discussed at the regular annual meeting of the organization. The respective Committees co-operated in the final form of the reports and they were presented to the Executive Council, which ordered them published. As the process indicates, these Committee Reports are not statements from the whole Association.

ETHICS COMMITTEE

RT. REV. JOHN A. RYAN, D.D., *Chairman*

REV. J. C. BARTLEY, O.S.A.	RT. REV. DONALD A. MacLEAN
REV. HAROLD BOLTON	FRANCIS E. McMAHON
EMMANUEL CHAPMAN	VERY REV CHARLES C. MILTNER, C.S.C.
RT. REV. ALCUIN DEUTSCH, O.S.B.	VERY REV. JAMES H. MOYNIHAN
REV. CYPRIAN EMANUEL, O.F.M.	KATHLEEN E. MURPHY
REV. GREGORY FEIGE	REV. CARROLL J. NOONAN, S.S.
REV. ADOLPH D. FRENAY, O.P.	ROBERT POLLOCK
REV. LEO C. GAINOR, O.P.	MIRIAM T. ROONEY
RT. REV. MICHAEL J. GRUPA	REV. JOHN K. RYAN
REV. LINUS A. LILLY, S.J.	RT. REV. FULTON J. SHEEN

JOINT POLICY COMMITTEE

JAMES M. EGAN, *Chairman*

Sub-Committee on Europe

JAMES M. EGAN, *Chairman*

WILLIAM GEORGE BRUCE	MARION HANSBERY
REV. JOHN K. CARTWRIGHT	MARY T. LOUGHLIN
WILLIAM M. CANNING	MARY C. MCGINNIS
MARIE J. CARROLL	ROBERT C. MURRAY
WILLIAM DE GROOT	DANIEL SARGENT
W. M. T. GAMBLE	JOHN SCHULER
REV. VICTOR J. GELLHUS, O.S.B.	SISTER M. ROSALIE
MARGARET JANE GRAY	SISTER M. ROSALITA, I.H.M.
JOSEPH E. HANSBERY	SISTER RAPHAEL, S.N.D.
	SISTER ST. IGNATIUS, G.N.S.H.

Sub-Committee on Latin America

ANNA DILL GAMBLE, *Chairman*

REV. WILLIAM F. BLAKESLEE, C.S.P.	WILLIAM F. MONTAVON
CARLOS E. CASTANEDA	MARY S. MURPHY
MRS. PETER L. COLLINS	PAUL V. MURRAY
J. DE SIQUEIRA COUTINHO	ANNE M. NICHOLSON
CATHERINE KIRWAN	RICHARD PATTEE
ELIZABETH W. LOUGHRAN	MRS. ROBERT M. PATTERSON
MARIE R. MADDEN	REV. EDWARD PETERS, C.S.P.
REV. JAMES A. MAGNER	WILLIAM A. PRENDERGAST
REV. VINCENT MARINARO	MOTHER M. JOSEPHINE, D.M.
REV. EDWARD J. MCCARTHY, O.S.A.	SISTER MARY ST. PATRICK McCONVILLE
E. FRANCIS McDEVITT	LOUIS S. ROSENTHALL
REV. R. A. MCGOWAN	REV. EDWIN RYAN
MERCEDES MOLINA Y ANCHORENA	REV. FRANCIS BORGIA STECK

Catholic Association for International Peace

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

Honorary President

MOST REVEREND EDWIN V. O'HARA, D.D.

President

JOHN L. McMAHON, Ph.D.

Vice-Presidents

EDWARD S. SKILLIN, JR.

REV. CHARLES C. MILTNER, C.S.C.

REV. MOTHER MARY LAWRENCE, S.H.C.J.

JAMES M. EAGAN, Ph.D.

MOST REV. ROBERT E. LUCEY, D.D.

MARY LEE EVANS

MARIE J. CARROLL

REV. PATRICK J. HIGGINS, S.J.

FRANK P. WEBERG, Ph.D.

CHARLES G. FENWICK, Ph.D., *Ex-Officio*

Acting Executive Secretary

REV. R. A. MCGOWAN

Treasurer

EDWARD E. GALLAHUE

Assistant Treasurer

MIRIAM T. ROONEY, Ph.D.

COMMITTEE CHAIRMEN

Ethics—Rt. Rev. Msgr. John A. Ryan, D.D.

Law and Organization—Charles G. Fenwick, Ph.D.

Economics and Social Relations—Elizabeth M. Lynskey, Ph.D.

National Attitudes—Robert Pollock, Ph.D.

Joint Policy—James M. Eagan, Ph.D.

THE OBLIGATION OF CATHOLICS TO PROMOTE PEACE

HAVE we an obligation to promote peace among the warring nations of Europe and Asia? Insofar as we are charged with such a duty our task would seem to be that of creating rather than promoting. The primary need in that situation is to bring an end to the wars. Of course, their cessation would involve some kind of peace, but the peace has to be produced before it can be promoted. Nevertheless, we can with propriety speak of promoting conditions among the belligerents which would lead to peace and be favorable to peace. Have we any obligation to do anything toward this end?

When we consider the war-torn world today and the refusal of so many rulers to have any regard for reason, justice, or love in their national aims and methods, we are tempted to meet this question with a negative answer. Obligations suppose possibilities. One is obliged to act only when and to the extent that action is physically and morally possible. What is there that the Catholics of the United States can do beyond offering fervent and continuous prayers to the Divine Ruler of the Universe?

Even if prayer were the only recourse, the assertion would still be justified that American Catholics have some obligation in the present awful conditions. "More things are wrought by prayer than this world dreams of," now, as always, expresses a fruitful and profound truth. World peace may for a time be unattainable by men but with God all things are possible. In the eloquent paragraphs, included by the Holy Father in the Encyclical *Summi Pontificatus*:

God can do all things. As well as the happiness and the fortunes of nations, He holds in His hands human counsels and sweetly turns them in whatever direction He wills: even the obstacles are for His Omnipotence means to mould affairs and events and to direct minds and free wills to His all-high purposes.



Pray then, Venerable Brethren, pray without ceasing; pray especially when you offer the Divine Sacrifice of Love. Do you, too, pray, you whose courageous profession of the faith entails today hard, painful and, not rarely, heroic sacrifices; pray you, suffering and agonizing members of the Church, when Jesus comes to console and to heal your pains, and do not forget with the aid of a true spirit of mortification and worthy practice of penance to make your prayers more acceptable in the eyes of Him Who "lifteth up all that fall; and setteth up all that are cast down" (Psalms cxliv. 14), that He in His mercy may shorten the days of trial and that thus the words of the Psalmist may be verified: "Then they cried to the Lord in their affliction: and He delivered them out of their distresses" (Psalms cvi. 13).

And you, white legions of children who are so loved and dear to Jesus, when you receive in Holy Communion the Bread of Life, raise up your simple and innocent prayers and unite them with those of the Universal Church. The Heart of Jesus, Who loves you, does not resist your suppliant innocence. Pray every one, pray uninterruptedly: "Pray without ceasing" (1 Thessalonians v. 17).

Happily, this exhortation of the Sovereign Pontiff can and should be obeyed by all Catholics without hesitation or reservation. Prayers for peace, however, are subject to two limitations: one set up by the spirit and one by the intellect. There is danger that many will not pray as fervently and as continuously as they might. Such persons will be so overwhelmed by the pessimism which is inherent in present conditions that they will almost despair of Divine intervention. At any rate, their prayers will be accompanied by considerably less faith than that which will move mountains. In other words, their petitions will lack one or more of the qualities which are necessary and sufficient to render prayer efficacious. This is a real danger, a real obstacle, which should be realized and resisted by everyone who believes in prayer, by everyone who considers prayer efficacious, by everyone who loyally accepts the exhortation quoted above

from the Holy Father. An Almighty God can bring about peace even from the present discouraging situation. An All-Wise God will restore peace to the world in His own good time.

The second limitation to prayer as a means of obtaining peace is that by itself it is not sufficient. By itself, it does not entirely fulfill our obligation to promote peace. Prayer is efficacious only when it is supported and complemented by such other actions as are within the reach of those who offer the petition. "Heaven helps those who help themselves." In the present war situation as in all other situations the petitioner must contribute serious co-operation according to the measure of his abilities and opportunities. Too many persons assume that they are doing their full duty for peace when they offer up more or less heartfelt prayers. All the rest they are willing to "leave to God." While this may sound like an edifying expression of human dependence upon the Almighty Governor of the Universe, it does not always deserve this appraisal. Sometimes it implies mental and moral laziness. No intelligent and sincere person is justified in "leaving it all to God" until he has made a reasonable effort to find out whether there may be something that he can do himself, whether there are not some human means which he can utilize to promote the attainment of the end for which he prays.

What human means are available to us in relation to the re-establishment of peace among the belligerent nations? There is one negative recourse. We can avoid feelings and expressions of hatred against the peoples of the war-afflicted countries. If we believe that certain powerful personages are inflicting wholesale injustice upon their fellow men we may very properly regard these personages with aversion. We may condemn their wickedness. We may even desire that they will, by legitimate means, be overthrown, deposed, and rendered incapable of further evil. And if we conscientiously pass this judgment upon any of these destructive personages there is no good reason why we should not give that judgment expression.

On the other hand, there is no justification for visiting such condemnation upon a whole people. Even though the peoples now at war are actively and deliberately supporting the evil and unjust policies of their leaders, they may be in good faith. They may think they are right. Therefore, they do not deserve any sort of punishment, not even in the form of mental attitudes, on the part of their fellow men. While the corporate character of a nation necessarily involves the suffering of the innocent with the guilty, moral guilt is always personal. It is not incurred by any person unless he realizes that he is doing wrong. Hence the stigma of "Huns" which was applied indiscriminately to the German people during the World War was cruel, irrational, un-Christian and unjust. Moreover, the attitude of hatred toward whole peoples and the practice of personifying them through such abstract terms as England, France, Germany, were largely responsible for the unjust and uncharitable conduct of the victors toward the vanquished at Versailles.

No matter where their sympathies may lie as between the contending national powers, American Catholics ought to guard against feelings and expressions of enmity toward the peoples involved. By following this course, American Catholics will not only set a good example to the nations at war, but will establish a claim to be heard when definite efforts toward peace are finally undertaken.

In the matter of positive action, we can adopt a favorable attitude toward every honest effort to effect an honorable peace before the belligerents have completely exhausted themselves. If the war continues until one or other of the contending parties is decisively defeated, there will be an acute danger that the only gains will go to Stalin and Communism. In particular, the possibility that Communism will arise in a defeated Germany should be given careful and anxious consideration. On the other hand, a decisive victory by Hitler would prevent at least for many years the resurrection of Poland and would insure continuation of Hitler's campaign for the

destruction of Christianity in Germany, Austria, Poland and Czechoslovakia. The restoration of peace before the occurrence of any of these devastating consequences is too clearly desirable to require elaboration.

There is, of course, the possibility that a peace established in the near future would represent a compromise with evil, that it would permit the consolidation of Hitler's conquests and the continuation of his efforts to paganize the German people. Many of us would regard this alternative as a greater evil than a continuation of the war. The predicament in which the lover of peace finds himself is grave, indeed, and the choice of the proper course of action is extremely difficult. Nevertheless, it is possible to encourage approaches toward a peaceful solution, without endangering the causes and values in which we all believe. It is not likely that Britain and France would begin negotiations for peace, or even entertain proposals for mediation by outsiders, if their main objectives were obviously put in jeopardy. On the other hand, initial moves for mediation could obtain a measure of serious consideration without endangering such obviously necessary and just objectives as the re-establishment of Poland and Czechoslovakia and the safeguarding of religion. Whenever approaches are made which do not explicitly exclude these aims they ought to have the sympathetic consideration of all Catholics. If, in the course of the discussions, these purposes are becoming endangered, Catholics can withdraw their support.

Closely connected with the obligation to support every promising effort toward the establishment of a just peace is that of demanding that the Allies make clearer their intentions concerning the post-war settlement. There must be no repetition of the vindictive and disastrous conditions imposed by the victors upon the vanquished at Versailles. Up to the present, Britain and France have not made their aims sufficiently clear and definite, beyond the elimination of Hitlerism and the restoration of Poland and Czechoslovakia. No peace arrangements will be just and durable which do not leave the German nation intact and make some provision for

Germany's international economic needs. The latter requirement does not imply "Lebensraum" in the brutal form proposed by Hitler, but it does mean a reasonable opportunity of access by Germany to the kind of international trade that is essential to the welfare of her people. Catholics have an obligation to keep this object alive and to publicize its vital importance in the final terms of peace. In this relation the following sentences from the Encyclical *Summi Pontificatus* are pertinent and wise:

To hope for a decisive change exclusively from the shock of war and its final issue is idle, as experience shows. The hour of victory is an hour of external triumph for the party to whom victory falls, but it is in equal measure the hour of temptation. In this hour the angel of justice strives with the demons of violence; the heart of the victor all too easily is hardened; moderation and far-seeing wisdom appear to him weakness; the excited passions of the people, often inflamed by the sacrifices and sufferings they have borne, obscure the vision even of responsible persons and make them inattentive to the warning voice of humanity and equity, which is overwhelmed or drowned in the inhuman cry, "*Vae victis*, woe to the conquered." There is danger lest settlements and decisions born in such conditions be nothing else than injustice under the cloak of justice.

Once the bitterness and the cruel strifes of the present have ceased, the new order of the world, of national and international life, must rest no longer on the quicksands of changeable and ephemeral standards that depend only on the selfish interests of groups and individuals. No, they must rest on the unshakeable foundation, on the solid rock of natural law and of Divine Revelation.

Another immediate obligation is to help in keeping our own country out of war. This does not imply the advocacy of a cowardly, un-Christian and impossible isolation. America should refrain from participation in any of the wars now raging because such participation would not only be injurious to herself but in the long run

would not benefit the other countries of the world. The facts and reasons which support these propositions need not be recounted here. Nor is it necessary to consider the question whether the war activities of Hitler and Stalin might not, after a time, become so threatening to civilization and religion as to create a moral obligation of active participation by the United States. That eventuality is conceivable but is very unlikely. It can become the subject of serious consideration when and if it becomes imminent.

In the Statement of Instruction given to the committees by the Executive Council of the Catholic Association for International Peace, the first of the points it emphasizes is that the Peace Association should "help to keep the United States out of war." That remains a moral obligation.

At present, it is the duty of Catholics as of all other Americans to seek out and utilize every legitimate method for preventing our involvement in the conflict. One of these methods is to avoid and discourage all assertions to the effect that our participation is "inevitable." Such statements reveal not merely an attitude of defeatism but betray shallow thinking and lazy evasion of the duty of analysis. The forces that supposedly will drag us into the war against our wills do not exist. The forces that exercise some influence in that direction can be thwarted if only we use our heads. This means continuous attention, agitation and education.

In this connection there is much exaggerated talk about insidious and irresistible propaganda. This term has been used so generally and so loosely that in many minds it stands for something mystifying and terrifying. Insofar as propaganda involves direct falsehood it is neither formidable or enduring. Insofar as it is merely misleading it can be adequately met by a general attitude of criticism, skepticism, or suspicion. There is not time here to enumerate the reasons why the efficacy of propaganda is likely to be very much smaller now than it was during the World War. Undoubtedly, the propaganda to which we shall be exposed during this

war will be less obvious and more subtle than the blatant and crude variety that was thrust upon us between 1914 and 1917. Already we have witnessed some of this modern, "streamlined" propaganda. The extent to which it has been recognized as such shows that Americans have some conception of the insidious quality of the new methods. Nevertheless, there should be no relaxing of vigilance in our attitude toward the new and more refined propaganda.

So much for the immediate situation. Our principal obligations to promote peace and our opportunities to do so lie in the general field of education for peace rather than in our relations to phases of the present conflict. The major task of the Catholic Association for International Peace remains essentially the same as it has always been. It is to apply Christian moral principles to the dealings of nations with one another. In this connection, part of the declarations of the Encyclical *Summi Pontificatus* on "Totalitarianism" should be quoted:

The idea which credits the State with unlimited authority is not simply an error harmful to the internal life of nations, to their prosperity, and to the larger and well-ordered increase in their well-being, but likewise it injures the relations between peoples, for it breaks the unity of supra-national society, robs the law of nations of its foundation and vigor, leads to violation of others' rights and impedes agreement and peaceful intercourse.

A disposition, in fact, of the divinely-sanctioned natural order divides the human race into social groups, nations or States, which are mutually independent in organization and in the direction of their internal life. But for all that, the human race is bound together by reciprocal ties, moral and juridical, into a great commonwealth directed to the good of all nations and ruled by special laws which protect its unity and promote its prosperity.

Our immediate and continuing task is to diffuse in all effective ways among our fellow citizens, non-Catholic as well as Catholic, the knowledge of the principles of char-

ity, justice and social justice in relation to international affairs. If the meaning and application of these principles were adequately understood by the majority of the citizens of a country, nine-tenths of the dangers of war would disappear. This is a generalization which is, of course, subject to exceptions. Comprehensive knowledge of the moral law is not sufficient to deter men of bad will from making war if they think it politically expedient. Our educational efforts must be directed mainly to those who show some respect for the moral law and are capable of applying it internationally.

In the report on "International Ethics" the Ethics Committee of this Association said:

The people require instruction concerning the universality of brotherhood, the possibility of permanent peace and the fallacy of indefinite preparedness, while statesmen stand in particular need of becoming familiar with the principles of international ethics.

Today, one of these educational tasks perhaps requires some qualification, or at least a more precise statement. In general the policy of indefinite preparedness is still "a fallacy"; it still "provokes international distrust, suspicion, and competition in armaments." Nevertheless, the assertion that the United States is "already in a condition of adequate preparedness," would not obtain universal assent today. Whatever be our differing views on this question we can unite in the hope that appropriations for additional armament will not be voted by Congress until they have received full and free discussion.

The other aims specified in the extract quoted above from "International Ethics" retain validity and pertinence. What is said about human brotherhood is particularly vital:

Human brotherhood must be intensively and extensively preached to all groups and classes; in theological seminaries, in colleges and schools; in the pulpit and in catechetical instructions; in religious books and periodicals. The individual must be taught

a right attitude of mind toward all foreigners. It is not enough to declare that "every human being is my neighbor." The obligations which are implicit in this phrase must be explicit. They must be set forth in detail with regard to foreign races and nations. Men must be reminded that "every human being" includes Frenchmen, Germans, Italians, Englishmen, Japanese, Chinese, and all other divisions of the human family. And this doctrine should be repeated and reiterated. Effective teaching and adequate assimilation depend largely upon the simple process of repetition.

A compelling reason for teaching human brotherhood today is found in the recent ebullition of anti-Semitism and other forms of racial antagonism. Sometimes these manifestations are crude, blatant, and, therefore, easily exposed and discredited. More frequently they are sly, insidious, and pharisaical. For example: the practice of calling specific attention to the race or nationality of an unworthy citizen, or the practice of disclaiming condemnation of *all* the members of a certain race while using language whose clear tendency and effect is to convey precisely that meaning. Any form of words which causes the members of a race to suffer economically or in the esteem of their fellows or in their own minds, is contrary to charity and justice. All such language and propaganda are injurious to the cause of peace.

Nationalism, or excessive nationalism, is still a deadly obstacle to the cause of universal brotherhood. "The peoples of the earth," said Pope Pius XI, "form but one family in God." It will not be out of place here to repeat the same Pontiff's well-known condemnation of nationalism in his Encyclical on the *Peace of Christ*:

Patriotism—the stimulus of so many virtues and of so many noble acts of heroism when kept within the bounds of the law of Christ—becomes merely an occasion, an added incentive, to grave injustice when true love of country is debased to the condition of an extreme nationalism, when we forget that all men are our brothers and we members of the same great human family, that other nations have an equal right with us both to life and to prosperity, that it is never

lawful nor even wise to dissociate morality from the affairs of practical life, that, in the last analysis, it is "justice which exalteth a nation: but sin maketh nations miserable" (Proverbs xiv. 34).

In *Summi Pontificatus* the present Holy Father declares that the first of the pernicious errors which afflict society "is the forgetfulness of that law of human solidarity and charity which is dictated and imposed by our common origin and by the equality of rational nature in all men, to whatever people they belong, and by the redeeming Sacrifice offered by Jesus Christ on the Altar of the Cross to His Heavenly Father on behalf of sinful mankind. . . . But legitimate and well-ordered love of our native country should not make us close our eyes to the all-embracing nature of Christian charity, which calls for consideration of others and of their interests in the pacifying light of love."

Modern nationalism is a complex phenomenon. Not all its elements are present in every country in which it has made its ugly appearance. A report of the Committee on National Attitudes of the C. A. I. P. on "Patriotism, Nationalism, and the Brotherhood of Man," describes three forms of nationalism, namely, "an absolute and exclusive loyalty to the national state coupled with an intolerance of dissent: a feeling of superiority and haughty pride in respect of foreign peoples coupled with imperialism and belligerency, and an adoration of one's nation and its government." The third of these forms is not conspicuous in the United States. The first exists here in some degree, as also does the first part of the second form. "A feeling of superiority and haughty pride in respect of foreign peoples," is all too prominent in America even among Catholics. Indeed, it has increased considerably within the last ten years. The irrational policies and acts of some rulers of Europe have caused many of us to look upon Europeans as incapable of living together peaceably, as constituting a lower or at least an incompetent order of beings, upon whom sympathy is wasted and with whom it is impos-

sible or unsafe or futile to co-operate. "Let them fry in their own fat," is the exclamation that is sometimes heard when measures are advocated to help these peoples out of their difficulties. The Pharisee in the Gospel story thanked God that he was not like other men, "even as this Publican." Modern American pharisees thank God that they are better than all foreign peoples, particularly those who inhabit some of the countries of Europe. It never seems to occur to these imitators of this very unpopular figure in the Gospel to ask themselves whether they would be any better than the despised foreigners if they lived in the same conditions.

Catholics need to become persuaded that permanent peace is possible. The considerations which move men to doubt this possibility are much more powerful today than they were twenty years ago. Since the end of the war that was going to end war forever, a dozen or more States have pursued courses which constantly impel them toward war, and at least two nations have deliberately scorned all rational methods of preserving peace. Nevertheless, we must continue to believe in and strive for a peace that will be lasting. We must continue to have faith that Christianity and civilization will not perish from the face of the earth. Never in the world's history was mankind more in need of the Seventh Beatitude: "Blessed are the peacemakers: for they shall be called the children of God." In the inscrutable designs of Providence it may be decreed that the present dominance of force in the policies of powerful States shall somehow be completely overthrown, that victory shall rest upon the banners of the hosts of peace and righteousness, even at the moment when their cause seems almost hopeless. Let us repeat here the serenely confident words of the Holy Father:

God can do all things. As well as the happiness and the fortunes of nations, He holds in His hands human counsels and sweetly turns them in whatever direction He wills: even the obstacles are for His Omnipotence means to mould affairs and events and to direct minds and free wills to His all-high purposes.

Finally, let us consider the obligations of American Catholics regarding the peace arrangements which should follow the cessation of the present conflict. Permanent peace, just peace, will not ensue automatically. It will not necessarily be established through the triumph of arms and armaments. Recall the paragraphs on this subject quoted earlier in this address from *Summi Pontificatus*. Almost at the end of the same Encyclical, the Holy Father expresses hope for "the reconstruction of a new world based on justice and love . . ." Undoubtedly, he expects that this reconstruction will be achieved through some form of world organization; for less than a month after these words were published the Sovereign Pontiff, in an audience granted to the Minister from Haiti, urged that the rulers of peoples renounce force and accept the supreme authority of the Creator as the basis of all individual and collective morality:

Then only will they succeed in effectuating and perfecting a stable, fruitful international organization such as is desired by men of good will, an organization which, respecting the rights of God, will be able to assure the reciprocal independence of nations big and small, to impose fidelity to agreements loyally agreed upon, and to safeguard the just liberty and dignity of the human person in each one's efforts towards the prosperity of all.

Finally, in his peace program outlined to the members of the Sacred College of Cardinals on Christmas Eve, the Holy Father envisaged a "reorganization of international neighborliness" and the "creation or reconstruction of international institutions."

Do these references to international organization and institutions imply merely a revitalized and reformed League of Nations, or something more comprehensive, something like a federation of States taking in all the countries of the world or at least those of Europe? Instead of attempting to answer these questions, we can appropriately recall the declarations of Pope Benedict XV in similar situations. On three separate occasions this great Pontiff described in pretty specific terms an

international organization for the preservation of peace following the World War. All three statements are summarized in the printed report on "International Ethics." It is worthwhile to reproduce them here:

In his letter to the belligerents, August 1917, he proposed that:—moral right be substituted for the material force of arms in the reciprocal dealings of nations; the nations enter upon a just agreement for the simultaneous and reciprocal reduction of armaments; armed force be replaced by the noble and peaceful institution of arbitration, with the provision that penalties be imposed upon any State which should refuse either to submit a national question to such a tribunal or to accept the arbitral decision.

In his letter to the American people on the last day of the year, 1918, he expressed a fervent desire for an international organization which, "by abolishing conscription will reduce armaments; by establishing international tribunals will eliminate or settle disputes; and by placing peace on a solid foundation will guarantee to all independence and equality of rights."

In his encyclical on "International Reconciliation," Pentecost Sunday, 1920, the same Pontiff laid particular stress upon the association of the States in an international organization: "All States should put aside mutual suspicion and unite in one sole society or rather family of peoples, both to guarantee their own independence and safeguard order in the civil concert of the peoples. A special reason, not to mention others, for forming this society among the nations is the need generally recognized of reducing, if it is not possible to abolish entirely, the enormous military expenditure which can no longer be borne by the State, in order that in this way murderous and disastrous wars may be prevented and to each people may be assured, within just confines, the independence and integrity of its own territory."

In the light of these declarations by his great predecessor, it is not rash to assume that the "International Organization" desired by Pius XII would be at least "a society or rather a family of peoples." Unfortunately

the International Organization set up at Versailles was greatly handicapped from the beginning. The League of Nations was dominated by a few of the powerful and victorious States and was conducted in much the same vengeful spirit that these same States had embodied in the treaty of peace. Probably this fact was mainly responsible for the opposition of American Catholics to American membership in the League. Had, however, the United States entered the League, it might have exercised sufficient influence to change the principal injustices of the peace treaty and to develop an effective instrument of world peace and world justice. Of course, we cannot be certain that American participation would have produced these beneficent results. Of three things, however, we can be certain: (1) that American participation could have caused the whole post-war history to be different and infinitely better; (2) the incompetence of the League could not have been greater with America in than it has been with America out; (3) the representatives of the United States in the League would have been able to prevent their associates from inflicting injury upon our own country.

The temptation to elaborate each of these three points is very great, but it must be resisted in this place. Nevertheless, we wish to summarize very briefly the practical implications of these three propositions: (1) American membership in the League would have prevented the collapse of the German Republic and the triumph of Hitler; (2) with America in the League, conditions and developments in Germany, Russia, Italy and some other countries could not have been worse than they are and have been since the end of the World War; (3) the assumption that the representatives of European countries would have shown themselves to be much more clever than the American members, that our interests would have been gravely endangered, receives no support from what we know about the intelligence and skill of our countrymen. It is curious and paradoxical that some of our most active jingoes disclose an inferiority complex when they think of American representatives sitting face

to face with those of other countries at a conference table.

However, the regretful history of the League of Nations—its domination by a few powerful and victorious States, its operation in the spirit of the injustices of the Versailles Treaty, and the absence of the United States from its council tables—is not now the important point except as a warning for the future. What is important is that some form of world organization must be created following the war, must be created in the spirit of justice and charity, and must include the United States therein. What form it should take, the Ethics Committee of the Peace Association leaves for consideration to other committees of this organization.

At any rate, American Catholics are subject to the moral law of nature and of revelation. They may not forget that our nation has obligations not only of justice but of charity to all other nations. If it becomes evident, as it surely will, that the United States can make a very great and lasting contribution to "the reconstruction of a new world based on justice and love"—to quote the Holy Father—by joining a league or society or family of peoples at the end of the present war, let us hope that no important Catholic voice will be raised in opposition. Let us hope that no intelligent person will be misled by "isolationists," who speak with the accents of Cain scorning to be his brother's keeper or who would have our country imitate the priest and the Levite who refused to help the wounded man on the way to Jericho. Let us hope that not many Catholics will be misled by the shallow epithet "internationalists," which is frequently hurled at sincere men and women who strive to give practical effect to the saying of Pius XI, "all peoples are one great family." Let us hope that Catholics will support every reasonable effort that may be made to establish an effective league, or society, or family of peoples.

APPENDIX

N. C. W. C. STUDY CLUB OUTLINE

I. PRAYER (pp. 5-7)

1. Discuss the distinction between "promoting" peace and "creating" peace in the present circumstances.
2. Discuss the obligation of prayer in the present world crisis.
3. Limitations on prayers for peace.
 - a. By the spirit: Lack of faith.
 - b. By the intellect: Unaccompanied by other action.

Suggested Papers: Review of Section VI "Prayer: A Means to Peace" in the Study Outline of "Pius XII and Peace." (N. C. W. C.), and sections on Prayer in "A Papal Peace Mosaic" (C. A. I. P.) (See Index). "The Liturgical Prayers for Peace."

Suggested Action: Institution of perpetual novenas for peace (of Masses, Rosaries or special devotions) by club members. Cooperation with parish and institutional authorities in securing parish and city-wide public devotions for peace. Send news story on activities to C. A. I. P. headquarters for national publicity.

II. HUMAN MEANS: NEGATIVE (pp. 7, 8)

1. Avoiding expressions of hatred.
2. What attitude may we have with regard to personages we regard responsible for international injustices and war?
3. May we condemn a whole people? Why not?
4. Discuss the following as consequences of avoiding expressions of hatred:
 - a. A good example.
 - b. Establishment of claim to be heard in peace efforts.

Suggested paper: Review of "Patriotism, Nationalism and the Brotherhood of Man" (C. A. I. P.).

III. HUMAN MEANS: POSITIVE ACTION (pp. 8-10)

1. A favorable attitude toward efforts to secure honorable peace. What are the dangers of:
 - a. Possibilities of war continuing until both parties are exhausted?
 - b. A decisive victory by Hitler?
 - c. Possibilities of an early peace representing compromise with evil?

2. Demand that Allies make clearer intentions concerning post-war settlement in the light of the Versailles Treaty. Territory and trade for Germany.
3. Discuss Pius XII's analysis of temptations of victory.
Suggested paper: Review of Pope Benedict XV's "Pacem" and Pius XI's "Ubi Arcano" (See "A Papal Peace Mosaic," C. A. I. P.).

IV. KEEPING COUNTRY OUT OF WAR (pp. 10-12)

1. Not the advocacy of un-Christian isolation.
2. Would United States participation benefit self or other countries?
3. Ways of keeping out of war:
 - a. Avoidance of defeatist attitude.
 - b. Attention to propaganda.

Suggested Paper: Review of "War Propaganda and the United States," by Lavine and Weschler, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1940.

V. EDUCATION FOR PEACE (pp. 12, 13)

1. Major task of Peace Association—to apply Christian moral principles to dealings of nations with one another.
2. Discuss the Encyclical "Summi Pontificatus" on "Totalitarianism."
3. To whom should our educational efforts be directed?

Suggested Papers: Review of sections on Justice and Charity in "A Papal Peace Mosaic" (C. A. I. P.) and "Pius XII and Peace" (N. C. W. C.). See Index and Study Club Outline. Review of sections on Educating for Peace in "International Ethics" and "Patriotism, Nationalism and the Brotherhood of Man." (C. A. I. P.).

VI. FIELDS OF EDUCATION (pp. 13-20)

1. Discuss the Ethics Committee statement on the fallacy of indefinite preparedness with reference to the present situation.
2. The task of educating in the universality of brotherhood and its special necessity now in view of present violations.
3. Nationalism as an obstacle. Discuss its nature and elements as applied to the United States.
4. The possibility of permanent peace.
5. Discussion of Papal statements regarding world organization, in connection with the failure of the League of Nations; relation and obligation of the United States thereto.

Suggested Paper: Review of "The Pope's Peace Program and the United States," Eagan (N. C. W. C.).

THE RIGHTS OF PEOPLES

THOMISTIC ETHICS is not a science that can deduce *a priori* the particular rules that can and must guide the singular action in all its concreteness. Save for the most general principles that can be acquired by the analysis of human nature in the abstract, the norms for action must be constructed in the light of human experience. Situations must be carefully studied, facts closely analyzed, even the historical background must be surveyed. This is why there is no ready-made solution for the problem of the "rights of peoples." The moralist is always in possession of the general principles, but their specific application is contingent upon a host of circumstances, material and psychological. Our analysis of the problem will try to respect this characteristic of sound ethical doctrine.

The Pontiff in his Christmas message of 1939 declares that "a point which should be given particular attention if better arrangement of Europe is sought, concerns the real needs and just demands of nations and peoples as well as of ethnical minorities." The Pope is here obviously referring to what has been in the past a potent cause of war, as well as a constant and major obstacle to permanent peace, the needs, namely, on the one hand, that nations and peoples experience for decent and secure existence, and the desires, on the other hand, of ethnical minorities within a nation of diversified cultures to achieve that freedom of action consonant with their particular culture. Here are two problems, the rights of nations and the rights of minorities, which, though related, are distinct. Clarity of exposition will be enhanced by treating these two problems separately.

I

The Rights of Nations

The Christian moralist is aware that in the recent past many rich and powerful nations have adopted a policy toward other nations that must be characterized

as immoral. This policy has been one either of passive indifference to their economic plight, or what probably has been more frequent, active pursuit by the richer nations of their own interests at the expense of these less favored countries. Prompted by a spirit of self-sufficiency and a desire for greater prosperity, nations have, for example, imposed embargoes on goods and enacted tariffs, without thought of the effect such actions might have upon the fortunes of other peoples struggling to subsist. That high tariff walls frequently constitute a boomerang for the nation imposing them, that the penalized nations become restless under the growing strain, and that international hatreds thereby become more intense, are facts that should persuade us that the policy of economic self-sufficiency of the past should be replaced by one of co-operation among nations in solving common economic difficulties.

The spirit is easily identifiable behind this anti-Christian and immoral attitude of the rich nation against the poor nation. It is exaggerated nationalism. Nations pursue exclusively their own interests, and do not scruple in the process to cripple economically other nations, because they have succumbed to the superstition that the *summum bonum* of their respective peoples is the State. Nationalism is prevalent everywhere today. The "have-not" nations manifest it in even more virulent forms than the "haves." But the latter are partially guilty, by reason of their selfish practices in the past, for the desperate and violent conduct of the former.

It is axiomatic with the Christian moralist that the resources of the earth are destined for exploitation by no particular group of people or particular nation exclusively, but that they are given by the Creator for the welfare of all men. This principle does not mean that a nation favored by the possession of great resources has not the right to exploit them to its own advantage. But it does mean that the exploitation should not be such that other nations are injured, or unduly deprived of that access to them necessary for decent living and security. The principles that govern the disposition of wealth

by the individual man can be applied *mutatis mutandis* to the State. No individual has the moral right to squander recklessly or to exploit selfishly the wealth at his command, when his fellow men are in want. Similarly, the rich and powerful State has not the right to utilize its own resources in a manner that deprives the poorer State of the opportunity for achieving a decent standard of living.

It is then a matter of justice that the "have-not" nations be permitted in some manner the access to and exploitation of those material resources which other nations have in superabundance. The demands of the family of mankind here override the claims of the individual State. It is right reason that dictates that "world resources, equipment and technique, *i. e.*, the unity, variety and change of the world economic life are to serve the human interests of all peoples everywhere."¹ The demands of justice, moreover, cannot be ignored on the plea that they are physically impossible to fulfill. "Objectively these (resources) are enough to give all peoples and all individuals a high physical, cultural, religious and moral life."²

The satisfaction of this demand of justice does not necessarily mean physical possession of territories or resources presently in the hands of other nations. Such a shifting of direct control would undoubtedly produce more harm than good, and specifically would constitute a major injustice in most instances against the peoples inhabiting such regions. There are more effective ways of adjusting world economy. Promotion of the free flow of trade, monetary loans, and the elimination of those tariffs presently checking the normal and healthy course of international commerce are powerful remedies for the current maladjustment. Where the demand for colonies appears reasonable and just, the more favored nations should agree to a transfer, or, at the very least, should make readily available their resources to the nations in need. The paramount necessity, however, is ac-

¹ "International Economic Life." A report of the Ethics and Economics Committees, Catholic Association for International Peace, p. 8.

² *Ibid.*, p. 8.

cessibility to markets in which nations can exchange their surpluses for the goods they desire.

The requirements of social justice must be emphasized. Social justice demands that each nation do its part in promoting the prosperity of all. As the individual is obliged to promote the common good of the society of which he is a member, so likewise is the individual State obliged to act for the good of human society as a whole. Social justice dictates that the strong and prosperous nations make available to all peoples the resources and equipment for the best possible cultural life. As Pius XI has said in his Encyclical *Quadragesimo Anno*: "Then only will the economic and social order be soundly established and attain its ends, when it offers, to all and to each, all those goods which the wealth and resources of nature, technical science and the corporate organization of social affairs can give. These goods should be sufficient to supply all necessities and reasonable comforts, and to uplift men to that higher standard of life which, provided it be used with prudence is not only not a hindrance but is of singular help to virtue."

The virtue of Christian charity reinforces here the claims of justice. The human race is one family of brothers under the Fatherhood of God. Charity dictates that the stronger assist the weaker. Charity does not stop at the demands of justice, but rather prompts one to give in abundance. At the very minimum charity insures that the demands of justice are fulfilled readily. "We are more prompt to render justice to those whom we truly love" (Thomas Aquinas). Justice and charity are the twin agents of international peace, justice removing the obstacles to tranquillity of order, and charity effecting directly that union of hearts which is the essence of genuine peace.

No nation is exempt from the obligation to satisfy the real needs and just demands of peoples and thus to promote world peace. A problem that affects humanity as a whole is one that morally obligates all of humanity. A nation, such as the United States, with its great power, prestige and resources, is *a fortiori* charged with a heavy

responsibility to promote this work. The role of the United States, moreover, will probably be a decisive one. If a spirit of extreme isolationism prevails in its policy and its actions, it is very likely that the problem will remain unsolved, or will find temporary "solutions" in a succession of armed conflicts, as the "have-not" nations attempt to wrest forcibly from the "haves" their share of economic resources and advantages. But assuming that the United States adheres to a policy at once more realistic and more humane, what practical measures could the moralist suggest for adoption at the present time?

There appear at present to be two methods by which the United States could fulfil its obligations. The first consists in the promotion of a kind of peace following the present war that will be consonant with the requirements of justice and charity. That such a peace should likewise involve some kind of world organization, in which the United States would eventually participate, and that would insure the peaceful adjustment of future grievances between nations, can only be suggested here. The second practical measure consists in the promotion of equitable trade agreements between this country and other nations to insure the free flow of goods, thereby not only enhancing our own prosperity, but also establishing or improving that of others. The Hull reciprocal trade agreements can be considered a most important step in this regard.

It is hardly necessary to emphasize that an explicit recognition by the nations of the world of the paramount claims of justice and charity is essential in finally solving this problem of the needs of peoples. Any kind of peace, or any adjustment of the demands of different nations, which is primarily motivated by political considerations divorced from virtue, will fail to bring about a state of world order and permanent peace. Hence the first requirement for the adjustment of grievances is a change of heart. The problem, as we have said, is not one of inadequate resources, or lack of technical knowledge. The problem is rather one of perverse human

nature, one largely of selfishness. The final solution awaits an acceptance of a different standard of values and a fresh expansion of Christian charity.

II

The Rights of Ethnical Minorities

To satisfy the rights of ethnical minorities both in Europe, and in the world generally, is one of the most important and most difficult political and social problems of our time. The World War in part had its origin in minority difficulties between the Serbs and their Austrian rulers. The present conflict in Europe also arose in part from a dispute about the German minority in Poland. These two considerations help us appreciate the seriousness and actuality of the problem. Consequent upon great migrations throughout past centuries, ethnical minorities established themselves in almost every country of Europe, and not infrequently formed "island cultures," that is, groups of minority peoples surrounded by members of the nation's major culture, and separated geographically from their own larger ethnical groups. Such an "island" is found in Rumania, in whose geographical center lie four counties densely populated with Hungarians, completely circumscribed by the people of the dominant culture.

Minority can be defined as a body of people bound together by a consciousness of kind, rooted in common ancestry, traditions, language, culture or religion, which sets them off from the majority or dominant people of the country in which they live. Suppression of minorities in one way or another is not exclusively a modern phenomenon. Throughout history various nations have persecuted the minorities living within their territory. But with the growth of modern nationalism, the problem of preserving the cultural and religious rights of minorities has become grave. As a consequence of the spirit of nationalism, the conviction has become widely accepted that nationality and the State are identical, in other words that a politically sovereign entity should coincide in all

respects with the culture of the majority of its subjects. The result has been that minorities within a national State have found their traditions and customs, languages and natural rights, interfered with, in an effort to make them conform to the dominant national culture. At the same time, the spirit of nationalism has affected the minority groups themselves. Under the slogan of "the right of self-determination" they have frequently striven for political independence, or at least for a territorial revision that would permit some form of union with the State having their own cultural character.

The attempt forcibly to assimilate alien peoples within a nation to the dominant culture has in some very few instances succeeded. But history demonstrates that minorities have usually adhered, in spite of persecution, to their own national, cultural or religious ideas. Aside from the patent injustice involved in attempting to transform the character of minority peoples to conform with that of the majority, experience attests to the futility of the process.

Our problem, of course, concerns minorities which have for generations occupied a given territory and have invested it with their peculiar cultural life. Their case obviously differs from minorities which have voluntarily migrated to other countries already enjoying a more or less unified culture. The former can demand in justice a recognition of their peculiar cultural status; the latter are bound to conform to a considerable extent to the cultural life to which they have willingly affixed themselves.

The authors of the Versailles treaty, while mixing the matter, attempted in many ways to solve the minority problem. The principle of self-determination, or the right of each people to decide for itself to what nation it desires to belong, was applied in many instances and with a high degree of success. Injustices of long standing were rectified. Poles, Lithuanians, Czechs, Slovaks, Serbs, Croats, Slovenes, Finns, Estonians and Letts were released from subjection to their "masters." National boundaries, it is true, were not always altered for ethnical reasons. Sometimes purely political or strategic

reasons dictated revision, with consequent suffering to the unfortunate minority occupying the territory in question. Notorious is the case of the Southern Tyrol, given to Italy, and containing 250,000 Austrians, who were immediately subjected to a ruthless process of cultural transformation. The effects of territorial revision by the Peace Treaty were not always just, but we should not ignore the good results obtained.

It was understood at Versailles, however, that territorial revision could not completely solve the minority problem. The demands of all minorities cannot be fulfilled in this manner. The "islands" of different nationalities, for example, found throughout Europe, make it impossible for all minorities to be united with their own brethren. From the viewpoint of ethics, moreover, the right of self-determination is not absolute or universally valid. When the exercise of such a "right" would seriously harm the entire State, or when political independence would bring about more harm than good to the minority itself, the action can hardly be justified.

Where the application of the principle of "self-determination" appeared unfeasible, the Allied and Associated Powers adopted other measures to insure respect for the rights of minorities. The Powers imposed upon the new or enlarged States of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Rumania, and Greece provisions for the protection of the civil, cultural and religious rights of minorities within their territories. Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia were refused admission into the League of Nations until each had formally accepted a Declaration to respect the rights of their minority peoples.

The exchange of populations has been another method tried since the World War to solve the difficulty. But the attempts rarely succeeded. Turkey and Greece were able, it is true, to exchange thousands of their respective Greek and Turkish minorities, but the cost in human suffering and privation was tremendous. The remedy proved far worse than the disease. It cannot be urged as a practical or humane solution of the problem.

No effective solution of the minorities problem is pos-

sible so long as the conception prevails that State and nationality are the same, that is, that the political ideals of the inhabitants of the State should be identical with the national-cultural ideals of the majority in it. Once these two fundamentally different things cease to be confounded, it should be possible for members of many nationalities to live together in complete harmony. But until this demon of exaggerated nationalism has been exorcised, the outlook is not encouraging.

Switzerland is almost unique as a State which has solved the problem in a happy manner. Constituted of different ethnical groups, this nation recognizes the cultural dominance of none of them. The traditions and customs, the language and particular loyalties, of each group are respected. The federal character of the State permits a measure of autonomy for the different elements of the population. In practical fashion the Swiss nation has demonstrated the distinction between nationality and State. When other countries will have attained the (on the whole) humane and just attitude of the Swiss, the problem of ethnical minorities will be solved.

With the advent of the present war the plight of minorities, both ethnical and religious, became still graver. Oppression is no longer confined merely to interference with customs and use of languages, or with deprivation of civil rights. Dominant majorities have not scrupled to violate basic natural rights: the right to life itself, to education, to religious worship, and the right to work. Great masses of people have been reduced virtually to the status of slaves, and brought to the brink of starvation. The problem of ethnical minorities was perhaps never graver in modern history than it is at the present time.

If we take the long-range view, the most practical form of protection of minorities is the proclamation of a bill of rights for the peoples of the world, to be incorporated within the provisions of an international organization. This bill of rights would enunciate the principle that no group of people should be deprived of their natural rights as human beings because of national-

ity or religion. It would also proclaim the principle that minority groups have the right to preserve their traditions, customs, language and religion, insofar as these latter are not opposed to the common good of the State. The international body would be empowered to intervene when any grave violation of human and national rights occurred or was seriously threatened.

The United States as a moral person, and as a member of the community of nations, has both the right and sometimes the duty to concern itself with violations of human rights against peoples. A crime perpetrated against a particular group of fellow humans is a crime against humanity, and no nation is excused from the dictate of charity to assist the oppressed. Just what form such assistance should take in any particular case must be determined, of course, according to the circumstances. But however difficult the particular application may be, the general principle is both clear and certain. The spirit of extreme isolationism, that is, the spirit of complete indifference to the plight of alien peoples, is contrary to Christian ethics. No one can deny that the American people display great generosity in the matter of immediate material relief to the unfortunate everywhere. But isolationism could still be evidenced in an unwillingness to lower immigration barriers for the sheltering of the oppressed, or by a reluctance to co-operate with other nations in solving the basic problem.

It could be possible for the United States to co-operate effectively in the solution of the minorities' problem by insisting upon a bill of natural rights as applied to nationalities in the treaty of peace that will end the present European struggle, and also by promoting a permanent society of nations, dedicated (in part) to the protection of these rights. As in the question of the needs of nations, so in this question of the rights of minorities, the role of our country appears to be one of the greatest importance.

Appendix A

The following excerpts from the Polish Minorities Treaty,¹ established between Poland and the Allied Powers in 1919, are offered as an illustration of some of the basic provisions that might be incorporated into an international bill of rights.

ARTICLE 1

Poland undertakes that the stipulations contained in Articles 2 to 8 of this Chapter shall be recognized as fundamental laws, and that no law, regulation or official action shall conflict or interfere with these stipulations, nor shall any law, regulation or official action prevail over them.

ARTICLE 2

Poland undertakes to assure full and complete protection of life and liberty to all inhabitants of Poland without distinction of birth, nationality, language, race or religion.

All inhabitants of Poland shall be entitled to the free exercise, whether public or private, of any creed, religion or belief, whose practices are not inconsistent with public order or public morals.

ARTICLE 7

All Polish nationals shall be equal before the law and shall enjoy the same civil and political rights without distinction as to race, language or religion.

Differences of religion, creed or confession shall not prejudice any Polish national in matters relating to the enjoyment of civil or political rights, as for instance admission to public employments, functions and honors, or the exercise of professions and industries.

No restriction shall be imposed on the free use by any Polish national of any language in private intercourse, in commerce, in religion, in the press or in publications of any kind, or at public meetings.

Notwithstanding any establishment by the Polish Government of an official language, adequate facilities shall be given to Polish nationals of non-Polish speech for the use of their language, either orally or in writing, before the courts.

ARTICLE 8

Polish nationals who belong to racial, religious or linguistic minorities shall enjoy the same treatment and security in law and in fact as the other Polish nationals. In particular they shall have an equal right to establish, manage and control at their own expense charitable, religious and social institutions, schools and other educational establishments, with the right to use their own language and to exercise their religion freely therein.

¹ Text of treaty to be found in McCartney's "National State and National Minorities," p. 502.

ARTICLE 9

Poland will provide in the public educational system in towns and districts in which a considerable proportion of Polish nationals of other than Polish speech are resident adequate facilities for ensuring that in the primary schools the instruction shall be given to the children of such Polish nationals through the medium of their own language. This provision shall not prevent the Polish Government from making the teaching of the Polish language obligatory in the said schools.

In towns and districts where there is a considerable proportion of Polish nationals belonging to racial, religious or linguistic minorities, these minorities shall be assured an equitable share in the enjoyment and application of the sums which may be provided out of public funds under the State, municipal or other budget, for educational, religious or charitable purposes.

ARTICLE 12

Poland agrees that the stipulations in the foregoing Articles, so far as they affect persons belonging to racial, religious or linguistic minorities, constitute obligations of international concern and shall be placed under the guarantee of the League of Nations. They shall not be modified without the assent of a majority of the Council of the League of Nations. The United States, the British Empire, France, Italy and Japan hereby agree not to withhold their assent from any modification in these Articles which is in due form assented to by a majority of the Council of the League of Nations.

Poland agrees that any Member of the Council of the League of Nations shall have the right to bring to the attention of the Council any infraction, or any danger of infraction, of any of these obligations, and that the Council may thereupon take such action and give such direction as it may deem proper and effective in the circumstances.

Poland further agrees that any difference of opinion as to questions of law or fact arising out of these Articles between the Polish Government and any one of the Principal Allied and Associated Powers or any other Power, a Member of the Council of the League of Nations, shall be held to be a dispute of an international character under Article 14 of the Covenant of the League of Nations. The Polish Government hereby consents that any such dispute shall, if the other party thereto demands, be referred to the Permanent Court of International Justice. The decision of the Permanent Court shall be final and shall have the same force and effect as an award under Article 13 of the Covenant.

Appendix B

N. C. W. C. STUDY CLUB OUTLINE

I. RIGHTS OF NATIONS (pp. 23-26)

1. The general principles of ethics and particular cases.
2. What does the Pope mean when he refers to the rights of peoples?
3. Purpose and effect of high tariff walls and nationalism as the spirit behind it: as manifested by the "have-nots" and the "haves."
4. The principle of the use of resources of earth for welfare of all in relation to an exploitation by the nation possessing the resources.
5. Does justice demand that the have-not nations actually possess resources now in possession of other nations?
6. Discuss free flow of trade, monetary loans, elimination of restrictive tariffs, colonies, accessibility of markets.
Suggested Papers: Review of "International Economic Life," C. A. I. P.; "Tariffs and World Peace," C. A. I. P.

II. OBLIGATIONS OF JUSTICE AND CHARITY (pp. 26-28)

1. What are the requirements of social justice in this connection?
2. What are the requirements of charity?
3. What is the special obligation of the United States with regard to the just demand of peoples? What would a policy of extreme isolation engender?
4. Discuss the following as means of fulfilling the obligation:
 - a. Promotion of a just and charitable peace following the present war.
 - b. Promotion of equitable trade agreements.
 - c. A change of heart.

Suggested Paper: Review of "The Pope's Peace Program and the United States," Eagan, N. C. W. C.

III. RIGHTS OF ETHNICAL MINORITIES (pp. 28, 29)

1. The part played by minorities in causing the World War and the present European conflict.
2. Past migrations which caused the present minority "islands" in Europe.
3. What is a minority? Discuss persecutions of minorities. How has the growth of modern nationalism intensified this growth by identifying nationality and State? Effect of spirit of nationalism on minorities themselves.

4. Injustice and futility of attempting cultural transformation of long established minorities. Difference of new migrating minorities, especially in a new land.

Suggested Paper: Review of first three sections of "Human Dynamite," Foreign Policy Association, New York.

IV. PAST ATTEMPTS (pp. 29-31)

1. Discuss the Versailles Treaty disposition of minorities.
2. Territorial revision as not solving completely the minority problem. Is the right of national self-determination absolute or universally valid in ethics?
3. The League of Nations and the declaration of newly-formed States to respect the rights of minorities.
4. Discuss the failure of the exchange of populations as a solution to the minority problem following the World War.

Suggested Paper: Review of Chapters IV-VIII of "Human Dynamite."

V. CONSTRUCTIVE SOLUTIONS (pp. 31, 32)

1. Discuss Switzerland as an example of the effectiveness of separating concepts of State and nationality.
2. How has the plight of minorities become intensified in the present war?
3. Discuss an international bill of rights as a safeguard for national minorities. Its dependency on a world organization.
4. The obligation of the United States. Material relief and immigration laws. Insistence on a bill of natural rights in the peace treaty to terminate the present strife. Promotion of a society of nations.

Suggested Paper: Review of Chapters VIII-XI of "Human Dynamite."

THE Catholic Association for International Peace is a membership organization. Its object is to further, in accord with the teachings of the Church, the "Peace of Christ in the Kingdom of Christ," through the preparation and distribution of studies applying Christian teaching to international life.

It was organized in a series of meetings during 1926 and 1927—the first held just following the Eucharistic Congress in Chicago, the second held in Cleveland that fall to form an organizing committee, and the third in Easter week, 1927, in Washington when the permanent organization was established.

The Association works through the preparation of committee reports. Following careful preparation, these are discussed both publicly and privately in order to secure able revision. They are then published by the organization. Questions involving moral judgments are submitted to the Committee on Ethics.

The Association solicits especially the membership and co-operation of those whose experience and studies are such that they can take part in the preparation of Committee reports.

The Catholic Association for International Peace has instructed its Committees during the course of the war to concentrate on:

- (1) Means of preventing our entrance into the war, including examination of the dangers of war trade and the threat of Nazi-Communism, the study of propaganda and encouragement of prayers for peace.
- (2) Steps to bring about peace in Europe including consideration of mediation and proposals of just terms, and exploring the possibility of an international boycott of the aggressors.
- (3) Plans for American entrance into world organization so as to help to cure the sins in economic, governmental and cultural life which have brought on this catastrophe and to prevent its recurrence.

The junior branch of the Association is composed of students in International Relations Clubs in more than a hundred Catholic colleges and in Catholic clubs of secular universities. The separate clubs are united in geographical federations, *e. g.*, New England, Lake Erie, Middle Atlantic, Capital, Ohio Valley, Mid-Western and Central. They are known as Catholic Student Peace Federations and receive the co-operation and assistance of the parent organization. The Catholic Student Peace Federations are autonomous and function under the direction of Boards of Directors composed of six student officers, four faculty advisers and one regional faculty adviser. A national Co-ordinating Committee brings together the regional federations.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE C.A.I.P.

Pamphlet Series—(10c a copy; \$1.00 a dozen)

- No. 1—International Ethics.*
- No. 2—Latin America and the United States.*
- No. 3—Causes of War, and Security, Old and New * (out of print).
- No. 4—Haiti, Past and Present (out of print).
- No. 5—Francis de Vitoria (out of print).
- No. 6—American Agriculture and International Affairs.*
- No. 7—Puerto Rico and the United States (out of print).
- No. 8—Europe and the United States—Elements in Their Relationship.*
- No. 9—The Ethics of War (out of print).
- No. 10—National Attitudes in Children.
- No. 11—Tariffs and World Peace.*
- No. 12—Manchuria—The Problem in the Far East.*
- No. 13—International Economic Life * (out of print).
- No. 14—The Church and Peace Efforts.*
- No. 15—War and Peace in St. Augustine's "De Civitate Dei."
- No. 16—Peace Education in Catholic Schools.
- No. 17—Peace Action of Benedict XV.
- No. 18—Relations Between France and Italy.
- No. 19—Catholic Organization for Peace in Europe.
- No. 20—The United States and the Dominican Republic (out of print).
- No. 21—An Introduction to Mexico.*
- No. 22—A Papal Peace Mosaic.
- No. 23—Arbitration and the World Court.*
- No. 24—Agriculture and International Life.*
- No. 25—Patriotism, Nationalism, and the Brotherhood of Man.*
- No. 26—The Church and the Jews.
- No. 27—The Obligation of Catholics to Promote Peace, and The Rights of Peoples.*

MISCELLANEOUS SERIES

Appeals for Peace of Pope Benedict XV and Pope Pius XI	10c
Catholic Primer of Peace	25c
Permanent Peace Program of Pope Benedict XV	10c
Syllabus on International Relations	10c

•

Catholic Tradition of the Law of Nations, John Eppstein \$2.50

•

Monthly News Letter (Issued during school months) \$1.00

NATIONAL CATHOLIC WELFARE CONFERENCE PEACE PAMPHLETS

Peace Statements of Recent Popes	10c
The Christian Way to Peace *	10c
Pius XII and Peace *	10c
The Pope's Peace Program and the United States *	10c

* Study Outline Appended.