

# CHRISTIAN MORALS IN INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

AN ADDRESS BY

DR. CHARLES MALIK

The following is an address delivered by Charles Malik at the Douglas L. Rights Peace Lecture on May 5, 1960.

# Christian Morals in International Affairs

## THE DOUGLAS RIGHTS PEACE LECTURE

The problem of the relevance of Christianity to the affairs of the nations is not without some interest; firstly because Christianity appears to be so conspicuously irrelevant; and secondly because these affairs are on the mind of everybody, and consequently on the mind of the Christian, who must therefore put to himself the question as to whether international matters take place all by themselves in a world apart. When the Christian, who in some ascertainable sense views and worships Jesus Christ as Lord both of himself and of history, is at the same time charged with national and international responsibility – and that does happen now and then – the problem to him becomes doubly interesting. With deep perplexity he asks himself everyday: What is the bearing of this Christ whom I love and worship, not upon my life – that is clear enough –, nor upon history as a whole – that too is somewhat clear –, but upon these concrete issues which face me every morning? How does the Lordship of Christ over history manifest itself in the concrete issues which are everyday determining history? Granted that diplomacy deals with real, objective situations – Korea, Suez, Berlin, the banning of nuclear tests – and granted that the diplomats and statesmen, trying to do the best they can, are honourable men engaged in a most honourable pursuit, still there is considerable bickering and craftiness, considerable scheming and intrigue, no end of mutual undermining and undercutting, and a vast amount of shadiness in which practically every law of God and man is broken. The conscience of the believing and practicing Christian, who is at the same time a responsible statesman or a diplomat, is then deeply troubled. But apart from this personal aspect of the matter, which admits perhaps of a way out in the understanding and forgiveness of God, there is the speculative question of

where God or Christ or the Holy Spirit is, where Christian morals are, in all this objective clash of interests and wills which constitutes the entrancing real drama of history. The question of Christian morals in international affairs appears then to be an inescapable question.

This is all the more so as international affairs appear to follow courses of development quite independent of moral, let alone Christian-moral, considerations. There are these 82 nations of which the United Nations is now composed; and before the present wave of nationalism and fragmentation has spent itself in Asia and Africa the membership will swell to a hundred. What is it that governs the lives of these 100 nations between themselves? The first principle of each nation in the international order is its own security; the second principle is so to conduct its international relations as to profit therefrom for the welfare of its own people, however it conceives this welfare. It posits itself as a fixed center and everything it does must subserve that center. In the actual give-and-take of international relations nations certainly make concessions to each other, but the concessions are always within limits, and for any concession the calculation has been that the interests of the nation are better served with the concession than without it. Common international interests also certainly exist, but they too are calculated in terms of national interests, and in any event they are not as stable or permanent as the national interests. If the first principle of a nation is, as Augustine would say, self-love,<sup>1</sup> how can it recognize any law above itself, any interest other than its own? Every decision it takes is intended to serve its own aggrandizement. And because this applies to every nation, when the nations had to come together in 1945 in some international judicial order, known today as the United Nations, it was found necessary to enshrine the principle of sovereign equality at the very heart of their Charter.

In recent years many nations, including the United States and the Soviet Union, have developed extensive programmes of economic and technical assistance to the underdeveloped countries. Do we not here have a clear invalidation of the principle of self-love? Is it not an instance of sacrifice, of giving, of generosity, of moral or altruistic conduct? The answer is that it is not. Real sacrifice is not when you give from your margin or from your abundance, but when you give from your substance; and no nation has sacrificed from its substance. A sharing is moral only if it involves a sacrifice of substance, be the substance material possessions or the substance of your soul. An act that leaves you unaffected whether or not you did it is not a moral act. And while the persons engaged in the formation of national policy may themselves, as Christians or even as persons, have the purest of altruistic motives, when national policy is finally formed, the motives are always mixed, and political considerations always play the decisive role. I am of course not thinking of sporadic acts of relief by governments to other peoples stricken by some earthquake or flood; nor of the

---

<sup>1</sup> Erich Przywara, *An Augustine Synthesis*, London, Sheed & Ward, 1936, p. 263.

activities of a hundred non-governmental organizations in the international humanitarian field. I am speaking neither of non-governmental acts nor of governmental acts that do not constitute national policy. I am speaking of the national policy of governments; and such policy always revolves around the national interest, or, to use, Augustine's phrase, around "self-love," as its fixed center. In fact, the very definition of national political responsibility is to keep the interests of the nation uppermost in your mind.

The international order, then, consists of these 100 entities governed each essentially by the principle of self-love, and an international act is some calculable resultant of the cold-blooded interaction of these diverse self-loves. Whoever expects other than self-love in the dealings of the nations with one another simply does not know the sort of being which the international order is. Where, then, are the morals, let alone the Christian morals, international affairs? The two phrases simply do not mix. International affairs are at least neutral morally; they are at least amoral. The subject I chose to talk to you about appears therefore to be completely unpromising of positive results; unless indeed I had the intention of delivering a sermon here, in which, after I had painted and lamented the awful state of the world, and after I had smitten my breast, I would exhort you to form a crusade, or to join me in forming a crusade to bring Christian morals into international affairs, to preach to the nations love instead of self-love, non-violence instead of the sanction of force, unilateral disarmament instead of the strongest possible security precautions, and turning the left cheek after the other has been hit. But I assure nothing is farther from my mind than to preach a sermon, especially such a sermon. Over the years I have received hundreds of "peace plans" from religious or idealistic or mentally excited enthusiasts, and filed them away under a not too savory label; and I have no desire to add my own contribution to that file. If, then, the subject is utterly barren, and I am not in the mood of moralizing, I should not have chosen it in the first place, or, having chosen it and having discovered its barrenness, I should now sit down.

Nothing could be more wrong. It is impossible to be a believer – praying all the same that one's unbelief be helped – and to have watched and taken part in responsible international life for years without this question insistently plaguing the mind. Do Christian morals have any bearing on international affairs? If ruthless self-love is the principle, how can a Christian engaged in these affairs still live with himself? Again to use Augustine's imagery, how do the two cities, Jerusalem and Babylon, commingle with each other?<sup>2</sup> No silly initial barrenness of argument can possibly silence the anxious pounding of this question on the human heart. And the error of Augustine consisted, not in raising the question, nor in sharpening the distinction between the two cities, but in failing to appreciate that, "between the times," namely, before the consummation of the ages, namely again, while time still exists and we

---

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., p. 266.

still have Babylon on our hands, a Christian cannot wash his hands of the city of self-love and leave it to the dogs. There is such a thing as Christian political and even international responsibility. While the corrupt nature of Babylon sets it completely apart from Jerusalem, still Babylon is not nothing: it has its own objective laws which are fully worthy of the contemplation of the mind, like the laws of any other being, no matter how dumb or stupid or removed from the glory of God. And, what is more, Babylon is not over against us, way across the desert, as though we could choose to have nothing to do with it: we are at one and the same time citizens both of Jerusalem and Babylon; we are both Babylonian and heavenly. And sometimes I think that, because they have plunged into the dirt of the world and taken its corruption upon themselves, and because while the world is still on our hands they had to do the job or else the dogs would do it, the politicians, the diplomats and the statesmen, by reason of the immensity of their self-sacrifice, are more entitled to intercede for us in heaven than even the saints.

It all depends on the spirit with which the question as to Christian morals in international affairs is asked. There are two spirits under which it can be asked. One may ask it expecting Jerusalem, i.e. the Church, to have nothing to do except to serve Babylon, i.e. the nations. Because he sees nothing except the nations, and because he sees the nations going their own way heedless of Jerusalem, one asks: where is the Church? He does not see the Church in itself, nor even side by side with the nations. And therefore he concludes that Christian morals are irrelevant. The other spirit knows that the Church is queen over a completely autonomous kingdom and can be judged by how she performs within her own kingdom and not by whether she is relevant or irrelevant to another kingdom. And yet, partly because the central claim of the Church and her Lord is that they judge and bear upon everything, since “all things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made;”<sup>3</sup> partly because they have been actually “commingling” with Babylon for 2000 years; it would seem strange if they have not penetrated and to some extent at least Christianized the kingdoms of the world. And for the least little penetration or relevance such a spirit will be thankful. My task, therefore, resolves itself into refuting the false expectations of the first spirit, namely, to set forth the complete autonomy of Jerusalem from the fortunes of the world; and into trying to satisfy the reasonable expectations of the second which recognizes such autonomy and which clings to Jerusalem even if it had no relevance whatsoever to international affairs.

The reflections I am about to make, no matter how I couch them, are not therefore the fruits of an abstract, academic interest; they constitute part of the light that has been granted me on this question in the fiery crucible of one of the most wonderful and at the same time most harrowing experiences of my life. Three limitations are therefore imposed upon this treatment: the author is a Christian, the theme is Christian, and the treatment is from a

---

3 Jn. 1:3.

Christian point of view. In a more or less chaotic world in which thinkers studiously labour to level their thought down to some least common denominator, it has not yet become altogether sinful or indecent for a Christian to examine Christian themes in a Christian spirit.

When we say the Church is independent of politics we mean three things, or we say the same thing in more or less three different ways: that politics, whether national or international, does not and cannot judge the Church; that the Church does not stand or fall depending on the political fortunes of mankind; and that the Church deals with a different order of existence altogether, both as to her origin, her law of development and her end.

When Christ came and founded His Church there was lots of politics in the world: the Roman Empire, one of the greatest political and indeed international designs of all times, was at its zenith; many other empires had already passed on the stage of history, some brilliant, some rather shabby; rulers and ruled, and in general the state, had already existed for millenia; the Jews themselves could look back upon their great golden age under David and Solomon a thousand years behind; and perhaps the deepest human treatises ever written on the subject of politics had already been conceived and recorded 350 years before across the Mediterranean in Greece. And yet Christ and the Church manifested the strangest reserve, nay even silence, with respect to matters political and international. Whether it was Tiberius or Herod or Pilate or the Centurion or Nero; whether it was Christ's single reference to Caesar, or what might be correctly deduced from the one or two remarks He made to His disciples about how their order between themselves should differ from the political order of the Gentiles, or later from the two or three sentences He said in the garden and before Pilate about the political human order being permitted by God; or whether it was Paul's teaching concerning civil authority and the Christian's duty of obedience, in general, to it; whatever little direct or indirect reference there might be in the New Testament to the civil government and to relations between governments, it is quite clear that this was entirely accidental to the occasion. The state and its affairs were not at all the center of the thought of Christ and the Church. It was as though Christ and the Church were saying: the state and the nations have always existed and have always somehow, through war or peace, muddled through their affairs; so let them continue muddling through their existence until the end of time; for our part, we have other business altogether to attend to. "My kingdom is not of this world."<sup>4</sup>

There are, then, no international teachings in the New Testament other than that Christ died for Jew and Gentile alike, and indeed for all men; that all can be saved by faith and by grace; that the disciples were sent to preach the Gospel to, and to convert and baptize, all nations; that Israel would return to Christ after the Gentiles had had their Christian day;

---

4 Jn. 18:36.

and that in the end all powers and principalities on earth and in heaven will be judged by Christ and will become subject to Him. But international political teachings, how the nations should conduct their affairs among themselves, there simply are none.

To be sure, there was terrific political fury against Christ, against Peter and against Paul, but they took it completely in their stride, even though it ended by killing all three of them. The political order from the very beginning, as by some strange sure instinct, took the Church most seriously (witness Herod and the slaughter of children); but the Church did not take the political order seriously at all: she went her way in almost complete disregard of here and there trying to avoid a direct clash with it. Nothing proves more the complete independence of the Church from all politics and all international relations than the fact that the Church arose on the death of Christ, which was politically and indeed also internationally determined, and grew upon the blood of the martyrs.

To be sure also, we are told both by Gibbon and by Toynbee that the Christian infiltration of the Roman Empire was one of the major causes of its downfall, and we know the momentous historic significance of the conversion of Constantine. But neither the infiltration of the Empire nor the conversion of the Emperor proves anything concerning the interest of the Church in politics. The Church certainly wanted to convert everybody, including centurions, senators, kings, and emperors, but she did not want to take their place in the ordering of secular affairs. She wanted to convert them, not because she wanted to seize power and rule over them, but because Christ loved and died for them. Thus both the peaceful Christian infiltration and the conversion of the Emperor only prove that when a man becomes a Christian, he becomes a new man, with new ideas, new purposes, a new spirit and a new sense of responsibility; and if a large enough number of men became Christian, then of course the whole tone of society, and therewith of the state, would change; and if one of these men happened to be an Emperor, then of course his new religion would determine and colour his conduct of state affairs. From the conversion of Constantine, tremendous consequences flowed, and the Church was thankful; and the Church would today be thankful if Khrushchev or someone else like him should be converted and should as a result bring his new Christian spirit to bear upon the formation and execution of state policy. But Christianity does not depend on numbers nor certainly on emperors. The conversion of Constantine did him and his dying Empire lots of good, but it had no effect whatsoever on the fact that we already had the Gospels, that the Church was already firmly established and was prospering despite all persecution, and that Christ had already long ago overcome the world. Neither Constantine nor anybody else can turn to Christ and the Church and say: look here, I am doing you a favor by my conversion, or by my piety and virtue.

What is, then, the separate kingdom of the Church which she will not allow politics, whether national or international, to encroach upon? The Church has received the Gospels, the Sacraments, the Tradition and the Liturgy, and while the Tradition grows and the Liturgy changes, the Gospels and the Sacraments cannot change. Politics and the state have nothing to do with all this; in fact the church received and preserved these things in the teeth of intense political and international opposition. The Church proclaims God the Creator, Christ the Saviour, and the Holy Spirit the Giver of life and truth; and the state has nothing to do with all this. The Church is commissioned to preach to and baptize all men, regardless of race, culture, background, nationality, political affiliation, and status in life; and political and international distinctions have no place whatsoever in this universal human ministry of the Church. The Church has received a certain code of morals both from the old law and from the new; and in trying to convert a certain tribe in Africa, she will not compromise this code by permitting them to continue practicing polygamy in order to please them, nor will she change her standards of honesty and fairness and liberal sharing, or gloss over Christ's teachings about covetousness and the rich and the camel going through the eye of a needle, in trying to convert a certain commercial class in New York. Saint John Chrysostom told the Empress Eudoxia to her face that she had no right, under Christ, to her fast living at the imperial court, and she banished him to the confines of Asia Minor where he died praising God. Finally, the Church is ordered to preserve herself, namely her unity and her continuity; and while both unity and continuity have been subjected to great trials and strains throughout history, the Church, both in her unity and in her continuity, has outlived a score of empires, hundreds of states, both petty and large, thousands of politicians, statesmen and dictators, and tens of thousands of long-established family traditions and family empires; and the yearning for Church unity and Church continuity characterizes the Christian heart today as never before. There is no institution in the whole of human history that even distantly compares with the Christian Church in universality, in unity, in continuity, and in power of survival; and such historic trifles as the breakup of the Roman Empire, or the passage from the ancient world to the middle ages, or the passage from the mediaeval times to modern times, or the rise and fall of empires and emperors, or fluctuations in international relations, whereby today Germany is the enemy, tomorrow the friend, or today the Soviet Union the enemy, tomorrow the friend, or the arrival of modern science with all its wonders, or the rise of a thousand philosophers and the development of a thousand philosophies, or wars and revolutions and famines and pestilences, or the atomic bomb, or the development of nuclear power, or the conquest of outer space, or landing on the moon and the planets, or encompassing the whole material universe – all these historic events the Church lives through without being affected by them in the slightest, both as to her character, her independence and her conception of herself. And I am authoritatively told that in the Soviet Union the Christian Orthodox Church, despite 43 years of the most relentless persecution, is



living and active today; that there are between 25 million and 50 million Russian believers; and that from the independent voluntary support of these believers the Russian Church is well off.

Let those therefore who see only the nations and scornfully ask, where is the Church?, recognize that the Church has always been there fruitfully and independently going about her own business. The first condition for seeing any light on the question of Christian morals in international affairs is for the man of the world to see, humbly and soberly, that men and the nations and the wisdom that comes from them are not all that there is, but that side by side with them and penetrating them at every level stands another given fact, the Christian Church, given not by the wisdom of the nations nor by the will of men, but as a living assault from heaven.

I have stressed the complete independence of the Church in questions of faith and morals vis-à-vis politics and international affairs, and that for three reasons: first, because this is the truth, and the truth, any truth, and therefore especially the highest truth, always vivifies the mind and liberates the soul; second, because unless we keep this truth in mind we might lose all sense of proportion when we consider Christian morals in international affairs; and third, because the worst thing that can happen to the Church or to Christianity or to Christian morals or indeed to simple Christian morals is for them to worry too much about international affairs, as though that were the Church's business, as though the Church existed only to worry about these affairs and to make sure that they do not go wrong. The Church serves international affairs best – though that is not by many means her only service to them – by being fully and absolutely the Church; by convicting men, rulers and ruled alike, of their sin; by bringing them all to God through Christ; by making the rulers feel that, while she is always praying for them, while she is always ready to minister to their spiritual needs, while they can always fall back upon her wonder-working grace, she leaves them alone to assume and carry out their own responsibilities in complete freedom; by cultivating Christian morals and the Christian conscience among the people, so that the people, so sensitized in their conscience and so lifted above the softness and indifference of corruption, will themselves criticize and check and guide their rulers, and hold them up to what is best for the nation and the world; and by speaking boldly and from the housetops, when need arises and as occasion serves, concerning specific issues about which her conscience is quite clear, always, however, from the standpoint of her absolute independence and without compromising that independence. But when things go wrong, and more often than not they do, it is always the fault of the politicians and statesmen, and never the fault of the Church; and when they go well, the politicians and statesmen must always thank God that He had compassion on them

to prosper their ways. International affairs and those who oversee them had better therefore take note of the Church, because she is going to outlive them all, and she is going to live to judge them all.

I come now to my second task, namely, the task of positively showing how Christian morals have borne and so bear on international affairs. Completely independent in her origins, her responsibilities and her ends, and wholly autonomous within her own separate kingdom, the Church nevertheless did exert considerable influence upon both the character and the conduct of international affairs over the centuries. The principles of Jerusalem have definitely impregnated the life of Babylon.

The bearing and influence of Christianity on international affairs is primarily the influence of the statesman, who is at the time Christian, on these affairs. In so far as there are Christian statesmen, who, because they are Christian, bring to bear their *Christian conscience* upon the conduct of affairs, Christianity exerts influence upon the state of the world. The primary task therefore is either to bring Christ to the statesman, or to bring the statesman to Christ; either to make Christians statesmen, or to make statesmen Christian.

But even were he a saint and with the best will in the world, a Christian statesman will find himself labouring in the international order under five limitations: (1) the passions and corruptions of human nature; (2) the fact that situations are as a rule ambiguous and mixed, and right and wrong not so clear as to absolve him from the necessity of hard moral choice and of taking the guilt of the world upon his shoulders; (3) the fact that he is dealing with so-called "Christian nations" which act for the most part from the principle of self-love; (4) the fact that he is also dealing with non-Christian nations; and (5) the fact that he is further dealing with militant movements consciously aiming at reconstructing society on anti-Christian bases. No man could therefore be more humble before his daily task than the Christian statesman.

Everything depends on what is meant by the *Christian conscience*. This means the Christian view of man. This includes the view that man, every individual human being, whether Christian or non-Christian, is created in the image and likeness of God; that therefore in his reason and understanding, in his freedom and in his ability to create, man participates in the nature of God, although of course in a most imperfect manner; that this divine immanence makes of the human soul something absolutely inviolable; that this is precisely what constitutes man's essential dignity and worth and entitles him, as a human being, to certain fundamental rights and freedoms; that this essential human dignity is further infinitely

enhanced by the fact that, in order to save man from himself and from the powers of evil, God Himself did not disdain to take on, in the Person of Jesus Christ, the form of man; that for these two very reasons, namely, man's original dignity and the love of Christ, positive human creations should be respected; that among these creations are the great entities which we call today "the nations" with their diverse national cultures and wills; that therefore these diverse national wills should be respected inasmuch as God "hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth" (Acts 17:26); and that therefore it is a Christian duty to seek and realize a just international order in which all nations and cultures can live together in peace, concord and mutual respect.

It is impossible to exaggerate how much the "international" idea itself owed its origin and its development to the Christian moral soil. The founders of international law in the 15th and 16th centuries, such great names as Vitoria, Suarez, and Grotius, are unthinkable apart from their Christian formation. Is it an accident that the international idea did not arise and mature within Greek or Roman or Chinese or Indian culture, and that other religions did not explicitly recognize "other" nations, nor did they work out a body of jurisprudence regulating their relations to them on the basis of law? Is it an accident that the very existence of "nations" other than "the German nation", let alone equality between "Duetschtum" and "other nations," was hardly admitted theoretically by Hitlerism, which therefore recognized no abiding law between itself and them; and that Lenin taught that the requirements of the international proletarian revolution were above any nation and any international law? Man as man appears clearer to himself within the Christian moral climate than anywhere else, not excluding the Stoics, who also helped considerably to clarify the idea of a universal human nature. The regulative notions of all so-called "international affairs," I mean such notions as "law," "rule of law," "order," "international order," "just international order," "family of nations," "equality," "juridical equality," "sovereign equality," "respect," "mutual respect," "peace," "just peace," "self defense," "international agreements," "binding agreements," "sanctity of treaties," "sanctity of the plighted word," "the possibility of something stable and enduring between the nations" – all such regulative principles derive principally from the bosom of Christian civilization with its distinctive view of man. It follows that there are no "international affairs" without "Christian morals" entering in and directly or indirectly determining their very essence. And the eye of faith can see in practically every international situation the hidden hand of Christ.

All this does not mean that at this or that point of history, or in connection with this or that development, so-called "Christian nations" or so-called "Christian peoples" or so-called "Christian statesmen," or even high Christian prelates, did not violate the Christian conscience in their decisions or actions, or did not prove unworthy of the Christ who they professed as their Lord. Babylon as a social-temporal organization will always be distinct

from Jerusalem and will never be completely prevailed by it; and in this life the old Adam will never be expunged from the hearts of men, even the best and saintliest men, and until He comes again, Christ's dominance over the affairs of men, individually or as groups or nations, will always be partial and incomplete.

An interesting topic of research would be to determine how much whatever humanism and humanitarianism exists between the nations and the peoples of the earth, I mean such things as the Red Cross, rules of war, international conventions about prisoners of war, the bombing in wartime of military targets alone and the sparing of the civilian population, the granting of rights to subjugated peoples, Works of relief and mercy, Etc., arose directly or indirectly from the Christian conscience. Have other civilizations and religions conceived the obligation of helping people outside their fold just because they are human beings? But there are such things as completely disinterested Christian charities among non-Christians.

Similarly the whole modern movement for the rights of man and cultures and nations and classes, the whole movement for a just society and for social justice, is inspired directly or indirectly by the Christian conscience. At the United Nations the universal Declaration of Human Rights which was proclaimed by the general assembly in 1948 would have been impossible - among other things - without the direct operation of the Christian conscience. If we keep in mind that this document is certainly one of the basic texts of this age, that when it was adopted not a single vote was cast against it, and that it has already entered into a dozen national constitutions and played an enormous role in stirring up the peoples of Asia and Africa to the rights and freedoms which the United Nations tells them they are entitled by reason of being human beings, we see here a humble instance of the Christian view of man impressing itself upon the world. Why should one believe that weak and helpless cultures and Nations have the natural right to freedom and Independence if he did not believe in the original Dignity of man? The Nazis believed in no such thing, and when Communism preaches what it calls, "national liberation," it does not do this out of respect for these peoples but primarily in order to weaken those who now rule them and in the hope that it will later absorb them itself. Also, it is interesting to note that, no sooner do some people take advantage and obtain their national independence and freedom, than they clamp down under the operation of their own native principles, upon all human rights and freedoms.

Do nations act, whether within or without the United Nations, except for self-interest? The answer is, of course they do not, and indeed they should not. In international relations there is room neither for a charity nor for philanthropy nor for sentimentalism, and any soft-headed moralizing misses the entire Point, namely, that the order of being that obtains

between sovereign entities is different from the order of being that obtains between subordinate entities under any one of these sovereign entities. There is nothing wrong with self-interest, save when it is wrongly conceived. A rightly conceived self-interest involves and respects the interests of others. This is often referred to as an, “enlightened self-interest,” but I ask: where does this “light” which illumines our interests and make us have regard for the interests of others as part of our calculations with respect to our own interests, come from? It comes from the Christian conscience which alone affirms the unity of man all over the world and believes in the universality of the moral law. To the extent people have been short-sighted and bigoted and narrow-minded day have not been touched by this conscience, and as a result they have misconceived their self-interest; and to the extent they have been wise and flexible and have sincerely taking others into account, the Christian conscience which sees way into debts, the depths of man and therefore the depths of the future, has granted them a measure of light. As soon as you step out of yourself, you are in the grip of Christ and therefore of Christian morals. The heaping of “coals of fire” upon the head of one’s enemy By giving him bread to eat and water to drink is very practical, political maxim.

War is of course the supreme question, and the Pacifists, by their actions and sustained deep meditations have forced the moral issue into the open. Reasonable Christians can therefore no longer take this matter lightly: They must endeavor to face and answer the Pacifist argument. For the sentiment of Pacifism is much more widespread, at least in England and America, then many people are prepared to admit; and I find myself again and again in the uncomfortable position of having to protest before good and well-meaning people that, although I do not believe in unilateral disarmament and although I would certainly resist unprovoked aggression and Communist encroachment and revolution wherever they occur, I am still a believing Christian. I will here make only the following brief observations.

(1) Because the subject of Christianity and war is exceedingly intricate and deep, and because the more I go into it the more I realize it is deeper than I had previously imagined, I am grateful to the pacifist for the tremendous vigor with which they keep raising this question, and I am always prepared to re-examine my present conclusions, which I nevertheless strong we hold two, in any serious and well-grounded discussion of this matter.

(2) In this connection it is right to bear witness to the invaluable rendered by the Pacifist to the cause of peace, humanity and international understanding, whether through the fellowship of reconciliation, or the Society of Friends, or the American Field Service, or World Brotherhood, or in innumerable other ways.

(3) There are sincere Christian Pacifists who base their convictions on their own

interpretations of Christianity, and there are Pacifists who are only dialectical tools, whether wittingly or unwittingly, of the international proletarian Revolution. The former I deeply respect; the latter can only be met with corresponding dialectical counter tools.

(4) There is a clear vein in the New Testament, which permits, at least on the face of it, of a pacifist interpretation. The same vein is to be found in primitive Christianity, as can be easily demonstrated by reference to such names as Justin Martyr, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Tertullian, Cyprian, and Lactantius.

(5) However, as soon as Christians began to assume political responsibility or to associate with those who did, we find a strong non-pacifist vein. The mere mention of the names of Athanasius, Chrysostom, Augustine, Aquinas, Luther and Calvin proves this point. Also the Westminster Confession and the Articles of Religion of the Anglican Church are distinctly non-pacifist.

(6) I fail to find in the pacifist tradition any evidence that it is right for a nation to allow another nation just to walk in and dominate it, or that people should in the international order accept peace at any price.

(7) From the natural right of people to freedom and Independence follows, it would seem, the duty to take the necessary steps, under the aegis of the Christian conscience, to protect this freedom and independence.

(8) Self-defense appears therefore to be a natural right.

(9) It is one thing for the individual Christian or even a community of Christians to choose to sacrifice themselves; it is entirely a different thing for a ruler, even a Christian ruler, to choose, even if he could, to sacrifice the whole nation. No nation has ever raised a ruler to the pinnacle of power or consented to his wielding ultimate authority over it on the basis that he will not protect it if attacked.

(10) In the actual day-to-day or even minute-to-minute discharge a political state responsibility, No statement has ever faced with moral decisions of absolute white or black Alternatives. It is always a matter of more or less messy Alternatives, and when you choose the less messy alternative, you still must bear the moral reproach and shame that it necessarily carries with it. We're certain acts of resistance or certain

methods are Prosecuting a war were decided upon, it can be shown that, if the responsible Statesman did not decide on them, the result would very likely have been more rather than less suffering, and diminution rather than an increase of humanness and decency in the hearts of men.

(11) Nuclear warfare should make no difference to truth or falsehood of the pacifist argument; otherwise it would appear that the moral argument of non-resistance to force had waited all these centuries until the destructive implications of the power of the atom made it true.

(12) Negotiation, discussion, dialogue, cultural exchanges, doing everything to promote Mutual trust, attempts at reconciliation and the peaceful settlement of disputes, supporting the United Nations and letting the free interplay of world public opinion bear upon critical situations - all this should always be encouraged and vigorously pursued. But we're much more than even one's nation is at stake, where a whole civilization is undermined and assaulted from all sides, military weakness is the last thing my conscience can recommend.

(13) While one must make a series of fundamental distinctions when it comes to war, especially where there is not only war between the nations but also aware of ideas and war of classes, and not only direct aggression but also subversion or indirect aggression, the concept of a just war, at least in self defense, as developed by Augustine or Aquinas or Luther or Grotius, does not seem to me to be inherently anti-Christian.

Christians have always prayed for peace and concord. Every Sunday for fifteen hundred years, the Orthodox Mass opens, immediately after invoking the Everlasting Kingdom of the Holy Trinity, by beseeching the Lord most ardently, "for peace from above" and "for the peace of the whole world." Every other Christian service I know contains special supplications for peace. Christians have written and list treaties on peace and justice. And list also have been there active intervention in this domain. Has there been a war, especially in recent decades and centuries, but some Christian leader - a Pope or an Archbishop or a Bishop or a Minister - or some Christian group did not rise and actively endeavour to intervene with the combatants to fight it, if they must continue fighting it, according to the dictates of humanity, or to bring it to a speedy conclusion according to the tenets of justice? In many a tension threatening to break out into a war world attention has time and again naturally turned towards some leader of the church to help in composing the differences and calming the tempestuous sea. The Church has active Representatives rooted in every culture of



the world; her listening posts are exceedingly well-informed on what is happening all over the place; because of her age-old international character, being far more beauty than any other international agency (in fact she is the Prototype and parent of all such agencies), her diplomatic experience is impressively vast, and practically all diplomatic usage stems from the matrix of this experience; and in general, if her advice is sought, and if she consents to give it, nothing is more profitable for the statesman than to listen to her calm and balanced words, always of course reserving himself to the final judgment on the situation on his mind. Books have been written on what Church representatives and Church agencies have done in international situations, and I wish to take this opportunity to pay a special tribute to the Protestant and Catholic Representatives at the United Nations for the constructive interest they have shown in every major international problem. The Commission of the Churches on International Affairs, representing the World Council of Churches, has been all over the years of particular help to all its friends at the United Nations. Who has stressed the importance and necessity of continuing negotiation and unbroken contact despite every difficulty more than the Church and her representatives? The day-by-day practical contribution of those who believe in Jesus Christ and worship Him to the cause of international understanding, justice, concord, negotiation, rapprochement, agreement, trust and peace, is absolutely second to none: certainly far greater than the contribution of the cynics who keep on asking: where is the Church and where are Christian morals?

Peace is a preeminent Christian concept. New philosophies teach today that the nature of things is to be at War. They stress contradiction and conflict; they believe in the Eternal War of the elements, the eternal war of emotions, the eternal war of interest, the eternal war of classes. Therefore they hold that only through violent revolution can anything be achieved. This they teach us as the eternal law of history and the universe. They have absolutely no trust and understanding and reason, and in the possibility of harmony. But Christianity teaches the exact opposite. Its ultimate regulative idea is peace. They are originally at peace and not in conflict, and if war and conflict intervene, it must be because of some evil principle. Moreover, this evil principal could not have the last word: the last word, the end of all things, is again. Does a Christian live in moves and has his whole being in the idea, not of conflict and contradiction, but of Peace. His first impulse is not to contradict, but to trust and believe. "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God."<sup>5</sup> The God of the Christian is a God of peace, and His covenant with man is a covenant of peace, peace on earth and goodwill. The Lord of the Christian is the Prince of Peace. At the very heart of all Christian faith, thought in life is yearning for peace. The eternal command will always bring the Christian back to his senses: make peace with God and man, and love justice! The tremendous vision of Isaiah, inscribed majestically on the United Nations Plaza in

5 Mt. 5:9.



New York, haunts the Christian day and night: “The nation shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their Spears into pruning hooks pull in nation shall not lift up sword against Nation, neither shall they learn war anymore.”<sup>6</sup> To the question of the cynic, where are Christian morals in international affairs, the answer is: it is quite true there are not enough Christian morals and international affairs; but it is doubtful that people, even cynics, would ever have asked this question, whether in a spirit of concern or the spirit of cynicism, but for the operation of the Christian morals and their mind; and it is doubtful that there would be any talk of peace and any striving after peace and any possibility of Peace in the world but for the fact that Christ “is our peace”<sup>7</sup> and that the peace of God has actually ruled in the hearts of man through Him.

Three things dominate the mind of the Christian in international affairs: peace, justice and man. There is no real peace except the peace that is conceived and founded in justice and that helps to promote the fullness of man. There is no real justice that does not respect the fullness of the dignity of man and that does not require an issue in peace. And perfect humanity is the realization of perfect justice which is itself then perfect peace. “Christian morals and international affairs” means the striving of the church for peace, justice and man.

The Christian believes that wherever and whenever there has been a measure of Peace, a measure of justice, and a measure of man, Christ has been at work. Mankind does not always obey and the nation’s do not always listen. Therefore, the church will never permit the infinite treasure she has received to depend on the winds and vagaries of men. The Church serves a different King and belongs to a different Kingdom, and while no agency has served the changing and unstable Kingdoms of the Earth more leave the church, and while, if only they had listened and obeyed, they will have a team to the maximum stability to which things moral and human could aspire, the church, knowing her independent origins and conscious of our separate loyalties, lives in and for her separate Kingdom, even “the city of the Living God, the heavenly Jerusalem”<sup>8</sup> “which cannot be moved”<sup>9</sup> and of which “there shall be no end.”<sup>10</sup>

It is altogether fitting that the last word be left to Saint Augustine:

“Observe two kinds of men: the one of those who labor, the other of those among whom they labor; the one of men who thinking of earth, the other of men thinking of Heaven; the one of those whose hearts are set on the depths, the other who join their hearts to the angels; the one trusting in Earthly things with which this world abounds, the other confiding in

---

6 Is. 2:4.

7 Eph. 2:14.

8 Heb. 12:22.

9 Heb. 12:28.

10 Lk. 1:33.

heavenly things, which God, who doth not lie, hath promised. But these kinds of men are mingled. We see now as it is in a Jerusalem, a citizen of the Kingdom of Heaven, holding some office upon earth; as for example, wearing the purple, serving as magistrate, as aedile, as proconsul, as Emperor, directing the earthly republic, but he hath his heart above if he is a Christian, if he is of the faithful, if he despiseth those things wherein he is not yet....Let us not therefore despair of the citizens of the Kingdom of heaven when we see them engaged in the affairs of Babylon, doing something terrestrial in a terrestrial republic; nor again let us forthwith congratulate all men whom we see engaged in celestial matters, for even the sons of the pestilence sit sometimes in the seat of Moses....The former amid earthly things lift up their hearts to heaven; the latter amid heavenly words trail their hearts on the earth. But there will come a time of winnowing when they will be separated, the one from the other, with the greatest care....So long then as it is mingled, let us listen thence to our voice, that is, the voice of the citizens of the Kingdom of heaven....,and let us join ourselves to this voice, both with ear and with tongue, with heart and with work. And if we have done this, we [witness in Babylon to the things we hear in Jerusalem.]”<sup>11</sup>

---

11      Przywara, *op. cit.*, p. 270.