



We the people of the  
UNITED NATIONS  
determined to save  
succeeding generations  
from the scourge of war  
. . . to reaffirm faith in  
fundamental human rights  
have resolved to combine  
our efforts to accomplish  
these aims.

PEACE on EARTH  
which all men  
of every era  
have most eagerly  
yearned for, can be  
firmly established  
only if the order  
laid down by God  
be fully observed.



# **A Special Report**

**on**

## **The International Convocation**

# PACEM PEACE IN ON TERRIS EARTH

*J. R. Cooney, O. P. and J. A. Doshner, O. P.*

Whatever else the Spring of 1963 has to do with the Winter of 1965 remains in the realm of the unknown until someone decides to search for connections and relationships, but on April 11, 1963, Holy Thursday of that year, the word went out from Rome to the clergy and faithful of the whole world and to all men of good will that,

Peace on Earth, which men of every era have so eagerly yearned for, can be firmly established only if the order laid down by God be dutifully observed.

On February 17, 1965, the year designated as International Co-operation Year, the Secretary-General of the United Nations,

U Thant, welcomed a host of men of good will to the formal opening of the Convocation on the letter, *Peace on Earth* sent out almost two years before by Pope John XXIII. Among those actively present were representatives from the nations of the world: statesmen, philosophers, newspeople, theologians. The Convocation was conceived by the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions; it was sponsored by large foundations and smaller donors; it received its inspirational impetus from the chairman of the Center, Robert M. Hutchins. His response to Pope John's message (whose prophetic and pastoral tone demanded more than a reaction) was to set in motion forces which would shape this convocation. Speaking for the gathering, Hutchins stated that, "it must be, in the first instance, deliberately secular. Its primary concern is not with faith and morals, but with those passages of *Pacem in Terris* which deal with the minimum conditions for human survival."

All nations were not represented in the convocation; the active participants came, for the most part, from Europe and the United States. In the Convocation's view, its stimulating purpose was not intended to be one of settling shaky situations or of drawing up a peace plan. "Rather we have sought to focus the program on four areas raising practical and urgent issues that must be confronted before there can be serious talk of larger designs for perfecting and maintaining a lasting peace."

What is strikingly important in this gathering might be, in the first analysis, the public examination of the four areas covering the requirements for peace: the nature of the problem, the European settlement, the institutional structures, and the non-nuclear powers. However, in the second analysis, the persons who made up this gathering might be regarded as the key consideration; certainly, men like Hubert Humphrey, Paul Tillich, Paul-Henri Spaak, Luis Quintanilla, Muhammad Zafrulla Khan, among others of equal dignity, constitute an impressive roster of influential men. Further, among the invited guests were leading men and women in politics, religion, education, journalism and business, who not only attended to the matters at hand but also discussed the issues involved among themselves and carried the word back to their indigenous situations.

Yet in the ultimate unfolding of the subtle values inherent in this convocation, there stir certain intangible forces, certain un-measurable impressions which prevail over the rather manifest plaudits and overt sense of the importance of the peace problem. What makes itself felt in an almost unanalyzable way is the impact of diverse ideologies, in open discussion, upon the participants, whose real commitment to peace making would have to be perceived long after the discussion was over. Even more than the impact of mind upon mind it is the high value of unification, which, in all its latent power brought theistic and atheistic, political and academic, oriental and occidental traditions face to face in existential openness, that passes under review as the most significantly hopeful reality present here. Because this value is elusive and not subject to scientific inquiry, it remains clothed in problematic mystery, awaiting more definitive recognition and appreciation.

More to the point, then, in recording the pulse-rate of this Convocation of several thousand people is the fact that the final testament and loving invitation of John XXIII was accepted. As Vice President, Hubert Humphrey said, "This encyclical represents not a utopian blueprint for world peace, presupposing a sudden change in the nature of man. Rather, it represents a call to action to leaders of nations, presupposing only a gradual change in human institutions. It is not confined to elaborating the abstract values of peace but looks to the building of a world community governed by institutions capable of preserving peace."

Involved in the nature of the problem is the blatant question of nuclear war. John had written,

Justice, . . . right reason and humanity urgently demand that the arms race should cease; that the stockpiles which exist in various countries should be reduced equally and simultaneously by the parties concerned; that nuclear weapons should be banned; and that a general agreement should eventually be reached about progressive disarmament and an effective method of control.

Arnold Toynbee viewed the issue in its universality and said it ". . . can be dealt with only by world authorities with effective power to override the national governments. . . ." He felt it was to the mutual interest of nations ". . . to subordinate their national

sovereignty to world-authorities. This is the only condition on which the nations can survive in the Atomic Age."

To Paul Tillich the atomic threat provides the first basis of genuine hope for peace. The second basis, in his words, is, "... the technical union of mankind by the conquest of space." He sees the cultural, scientific, and religious exchanges as the third basis. The fourth basis is estimated to be a legal structure which can guarantee peace "... among those who are subject to it." Yet, underlying each basis is "communal eros, that kind of love which is not directed to an individual but to a group. . . . It seems that no world community is possible without this eros which trespasses interest as well as law."

If theologian Paul Tillich could also doubt the universality of acceptance of the principles of *Peace on Earth*, then scientist Linus Pauling "[could] not accept the contention that we cannot measure the suffering of other human beings, that we do not know what is good and what is evil."

Nobel Prize winner Pauling, with reference to deficient social structures said it is "... our duty to work to achieve [the basic rights] for everyone." He made reference to John's words,

It is not enough . . . to acknowledge and respect every man's right to the means of subsistence: one must also strive to obtain that he actually has enough in the way of food and nourishment. The society of men must not only be organized but must also provide them with abundant resources.

While all the participants spoke of the need for the Rule of Law throughout the world, Philip Jessup, Judge of the International Court of Justice, finds the great obstacle rooted in the theory and practice of national sovereignty. An inverse proportion is observable here; the more national sovereignty is surrendered, the more the Rule of Law will be able to ameliorate world conflicts.

The means suggested towards establishing the Rule of Law fall within three general areas:

1. *There must be a development of the sense of justice among all peoples.* The consensus held by the people will always influence

and modify national policy. "For in the last resort," observes Mohammad Zafrulla Khan, "peace must be built into the hearts of men."

2. *Self imposed legal limitations on the use and type of arms is a very direct way of limiting national sovereignty.* For example, Germany has renounced, by treaty, the production of atomic weapons. Kenzo Takayanagi, Chairman of the Constitutional Revision Commission of Japan, suggests that all nations adopt a provision similar to Article 9 of the Japanese Constitution, which abolishes



war as a sovereign right of the nation. Robert Hutchins favors an effort to have the United States adopt such a constitutional abolition. The total implication of the policy is not pacifism because Japan today *does* maintain a defense force.

3. *The avenue to peace most discussed was an effective world government.* In its present form the United Nations is not equipped to accomplish its purpose: the maintenance of peace. Luis Quintanilla, Former President of O.A.S. saw a need to:

- a. expand the Security Council from its present eleven members to at least twenty five members;
- b. establish a second House of Legislation at the U.N. of which representative membership would be apportioned by population;
- c. make the decrees of the International Court of Justice compulsory;

- d. create a monopoly of force in the United Nations, which would include nuclear weapons;
- e. make membership universal regardless of the economic system or political ideology of any world state.

Pietry Nenni, Deputy Prime Minister of Italy, supported those who advocate a partial integration of national sovereignties within a "European Parliamentary Assembly, elected by universal suffrage . . . in association with England and Scandinavia." The Europeans at the Convocation were preoccupied with their immediate problems. We can only doubt whether their insistence on the unification of Western Europe is not, in effect, promoting the *bloc* mentality at the expense of a world outlook. For it seems that Nenni and Carlo Schmid, Vice-President of the Bundestag of the Federal Republic of Germany, see the unification of Western Europe as the foremost task, whereas, George Kennon, Former U.S. Ambassador to Russia, sees the unification of *both* Eastern and Western Europe together as the ultimate solution of the European Problem.

Some said the overwhelming threat of "Doomsday" technology is the only goad that might urge antagonistic nations and power blocs to submit their sovereignty to a world organization. There are hopeful signs of change. As William Fulbright, Senator from Arkansas, said, "Both sides are showing tendencies to cut their ideologies down to size . . . both sides are showing at least intermittent awareness that their ideologies are a great source of danger." This is because "the inability of men to develop sympathetic understanding of other men of different cultural and political heritage is surely one of the major obstacles to coexistence." George F. Kennon calls for a new act of faith in the ultimate humanity and sobriety of the people on the other side. "Our sole hope lies in the possibility that the adversary, too, has learned something from the sterility of past conflict; that he, too, sees the identity of fate that binds us all; that some reliance can be placed on the adjustment of mutual differences, on his readiness to abstain, voluntarily and in self-interest, from the wildest and most senseless acts of physical destruction."

The paralysis of the Security Council, as an effective instrument of world order, stemming from the use and threat of the veto power by any one of the five permanent members, is now paralysed by a motionless General Assembly, the result of the assessment controversy for peace keeping operations. Let us not forget that the weakness of the League of Nations gave the impetus to the birth of Nazi imperialism. The urgent need for an effective World government, eloquently recognized in *Pacem in Terris* as the road to peace, is generally admitted by most peoples. Political theorists and political engineers can and must establish this world structure, buttressed with the power to avoid wars and ensure the peace. That this is not an impossible task is the message of *Peace on Earth*.

There is an immense task incumbent on all men of good will, namely, the task of restoring the relations of the human family in truth, in justice, in love and in freedom; the relations between individual human beings; between citizens and their respective political communities; between political communities themselves; between individuals, families, intermediate associations and political communities on the one hand, and the world community on the other. This is a most exalted task, for it is the task of bringing about true peace in the order established by God.

What was said in New York City this February in the onrush of words, shaped as they were by speeches, discussions, and reports, cannot be allowed to remain embedded on the printed page. The word of peace must be spoken to others by all who have heard it so that this unique convocation on *Peace on Earth* can give rise to myriads of smaller gatherings all over the world in the hope that whatever inner dynamism for peace there remains throbbing in the lethargic unconsciousness of mankind can be summoned up by the power of communication. This passing along the word of peace, as desperately desired and needed as it is, is not merely our (the authors') plea; it is the sedulous yearning of the Convocation itself.

We wish success to the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions in their pursuit of the study and discussion of the ways of achieving a peaceful earth. We also give thanks that the johannine spirit continues to penetrate the darkness of our age with light and the coldness of our time with love.