

Assessing Pacem in Terris 50 Years On: A Personal Odyssey

David Cortright, "Assessing Pacem in Terris 50 Years On: A Personal Odyssey." *Journal of Catholic Social Thought*. Volume 11, Issue 1, Winter 2014. Manuscript version

Studying *Pacem in Terris* has been a lifetime journey for me, a deeply personal encounter with a document that is arguably one of the most important statements on peace ever issued by the Catholic Church. Pope John XXIII's encyclical has deepened my faith and given me a new understanding of what it means to be a Christian and an advocate of peace. *Pacem in Terris* was written during the most terrifying time of the Cold War, in the shadow of the Cuban missile crisis when the fate of the earth hung in the balance, but it offered a powerful message of hope and spiritual fulfillment for the future. Pope John's message remains highly relevant to the problems of war and peace that challenge our world today. In this essay I tell the story of my encounters with the historic document, examine its meaning and essential insights, and explore its implications for the future of disarmament and peace. I trace its lineage to another historic Church document, the 1983 U.S. Catholic Conference of Bishops pastoral letter, *The Challenge of Peace*, and reflect upon the mandate for peacemaking that lies at the core of both.

A journey of activism and faith

I first read and studied *Pacem in Terris* in 1983 when I was asked by a priest at the University of Scranton near my hometown to make a presentation on the 20th anniversary of the encyclical. This was a time of widespread public activism for nuclear disarmament, with the Nuclear Weapons Freeze Campaign at its height, and the U.S. Catholic Bishops preparing their influential pastoral letter on peace.¹ I was at the center of the action, serving as the Executive Director of SANE, the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, and participating in numerous organizing campaigns and projects for nuclear disarmament and peace. It was an extraordinary moment in history and an appropriate and long overdue time in my life for revisiting Pope John's historic message of peace.

When *Pacem in Terris* was issued in 1963 I was a high school student headed the next year to Notre Dame. I heard of the encyclical in the context of the sweeping changes in Church life flowing from Vatican II, but the broader issues of war and peace had not yet entered my consciousness. That was to come four years later when the Vietnam War intruded into my life and turned my world upside down. During my undergraduate courses I grew increasingly skeptical of the simplistic religious teaching that had been drummed into my head in parochial school. I drifted toward agnosticism, dropped out of science and

engineering, and embarked on a restless search for truth through music and philosophy, eventually majoring in history. When I graduated in 1968 I had no sense of direction and no plans for the future. Uncle Sam promptly took care of that. Within days of returning home I received a military conscription notice and soon was in the army, drafted for the Vietnam War.

Serving in an unjust and unpopular war turned me into a peace activist. As I learned about what was actually happening in Vietnam, much of it from returning veterans, I began to speak out against the war as an active duty soldier stationed in the U.S. I became part of the GI peace movement, perhaps the least known but in some ways most influential part of the Vietnam antiwar movement—a story I tell in my book *Soldiers in Revolt* and other writings.² I joined with other soldiers in circulating petitions against the war (one of which appeared in the *New York Times*), publishing GI underground newspapers, organizing and attending antiwar rallies, and filing a law suit against the army for its attempts to suppress our First Amendment rights. It was a frightening experience at times as we faced punishments and harassment from commanders, but it was also exhilarating as we received broad support from many lower ranking GIs and veterans. That experience of fighting against the war from inside the army transformed my life and gave me a sense of purpose. It set me on a path from which I have not veered in all the years since. Finding a passion for peace, however, did not solve my quest for spiritual meaning. Nor did it bring me back to my faith. That came through my encounter with the Black Church, and the study of *Pacem in Terris*.

As the director of SANE I worked in a number of justice and peace coalitions, including several efforts organized by Rev. Jesse Jackson and Operation PUSH. Along the way I attended African American church meetings and worship services and was introduced to a rich tradition of Christian worship I had never known before. When Rev. Jackson invited me to a church meeting I expected a small organizing session in the basement. Instead I experienced a joyous, foot-stomping worship service in a crowded sanctuary. I was moved by the song-filled liturgy and inspired by the Social Gospel preaching of Rev. Jackson and others. They quoted Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. in recalling Jesus's mission to bring good news to the poor, to serve the least of these, to lift up the oppressed and downtrodden. They emphasized the Gospel command to love all, even our enemies, and to overcome evil with good. They called us to take action based on our faith. Those worship experiences brought home to me the Christian message of justice and nonviolence—the very principles to which I had dedicated my life in working for peace and disarmament. My agnosticism began to melt away as I came to see Christianity as the basis for deepening and sustaining my commitment to peacemaking. I was coming back home.

This was reinforced by my study of *Pacem in Terris* in preparation for the 20th anniversary presentation in 1983. As I read and re-read Pope John's opus I recognized the same linkage between justice and peace that Dr. King taught, the same commitment to nonviolence and peace. King emphasized the necessity of "nonviolent resistance to evil."³ Justice "never rolls in on the wheels of inevitability," he often preached, but comes through the "tireless efforts" of women and men "willing to be co-workers with God."⁴ That was the faith that guided my activist commitment. I was pleasantly surprised to see these same values and beliefs reinforced in my own Roman Catholic tradition. As a child I had heard very little about this part of Catholic teaching in the sermons of my local parish priests, or in the parochial school lessons of the nuns. Nor did I learn much of the Social Gospel in the theology and philosophy classes I took at Notre Dame. As I discovered these peacemaking principles in Pope John's famous encyclical and in the Catholic bishops' pastoral letter, I gained a renewed, deeper appreciation of the Church and its peace witness.

Peace and human rights

Pacem in Terris is a groundbreaking document in several respects. It builds the case for peace on a firm foundation of human rights. In this sense the encyclical was ahead of its time and helped lay the foundation for the human rights revolution that began to unfold a decade later. It is perhaps no accident that human rights and civil society activism emerged with special vigor during the 1970s and 80s in Catholic Latin America and Poland.⁵ The encyclical and the documents of Vatican II expressed a new spirit of universality, intended not just for Catholics but for all people of good will, based on promoting love over fear as the basis for human salvation and progress. By grounding the theology of peace and international cooperation in "the personal dignity and liberty" of each person, *Pacem in Terris* elevated the promotion of human rights to a first order priority in the mission of the Catholic Church to the world.⁶

The encyclical begins with a detailed enumeration of the moral, religious, economic, civil and political rights and duties of all people. Pope John defines peace as an ordered society based on moral principles and rooted in rights, of which the most important is the right to life. Every person "has the right to life, to bodily integrity, and to the means which are suitable for the proper development of life," including the opportunity to work and earn a just wage (par. 11, 20). The right to life as defined in the document goes beyond the narrow focus on the unborn that is prevalent today. The right to life includes the right to "a worthy standard of living." It encompasses the right to economic and social security in cases of sickness, unemployment, widowhood, old age or other deprivations that occur through no fault of our own (par. 11).

The principle of human dignity means that all people have the right to choose freely the state of life they prefer, “with equal rights and duties for man and woman” (par. 15). This recognition of women’s equality is addressed elsewhere in the document as one of the “characteristics of the present day.” Here again Pope John was ahead of his time in acknowledging the equality of women as a just, theologically sound dimension of human rights. Women “are now taking part in public life,” the encyclical presciently observes, and they “demand rights befitting a human person both in domestic and in public life” (par. 41). *Pacem in Terris* also includes an unequivocal rejection of racism in all its forms. Based on the conviction “that all [humans] are equal by reason of their natural dignity,” the document asserts that “racial discrimination can in no way be justified” (par. 44). It is the duty of states to work for “the elimination of every trace of racism” (par. 86).

Pacem in Terris invokes the moral duty of reciprocity and mutual collaboration. The recognition of one’s own rights includes a duty to acknowledge and respect the rights of others. As Cardinal Peter Turkson, President of the Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace, observed at a recent conference on the 50th anniversary of the encyclical, “One person’s natural right gives rise to a corresponding duty in others of respecting that right. We are not only called to claim our human rights but we are also called to respect the human rights of others.”⁷ *Pacem in Terris* declares that each person should “contribute generously to the establishment of a civic order in which rights and duties are more sincerely and effectively acknowledged and fulfilled” (par. 31). The paramount task of government officials “is that of recognizing, respecting, reconciling, protecting and promoting the rights and duties of citizens” (par. 77).

The common good

Drawing from the encyclicals of his predecessors Leo XIII, Pius XI and Pius XII, Pope John emphasizes the obligation of governments to serve the common good (par. 56). Civil authority should not serve the interests of any one individual or small group but rather promote the material and spiritual welfare of citizens. One of the remarkable features of the document is its emphasis on the importance of providing social services that enable people to live a dignified life. All people and governing authorities have duties to ensure that the means of sustenance are available to everyone. Acknowledging the harmful effects of widespread “inequalities between the citizens,” the encyclical calls on governments to give “wholehearted and careful attention” to social as well as economic progress. Governments must therefore develop “essential services,” including “public health,” and see to it “that insurance systems are made available” so that “no person will be without the necessary means to maintain a decent standard of living” (par. 63–64). The document urges those with power and wealth to “lend mutual assistance” to others.

Countries with the greatest superiority have an “obligation to make a greater contribution to the general development of the people” (par. 86–88).

These moral prescriptions for social solidarity and mutual assistance seem remarkable in light of today’s very different political and cultural milieu. Concerns for the disadvantaged and the needy have been lost in the recent austerity policies of Europe and the sequester-induced reductions in public spending in the United States. The encyclical’s emphasis on the state’s public welfare obligation remains relevant, however. Catholic social teaching continues to emphasize the need to serve the least of these even in the midst of lean economic times. These principles have motivated important efforts by the U.S.

Conference of Catholic Bishops and other Church bodies to attempt to prevent cuts in programs that serve the poor and to remind public officials of their moral duty to address the needs of society.

Pacem in Terris also addresses the “universal common good” and the need for greater efforts by nations to cooperate for economic development and peace. The encyclical calls for the establishment of a global “public authority with a wideness of powers” for tackling worldwide challenges. This idea of world government had considerable appeal in the early days of the Cold War, when the recent memory of World War II and the growing threat of atomic weapons seemed to call for drastic measures to protect human security. World federalism has little salience today, and we are left with a relatively powerless United Nations. Pope John acknowledges and praises the United Nations, especially the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and expresses the “ardent desire that the United Nations Organization ... may become ever more equal to the magnitude and nobility of its tasks” (par. 145).

The imperative of disarmament

The writing of *Pacem in Terris* was motivated by the Cuban missile crisis of October 1962. Pope John played an important role as a back channel in the discussions between President John F. Kennedy and Soviet leader Nikita Khrushchev. Both the Catholic U.S. President and the reform-minded but erratic Soviet leader respected Pope John, who had a reputation for fairness and could speak to both sides. He used his privileged position to urge both leaders to avert the looming catastrophe and seek a solution through dialogue. Few today remember how close the world came to annihilation during those terrifying days, which historian Arthur Schlesinger Jr. described as “the most dangerous moment in human history.”⁸ As Robert Kennedy recounts in his gripping account *Thirteen Days*, he and his brother awoke on the climactic “Black Saturday” morning of the crisis unsure if they and the nation they were sworn to protect would survive the day. Thankfully the two sides stepped back from the brink and made concessions that resolved the crisis.

For Pope John and the world, the missile crisis was a transformative moment. The experience of staring into the abyss had a sobering effect on U.S. and Soviet leaders. It led to the beginnings of arms control with the signing of the Partial Test Ban Treaty the following year and the opening of a hotline between Washington and Moscow. Most importantly it helped to instill greater realism about the perils of nuclear brinksmanship and the need for nuclear restraint. It would take 25 more years before significant arms reduction would begin, but the seeds of the Cold War's undoing were planted during that October of fear and the moral reflections that followed.

Pacem in Terris is unstinting in its condemnation of the arms race and its call for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons. There is no hope of putting an end to the building up of armaments, Pope John writes, unless the process is complete and thorough.

Justice, then, right reason and consideration for human dignity and life 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 finally that all come to an agreement on a fitting program of disarmament (par. 112).

The Church's pastoral constitution, *Gaudium et Spes*, adopted two years later at the conclusion of Vatican II, reiterates Pope John's call for international disarmament. It declares that any use of indiscriminate weapons to destroy entire cities "is a crime against God and man himself. It merits unequivocal and unhesitating condemnation."⁹

Pope John's commitment to disarmament is based in part on the economic costs of the arms race. He notes with "deep sorrow" that the production of "enormous stocks of armaments" requires "a vast outlay of intellectual and economic resources." The result is that other countries are "deprived of the collaboration they need in order to make economic and social progress" (par. 109). This emphasis on the economic costs of the arms race fits with the human rights and social justice context of the encyclical. It is rooted in longstanding Church teaching that vast expenditures for weaponry are a gross distortion of priorities and a "theft from the poor."¹⁰ Just as peace is based on the principles of human dignity and the right of every person to a decent standard of living, so the imperative for disarmament is rooted in the right to life and the requirement of governments to prioritize economic and social well-being. The arms race threatens life not only in the destructive potential of nuclear conflagration but in the more subtle, slow motion effects of economic depletion. This teaching was reiterated in *Gaudium et Spes*, which described the arms race as "an utterly treacherous trap for humanity, and one which ensnares the poor to an intolerable degree."¹¹ Disarmament is necessary not only to protect the right to

life but to enable a redirection of resources to serve the needs of the poor, and increasingly today we would say the environment, all of God's creation.

The U.S. Catholic bishops speak

Although *Pacem in Terris* grew out of a global near-miss with atomic annihilation, the document devoted only a few paragraphs to the specific challenge of nuclear disarmament. Over the following decades, the Church's commitment to disarmament remained steadfast, but it was not until 20 years later that the U.S. Catholic Conference of Bishops addressed questions of disarmament peace in detail. Their pastoral letter, *The Challenge of Peace*, was released in 1983 during a time of elevated nuclear anxiety, when Soviet and U.S. intermediate range nuclear weapons were being deployed in Europe and Cold War tensions were rising. The fear of nuclear war was palpable at the time. Opinion surveys in the early 1980s showed widespread public belief that nuclear war was a real possibility.¹² Membership at SANE was growing rapidly, and the nuclear freeze movement was spreading across the United States like a populist prairie fire. On June 12, 1982, an estimated one million people gathered in New York's Central Park for a rally to freeze and reverse the arms race, an event I helped to organize. Concerns about the arms race were growing in the Church community and among some of the U.S. Catholic bishops. Many were impressed by the annual peace message issued by Pope John Paul II in 1982, which stated:

Peace can be firmly constructed only if it corresponds to the resolute determination of all people of goodwill. Rulers must be supported and enlightened by a public opinion that encourages them or, where necessary, expresses disapproval.¹³

The U.S. bishops were motivated by that message and read it as an appeal to form public opinion.

The *Challenge of Peace* had a significant impact on the nuclear debate in the United States.¹⁴ The Catholic journal *Commonweal* called the letter a "watershed event" not only for the Catholic community but for society as a whole.¹⁵ George Kennan wrote in the *New York Times* that the bishops' letter was "the most profound and searching inquiry yet conducted by any responsible collective body into the relations of nuclear weaponry, and indeed of modern war in general."¹⁶ By articulating and reiterating the Church's well-established opposition to the arms race and to the use of nuclear weapons, the bishops were expressing opinions largely at odds with the hawkish nuclear-buildup policies of the Reagan Administration. Their letter gave legitimacy and moral support to the discussions of disarmament that were percolating at the time. The letter cast a "mantle of respectability" over the emerging nuclear freeze movement and gave credibility and

momentum to the disarmament cause.¹⁷ For those of us who were actively campaigning for disarmament at the time, the bishops' letter seemed like proverbial manna from heaven.

The pastoral letter reiterated *Pacem in Terris* in condemning the arms race and calling for negotiations to ban nuclear weapons, but it focused most extensively on the pressing nuclear policy issues of the day. The pastoral letter expressed support for "immediate, bilateral verifiable agreements to halt the testing, production and deployment of new nuclear weapons systems."¹⁸ Although the bishops cautioned that this recommendation was not to be identified with any specific political initiative, this was an implicit endorsement of the proposal for a bilateral nuclear weapons freeze. The bishops used the exact words that were at the heart of Randall Forsberg's original formulation of the freeze and were included in the freeze resolution adopted by the House of Representatives in May 1983, the same month *The Challenge of Peace* was released. The pastoral letter also endorsed efforts to achieve deep cuts in the arsenals of both superpowers, negotiations for a comprehensive test ban treaty, and new efforts to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons in the world.

The most important but also most ambiguous part of the letter addressed the principles of nuclear deterrence. The bishops rejected the initiation of nuclear warfare under any circumstances and judged the use of nuclear weapons to counter a conventional attack "morally unjustifiable."¹⁹ The bishops did not dismiss deterrence (the strategy of threatening and being prepared to use nuclear weapons against potential nuclear attack), but they placed conditions on their acceptance of the strategy. They judged deterrence morally justifiable not on its own merits but as a step toward progressive disarmament. They placed conditions on their acceptance. No use of nuclear weapons that violates the principles of discrimination and proportionality could be intended for deterrence strategy. "Deterrence is not an adequate strategy as a long-term basis for peace," they stated; "it is a transitional strategy justifiable only in conjunction with resolute determination to pursue arms control and disarmament."²⁰

Toward a non-nuclear ethic

The *Challenge of Peace* articulated what Gerard Powers describes as an "interim nuclear ethic" based on the principles of "sole use," that nuclear weapons exist only to deter other nuclear weapons and should never be used for war fighting; "sufficiency," that the level of weapons should be limited to what is necessary for deterrence; and "disarmament," that deterrence must be a step toward progressive disarmament.²¹ This "strictly conditioned moral acceptance of deterrence" represented a significant dissent from the nuclear expansionism of U.S. and Soviet policy at the time, and was an important contribution

toward generating a public constituency for arms reduction. Widespread public concerns about the nuclear danger created a political climate conducive to arms control and helped to pave the way for the significant arms reductions of the late 1980s that brought an end to the Cold War. Notwithstanding this historic achievement, the bishops' conditional acceptance of deterrence was for some disarmament advocates a disappointment. It seemed less forthright and decisive than the call for banning all nuclear weapons and negotiating nuclear disarmament that was articulated in *Pacem in Terris*.

The tension between Pope John's call for complete disarmament and the bishops' interim acceptance of deterrence has become more pronounced in recent decades as the nuclear danger has become more diffuse and the major powers have refused to disarm. On the one hand, the world is safer because of the large reductions in strategic nuclear weapons and the end of the Cold War and Soviet bloc system in Eastern Europe. On the other hand, nuclear dangers have increased because of the proliferation of nuclear weaponry to other countries and potentially to terrorists. Relations between the United States and Russia have chilled in recent years, and the two countries continue to cling to their still formidable nuclear arsenals. Neither shows any serious intention of negotiating for genuine disarmament, notwithstanding solemn declarations at the UN "to create the conditions for a world without nuclear weapons."²² Moscow and Washington are proceeding with programs to upgrade and modernize nuclear capabilities.

As Powers notes, if the interim condition for the acceptance of deterrence is the 'resolute determination' to achieve progressive disarmament, that condition does not exist in today's world. He cites remarks in March 2010 by Archbishop Celestino Migliore, the Holy See's observer at the United Nations, decrying the continued reliance on nuclear deterrence in the military doctrines of the major powers. "It is evident," the archbishop concludes, "that nuclear deterrence is preventing genuine nuclear disarmament. Consequently, *the conditions* that prevailed during the cold war, which gave a basis for the church's limited toleration of nuclear deterrence, *no longer apply*."²³ [italics in original]

The subsequent Holy See UN Observer, Archbishop Francis Chullikatt, offered the same critique in a speech to the Catholic Center of the Archdiocese of Kansas City in July 2011. Chullikatt notes that current efforts by the nuclear powers to maintain and improve their nuclear infrastructures cast doubt on the declared intentions to negotiate for disarmament. "It cannot be considered morally sufficient to draw down the stocks of superfluous nuclear weapons while modernizing nuclear arsenals and investing vast sums to ensure their future production and maintenance," Chullikatt asserts. The "unlawfulness of the threat and use of nuclear weapons calls into serious question the lawfulness of the possession of nuclear weapons." He calls upon states to abide by their obligation in Article

VI of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty to "pursue negotiations on... a treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control." He urges a commitment to "implementing a well-founded comprehensive approach to eliminating nuclear weapons."²⁴ Chullikatt ends his speech with a call for people to work together to build a world free of nuclear weapons.

The duty of public action

Many of us have tried to respond to that call for action and continue to advocate for deeper nuclear reductions and negotiations for disarmament. We recognize the political obstacles, however, and are acutely aware of the current lack of public attention to these issues. Unlike the halcyon days of the 1980s, when disarmament activism was widespread and the nuclear freeze movement had broad public support, few people today even think of the nuclear threat. Groups such as Global Zero continue to keep the flame alive, but the glow is not very bright.

Working for disarmament and peace is often a lonely and difficult challenge. I have spent all of my adult life striving for the prevention of war and the elimination of nuclear weapons, yet the goal of a world without nuclear weapons seems as distant as ever. Some progress has been achieved toward nuclear reduction, and our social movements at times have constrained nuclear buildups and war making, but the successes have been few and are often difficult to recognize. Peacemaking reminds me of the toils of the mythic Sisyphus. We push our boulder up the mountain, only to have it roll back down again, and yet we press on with the seemingly impossible task.

What can sustain us in the struggle for peace? As I reflect upon my own motivations for sustaining this work over more than four decades, I recognize the increasingly important role of divine inspiration. Political ideologies or rational policy calculations are not sufficient to prompt the giving of time and energy to what often seems like a forlorn cause. The will to struggle for justice and peace requires something much deeper. It comes from what Reinhold Niebuhr called the "sublime madness" of religion, the commitment to a higher calling, to a force much greater than ourselves, a willingness to suspend doubt and hold fast to Jesus' teachings of love and nonviolence.

Abraham Joshua Heschel wrote of a theology of action in which we express our faith by answering the call to love and serve others. Heschel practiced what he preached and famously marched with Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. in the 1965 pilgrimage from Selma to Montgomery. Heschel wrote of that experience, "I felt as though my legs were praying." I have occasionally experienced that same sense of awe and spiritual wonder in the commitment to social action, especially during the rally to end the arms race in New York's

Central Park in 1982. These moments and the deeper commitment to love sustain me in the face of doubt and uncertainty. We know our efforts may not succeed in the near term or even in our lifetimes, but I believe, as Dr. King said, that “the arc of the moral universe is long and it bends toward justice.”

Working for justice and peace is how we live our faith. It gives purpose and meaning to our lives. The bishops’ pastoral letter concludes with a call to action:

Peacemaking is not an optional commitment. It is a requirement of our faith. We are called to be peacemakers, not by some movement of the moment, but by our Lord Jesus. The content and context of our peacemaking is set, not by some political agenda or ideological program, but by the teaching of his Church.²⁵

I have drawn strength and sustenance from the teachings of Jesus and from the recognition that working for peace is a central part of our faith tradition. Most of all I have been inspired by the clarion call of *Pacem in Terris* to strive for disarmament and a less-violent future based on human rights and dignity. Pope John exhorts us to help bring about “true peace in the order established by God.” He describes peacemaking as “an imperative of duty; it is a requirement of love.” We are called to be “magnanimous” in serving as a “spark of light,” a “vivifying leaven,” to help bring about the beloved community of peace based on the love of God (par. 163, 164, 167). May all of us in the Catholic tradition rededicate ourselves to that vision and constantly strive to invoke and fulfill the mission of disarmament and peace.

¹ For accounts of the freeze movement and disarmament activism at the time see Lawrence S. Wittner, *The Struggle Against the Bomb III: Toward Nuclear Abolition, A History of the World Nuclear Disarmament Movement, 1971 to the Present* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2003); David Cortright, *Peace Works: The Citizen’s Role in Ending the Cold War* (Boulder, CO.: Westview Press, 1993); Jim Castelli, *The Bishops and the Bomb: Waging War in the Nuclear Age* (New York: Doubleday, 1983); and Pam Solo, *From Protest to Policy: Beyond the Freeze to Common Security* (Cambridge, MA.: Ballinger, 1988).

² David Cortright, *Soldiers in Revolt: GI Resistance During the Vietnam War*, 2nd edition, (Chicago: Haymarket Books, 2005).

³ Martin Luther King, Jr., *Stride Toward Freedom: The Montgomery Story* (New York: Harper & Row, 1958), 98.

⁴ Martin Luther King, Jr., "Letter from a Birmingham Jail," in *A Testament of Hope: The Essential Writings and Speeches of Martin Luther King, Jr.*, ed. James M. Washington (San Francisco: Harper-San Francisco, 1991), 296.

⁵ For a discussion of the rise of civil society and human rights see Mary Kaldor, *Human Security: Reflections on Globalization and Intervention* (Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 2007), 142.

⁶ Drew Christiansen, "A Vision of Peace: How the prophetic 'Pacem in Terris' helped change the world," *America* April 8-15, 2013.

⁷ Cardinal Peter Turkson, "Remarks at the Conference Enhancing the Study and Practice of Catholic Peacebuilding: *Pacem in Terris* at 50," Catholic University of America, 9-10 April, 2013.

⁸ Michael Dobbs, "The Cuban Missile Crisis (1962)," *The New York Times*, October 23, 2012, http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/c/cuban_missile_crisis/index.html, accessed July 1, 2013.

⁹ The Vatican, *Pastoral Constitution of the Church in the Modern World, Gaudium et Spes*, Promulgated by his Holiness Pope Paul VI, on December 7, 1965, par. 80., http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_cons_19651207_gaudium-et-spes_en.html

¹⁰ Archbishop Francis Chullikatt, "The Church's Teachings and the Current State of Affairs," Archbishop Chullikatt's Address on the Nuclear Question, *ZENET*, the World Seen From Rome, July 23, 2011, <http://www.zenit.org/en/articles/archbishop-chullikatt-s-address-on-the-nuclear-question>

¹¹ The Vatican, *Pastoral Constitution of the Church in the Modern World, Gaudium et Spes*, Promulgated by his Holiness Pope Paul VI, on December 7, 1965, par. 81., http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_cons_19651207_gaudium-et-spes_en.html

¹² See the report of a Gallup survey in "Poll Finds 7 out of 10 Imagining Outbreak of Soviet Nuclear War," *The Washington Post*, September 28, 1981, 17

¹³ The Vatican, *Message of His Holiness Pope John Paul II for the Celebration of the Day of Peace*, 1 January 1982, par. 6, http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/messages/peace/documents/hf_jp-ii_mes_19811208_xv-world-day-for-peace_en.html

¹⁴ For discussion of the letter and its impact see David Cortright, *Peace Works: The Citizen's Role in Ending the Cold War* (Boulder, CO.: Westview Press, 1993), Chapter 4, 40-56.

¹⁵ *Commonweal* 110 (May 20, 1983), 291-92.

¹⁶ George F. Kennan, "The Bishops' Letter," *New York Times*, May 1, 1983, sec. 4, 21.

¹⁷ The phrase comes from an interview, David Cortright with Rev. William Sloane Coffin, December 3, 1990.

¹⁸ The U.S. Catholic Conference of Bishops, *The Challenge of Peace: God's Promise and Our Response*, A Pastoral Letter on War and Peace by the Catholic Conference of Bishops, May 1983, par. 191, <http://old.usccb.org/sdwp/international/TheChallengeofPeace.pdf>

¹⁹ The U.S. Catholic Conference of Bishops, *The Challenge of Peace: God's Promise and Our Response*, A Pastoral Letter on War and Peace by the Catholic Conference of Bishops, May 1983, par. 150, <http://old.usccb.org/sdwp/international/TheChallengeofPeace.pdf>

²⁰ The U.S. Catholic Conference of Bishops, *The Challenge of Peace: God's Promise and Our Response*, A Pastoral Letter on War and Peace by the Catholic Conference of Bishops, May 1983, Summary, I, B, 3, <http://old.usccb.org/sdwp/international/TheChallengeofPeace.pdf>

²¹ Gerard Powers, "The Nuclear Ethics Gap: Finding Our Way on the Road to Disarmament," *America*, May 20, 2010.

²² United Nations Security Council, *Security Council Resolution 1887* (2009), SC/9747, 24 September 2009.

²³ Gerard Powers, "The Nuclear Ethics Gap: Finding Our Way on the Road to Disarmament," *America*, May 20, 2010.

²⁴ Archbishop Francis Chullikatt, "The Church's Teachings and the Current State of Affairs," Archbishop Chullikatt's Address on the Nuclear Question, *ZENET*, the World Seen From Rome, July 23, 2011, <http://www.zenit.org/en/articles/archbishop-chullikatt-s-address-on-the-nuclear-question>

²⁵ The U.S. Catholic Conference of Bishops, *The Challenge of Peace: God's Promise and Our Response*, A Pastoral Letter on War and Peace by the Catholic Conference of Bishops, May 1983, par. 333, <http://old.usccb.org/sdwp/international/TheChallengeofPeace.pdf>