

Portland State University

PDXScholar

Special Collections: Oregon Public Speakers

Special Collections and University Archives

7-13-1966

"The Church's Historic Position Toward War"

Gabriel Bernhard Fedde

Follow this and additional works at: <https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/orspeakers>



Part of the [History of Christianity Commons](#), and the [Peace and Conflict Studies Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Fedde, Gabriel Bernhard, ""The Church's Historic Position Toward War"" (1966). *Special Collections: Oregon Public Speakers*. 32.

<https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/orspeakers/32>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Special Collections: Oregon Public Speakers by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

Gabriel Bernhard Fedde
"The Church's Historic Position Toward War"
Portland State University
July 13, 1966

PSU Library Special Collections and University Archives
Oregon Public Speakers Collection
<http://archives.pdx.edu/ds/psu/11162>
Transcribed by Carlos Julian Santizo Salazar, March 5, 2021
Audited by Carolee Harrison, April 2021

PSU Library Special Collections and University Archives presents these recordings as part of the historical record. They reflect the recollections and opinions of the individual speakers and are not intended to be representative of the views of Portland State University. They may contain language, ideas, or stereotypes that are offensive to others.

HOST: [recording begins mid-sentence] ...I teach music here. Although it is almost purely accidental, and although he almost certainly had no choice in the matter, I have the opportunity to introduce Bernhard Fedde today, and this pleases me intensely. We are not well acquainted, although I managed to get on another program with him earlier this spring; that time, singing hillbilly songs with high school students to help them relax before a long morning of war talk and anti-war talk. He was badly outnumbered that day by hawks, academic and clerical, but he made a spirited and informed presentation.

Mr. Fedde, as most of you know already, holds degrees from Williams College, Oregon, and Oregon State. He is a lawyer and a historian with a particular interest in the Scandinavian countries. The research committee here, of which I was a member last fall and through the year, considered a grant from Mr. Fedde last year, in which he indicated extraordinary linguistic abilities. Within his household it appears a large proportion of the languages of the world are spoken or at least read. He has worked here and abroad with that most energetic and compassionate organization, the American Friends Service Committee. This last spring, I met a good many times with a Portland group called C.O. Services, and got the impression that Mr. Fedde would be the first man to seek out because of his understanding and knowledge, for a young man who finds himself in this position, *vis à vis* his government. His talk today, as

scheduled, is on the church's historic position with respect to war, bringing this topic forward to the present time, and the considerations of the individual Christian pacifist. Mr. Fedde.

[applause]

GABRIEL BERNHARD FEDDE: I have to smile at this comment about the draft. I happened to be talking to one of my very good friends, the state director of Selective Service, and he made the comment that he'd gotten a tremendous number of people who had used my name. Whether in vain or not I don't know, but he was quoting the advice I had given to them back at me. We had quite a bit of fun, anyhow. But this raises a question of the peace position and the pacifists' position: where did it come from?

The church today, and today, at this hour, we want to confine ourselves to the contemporary church and war. Still, the church today has its roots in history. It's the product of history, of an event that took place over two thousand years ago, or about two thousand years ago, in the fullness of time when God revealed himself to man in his son Jesus Christ. The church believes that Jesus was born into the world not to destroy the law, but to fulfill the law. Now, limiting ourselves solely to the question of war, he put new and added meaning into the old commandment, "Thou shalt not kill." Mind you, as he taught us to "love our enemies" and to "do good to them that despitefully used us" and to "go the second mile" and to "turn the other cheek," he said this against the backdrop of a cruel, harsh Roman Empire. An empire that was unutterably cruel to the Jews. Probably of all the provinces of Rome, the province of Judea, or of Palestine, was that which created the greatest difficulty for the Romans. And Josephus tells us that in the period of Roman occupation, over 160,000 Jews perished on crosses or in Roman galleys because they would not bend their neck to the Caesar of Rome.

And also, Jesus spoke these words against the backdrop of an incident that took place in his childhood at the village of Sepphoris, about a mile or two from Nazareth, where he was reared during his teenage and earlier years. King Herod had won the favor of the Romans because of his Hellenistic approach, trying to get rid of this doctrine of the Jews... Judaism, the faith of Judaism, and introduced instead the Hellenistic philosophy which was so popular in Rome. And he won the favor of the Romans when there was an uprising in Sepphoris and Herod slew *every single* male in that village. This was a village about a mile or two from Nazareth. Do you think that Jesus didn't know about that? When he was probably only... he was in his... perhaps seven, eight, nine, ten years old? But certainly he must have known of this. And yet he urged his gospel of love, even to include the hated Roman, even to going the second mile, to carrying the pack for the Roman, and if necessary, to give his coat. The Roman was every bit as terrible as any Communist menace today.

Now after his crucifixion and resurrection, his followers, without exception, took no part in war or in military service. Church historians tell us that any soldier who became a Christian gave up military service. Christians, to a man, were pacifist and sought through a ministry of love to win people to a way that took occasion... that took away the occasion for wars.

However, in the 4th century, the emperor Constantine claimed he saw a vision, and a cross, and this was a “symbol,” he said, whereby he could win battles. At least, he thought he could do better than the other generals and co-emperors who were fighting under the Mithraic and Manichaeic cults, which were so bloody and so popular with the soldiers and armies of their rivals. Well, Christians, many of them at least, thought that a compromise might enhance their cause and so they accepted state favor. So through the next few centuries, imperial armies of Rome, or of Byzantium, fought heathens under the banner of the cross. The church sweated under this compromise, and sought to curtail war and killing. Bit by bit, the papacy and the bishops limited the days upon which one could fight. In the first place, no good Christian could fight on Sunday. No good Christian could fight at Easter. Or at Christmas. Or during Lent. Or on Friday. And then, since there is no point in starting fighting again on Saturday, include Saturday. And, this is serious... I mean, this is what actually happened. And bit by bit, finally, in the 11th century, about 1064, I believe it was a German bishop who declared that even on saint’s days one could not fight. This then reduced the legitimate number of days that a knight could fight to approximately 153 days a year.

Well, perhaps the trend might have gone so far as to stigmatize all fighting at any time. Unfortunately, there came an appeal from Byzantium to free the holy places from Muslim rule. And the papacy then saw a chance, perhaps, to reunite the church. What should come first: to reunite the church, perhaps with force of arms, that is, with joining forces with Byzantium? Or, should the opportunity be turned down? And you remember the first crusade, “the children’s crusade,” “the first crusade,” and so on, beginning around the year 1096 and 1100, and the years that followed? Whereby once more, the cause of war and Christianity were united.

During these same centuries, it was a tough dilemma for the evangelists. For if the church was to move fast, and not just move disciple by disciple, the best way was to convert the kings. Now kings, then as well as now, were politicians. They were out to win kingdoms. And the evangelists, unfortunately, often won them by arguing that Christ was a better fighter than Thor. And so in this fashion Christianity came to Denmark in 826, to Sweden in 829—although that was a brief episode because it wasn’t until about 1130 that it came to stay; that was through the influence of St. Ansgar—and then to Norway, in 1030, through the efforts of St. Olaf, with hardly any mitigation in the ferocity of the Norsemen. They were still terrible fighters

after they had accepted Christianity. Yet, there are exceptions to the spread of Christianity, such as: St. Patrick to Ireland, St. Benedict to England, St. Boniface to Germany, many of whose followers were slain by the heathen barbarians rather than to resort to arms.

However, in the years that followed, Christianity became a tool of the state to win battles. And to this day, no army accepts a pacifist as a chaplain. It's small wonder that in the centuries that followed the Crusades, the church was downgraded as men during the Renaissance turned to themselves, to vanity, possessions, and in great measure abandoned Christianity until the Reformation and the counter-Reformation once more made faith a central issue. But even here, kings and religious leaders forgot that ends and means must be harmonious. For ends preexist in the means. And so, the wars of religion of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

Eventually, voices of dissent were heard. And this brings us up to the contemporary position of many churches. First were the Anabaptists, who at first, tried to set up a state of their own at Münster, but then were driven out. And eventually... and I mean just within a matter of a couple of years after this, in about 1529-1530, in through there, took the position that they should have no part in any state government. That is, any part of government. They should follow the policy of nonresistance to evil or nonresistance to war and simply accept or live the life of the Christian in day-to-day living, and abstain from taking part in secular affairs. Next were the Quakers, beginning around 1645, under the leadership of George Fox. And then the Church of the Brethren. I don't have a beginning date for the Church of the Brethren. However, these three groups: the Anabaptists—who now are called Mennonites, that is, the branch that followed the pacifist line are called the Mennonites—the Mennonites, Quakers, and Brethren, these three form the "Peace churches" of our American scene. There are others, I may add, smaller groups; but these are the major ones.

And during World War I as well as during World War II, a large, or heavy percentage, of the conscientious objectors in civilian public service belonged to these three groups. In the 1930s, a fourth group assumed a major role, and that was the Methodist Church. But this was not until about 1938.

Now the position that these churches start from, is that: If Jesus is "God of very God" as he claimed to be, and as the Athanasian and Nicene Creeds declare, then what Jesus tells us about mankind, about society, and the world, is revealing the true nature of man and his environment. Now, some would say that the Sermon on the Mount is sheer idealism; it's unreal and fanciful, too good to be true. But you will recall that at the end of the Sermon of the Mount, *on* the Mount, it states that, the multitudes who heard him "were astonished at his doctrine, for he taught them as one having authority." Was Jesus shouting his opposition

down? If so, how do you account for the fact that, 2000 years later, long after the shouting has ceased to echo in the Judean hills, he still speaks as one having authority.

No, I submit that it was the authority of the facts. Psychologists, lawyers, physicians, and theologians recognize the inherent truth that he revealed about man. He revealed the nature of God; a God of love and forgiveness who drew a circle to encompass the unlovely, a circle wider than any human being has been able to draw it. He revealed the nature of man; upholding meekness, mercy, purity of heart, the thirst for righteousness, and the pouring out of the self for the sake of the kingdom of God. If you say this is not true, then I would suggest this: let's follow the opposite course. Instead of showing mercy, let's show cruelty and see how far you get. Or, instead of showing purity of heart, let's go for everything that's impure and see how long anyone lasts. If you don't land in jail; if you manage to keep it secret for a while, you'll still find that it will gnaw away at your vitals, and a tremendous number of people bear in their own bodies, in their ulcers, and their tensions, and nervous breakdowns, much of the results of trying to live a life that is *not* in harmony with this Sermon on the Mount. Now I submit that he spoke with authority, based upon fact. And so instead of being an *imposed* realism, it was *exposed* - instead of being an *imposed* idealism, it was an *exposed* realism. It was reality itself speaking. Here was authority speaking: the indicative had become the imperative.

Well, this brings us then, if this is the teaching of Jesus, and if these churches, if the churches that I've mentioned: the Mennonites, Quakers and Brethren, have followed this teaching of Jesus on war—and we're confining ourselves primarily to war—what is the contemporary position of these churches? Now, I'll mention for instance the Mennonites...

[aside] ...Oh, well thank you. [continuing] I'll mention, first of all, the position of the Mennonites. They have... the Mennonites take the position, that of what is called "the Principle of love and non-resistance." This is a position that they've held for about three centuries, and they... I'll read that particular paragraph: "While we are deeply grateful to God for the precious heritage of faith including the principle of love and non-resistance which our Swiss, Dutch, and German Anabaptist Mennonite forefathers purchased for us by their faith and their obedience and sacrifice, and which we believe is again expressed in the above declarations and commitments; we are convinced that this faith must be repossessed personally by each one out of his own reading and obeying of God's word, and must ever be spelled out in life practice anew," and so on. Then they do state that if war does come, with its possible serious devastation from bombings or other forms of destruction such as atomic blasts, germ warfare, poison gas and so on: "We will willingly render every help which conscience permits, sacrificially, and without thought of personal safety, so long as we thereby help to preserve and restore life and not to destroy it. We cannot compromise with war in any form." The position is

quite long, covering several pages, but I mention this as the keynote of the Mennonite position being that of non-resistance.

And then, the Friends' position, as stated by George Fox in a declaration made in 1660: "We utterly deny all outward wars and strife, and fightings with outward weapons for any end, under any pretense whatever. This is our testimony to the whole world." By the way, sixteen... He was talking, you see, during the Cromwellian period, during which England had gone through a period of civil war and quite a bit of bloodshed. And so he continues: "The spirit of Christ, by which we are guided, is not changeable, so as once to command us from a thing as evil, and again to move us unto it; and we certainly know, and testify to the world, that the spirit of Christ, which leads us unto all truth, will never move us to fight and war against any man with outward weapons, neither for the kingdom of Christ, or for the kingdoms of this world. Therefore, we cannot learn war any more." And in 1948, it was stated, "We are opposed to war as a method of settling disputes because it is unchristian, destructive of our highest values, and sows the seeds of future war." In a very specific statement a little bit later on, again in 1948 from Indiana, Richmond, Indiana, one of the points that's mentioned is that "Friends are urged to avoid engaging in any trade, business, or profession directly contributing to the military system, and the purchase of government war bonds or stock certificates in war industries. They should also consider carefully the implication of paying those taxes, a major portion of which goes for military purposes." I saw a statement yesterday that some 350 Quakers, and others, have publicly refused to pay their taxes, at least that portion which goes for war purposes. I may add, as a tax lawyer, that it is collected: the federal government, the Internal Revenue Service, issues a distraint warrant which then is served upon your bank and the bank simply takes the money out of your account. But at least you have made your protest. The Quaker statement goes on to say that they are urged... they urge Quakers "to ask our Quaker schools and colleges to refuse to accept military training units or contracts or military subsidies for scientific research. And to advise young Friends," that is, Quakers, "not to accept military training in other institutions." And finally, my final point, "to press for world disarmament, beginning unilaterally with the United States, if necessary." This is quite *far out*, as you can see.

And then, the Church of the Brethren have stated their position going back to the conference in 1934, and I quote: "All war is sin. We, therefore, cannot encourage, engage in, or willingly profit from armed conflict at home or abroad. We cannot, in the event of war, accept military service or support the military machine in any capacity." And recently, in fact, just in the last few days, the... I believe it's the Federal Council of Churches, has come out with a proposal urging that people support the proposals, basically, the proposals of U Thant. First, that as far as the Vietnam war is concerned, "that there be a cessation of bombing of North Vietnam, right now."

Second, “that there be a de-escalation of military operations.” Third, “that discussions begin and be carried on, with all those fighting.” And this of course includes the Viet Cong.

Now, you might ask the question, “Does this work? Is this system... this is very nice, but does it actually work?” Let me give one illustration. In 1917, when the United States got its first draft, a number of boys, Mennonites, Brethrens, Quakers, refused to put on their uniforms. They were held up to ridicule as they were paraded up and down the streets in their underwear, the streets of the camp. People saw that these boys would not bend to the military, and a committee called upon President Wilson asking that these boys be paroled to this committee for some kind of useful and constructive work. After quite a bit of dickering, President Wilson finally agreed. And this marked the beginning of the American... well, perhaps not the *first* instance, but at least the first instance of a major relief operation, overseas. These boys were trained, together with many girls also, in elementary construction and relief programs. Many of them learned, quickly, to become carpenters, and they were shipped overseas. But even before the war had ended, they helped to build and work for civilians only. Not for the military but only for the civilians. Whom the military, by the way, would not touch. And so, they rebuilt hospitals, they rebuilt homes, they fed... where they could, fed the civilians. And sometimes they found themselves behind the German lines, sometimes behind the French—most of the time behind the French lines—the French and American lines. When the war was over, they went on into Germany, where a famine was overtaking the land due to the continuation of the blockade. They fed there, and then famine broke out in Russia. And these young men continued on into Russia. And they fed mostly in the Ukraine. Time passed. The units were taken back, brought back to the United States, and many of them have been living in the Willamette Valley. I’ve talked to a number of them myself, and they’re now up into their sixties and seventies however, and are a passing generation.

However, in 1947, the American Friends Service Committee, which was the continuing organization carrying on this relief work, was given the Nobel Peace Prize, together with the British Friends Relief Service. In Philadelphia, the operations were under the control of Clarence Pickett, the executive secretary. Shortly after the award of the Nobel Peace Prize, Clarence Pickett got a telephone call and the voice on the other end said that “This is the Russian Embassy. I am the Russian ambassador to the United States. Have you ever carried on relief work in...” and he named a certain town. Clarence Pickett said, “I don’t know, we didn’t keep that close a record of where we had been.” “Well,” said the voice, “I do remember that in our village, in the dead of winter, we were starving, we were cold, and many of the people had died. We had stacked the bodies outside waiting for the spring thaw so that we could have a community burial. And my own family, my mother and I, were the only ones left. And then, out of the blue, came some people whom we’d called *Quackers* or something like that, and these

people brought food and clothing. And having fed us, and left blankets with us, they left again. And I think that I have you to thank for being alive." Well, we couldn't prove that this was the... that we had been there, that we had fed this particular ambassador, this young man. However, out of this opportunity, or this contact, arose the opportunity to carry on further discussions with the Russian ambassador. In time the Russian ambassador was shifted to the United Nations scene. And many conversations were carried on with this man. One of them, I have been told, was... or many of them, were along the lines of what the world should be like, what the world really is like and is not being, and is being frustrated, to achieve. That is to say, what is realism; what is pure fantasy. He realized that the Christian order had a great deal to offer, although he was not a Christian.

And on one occasion, in talking with Elmore Jackson and I believe also Philip Jessup, on one occasion he said, "All right. Tomorrow morning, eight o'clock, I come into my office. I want to follow this blueprint, these plans, for creating a world order. What do I do?" It was a tough question. We couldn't answer this question. And Elmore Jackson, Philip Jessup and the others who were sitting and discussing this over coffee cups continued, however, the discussion. Eventually the young... this ambassador was transferred back to Russia, where he is still active in government service.

The story doesn't end there. In 1948, or was it '49? During the blockade of Berlin, difficulties... you remember the United States had difficulties getting supplies into the civilian population of Berlin. It looked as though we were headed toward another showdown: war. And then, this man, in talking with Elmore Jackson—I think it was Philip Jessup then—made the comment that, "Suppose that you suggest certain points to the American delegation? We'll see what happens." Those points were suggested to the American delegation. The American delegation then came back and suggested them to the Russians. The Russians at this point said, "Well, we think it might work out." And so, the Berlin blockade basically was broken. Again, a product of the feeding, back there in 1920-21. As the writer in Ecclesiastes says, "Cast thy bread upon the waters, and it will return unto thee." So, does it work?

However, it doesn't make much difference to the Christian pacifist because to him, God and he, God and I, make a majority, and the Christian pacifist does not wait for a Gallup poll or a popular vote. A story is told of Thomas, or Joseph Hogue in 1812, who was pleading for peace. He was in the frontier of western North Carolina, and the trouble then was with those people who simply understand no other language except the language of violence. That is to say, the Indian. You can't reason with him, he's beyond reason. He is... the only thing he understands is force. Well, he landed in a hotel. As did also that same evening a general and his aide who were trying to conscript volunteers for the fight against the Indian on the frontier. And perceiving

that there was a Quaker opposed to war and to this conscription process, the aide asked what the Quaker would do if he was faced with fierce Indians who understood no language but violence. Wouldn't he kill'em... Wouldn't he kill, then, in self defense? And the answer of Joseph Hogue was, "If I killed him, I would certainly send a heathen soul to hell. And so doing, I might endanger my own soul. But if he killed me, I am ready to die. I know that my salvation is assured. And he, having another day to ponder, may also be saved." Well, the general... this stopped the aide, but the general then commented and said, "Well, that's all very well if everyone else agreed with your position," and the answer of Hogue was, "Thee would be the last to do right? I would rather be the first." Well, today, when mankind is more secure than ever, with explosive power equal to about seventeen tons of TNT per man, woman, and child in this world, and how much more secure can one get? I submit that the answer of Thomas Hogue [sic] may not be safe, but it is safer. [applause]

We have about, fifteen... twenty minutes I guess, for any questions you may have. I've tried to cut this short. I have omitted, by the way, the statement of the Presbyterians which came out just this last weekend, a proposed confession of faith, and this is *way out* in that it goes so far as to say that the church should "Pursue fresh and responsible relations across every line of conflict, even at the risk to national security." This has made, according to the *Oregonian*, one Marine, who is on the security staff of the White House, has had to resign from the Presbyterian church. However, MacNamara and Rusk, who are both Presbyterians, have not yet resigned. [laughter]

I don't know if I've aroused or... started any thoughts going in your mind... Yes?

[question asked in background, inaudible]

Well, there are... *pacifism*, as the word implies, means "a maker of peace," one who actively goes out and tries to be a peacemaker. Thus, you don't just say, "I won't shoot," you also go out and try to overcome the situation that creates that crisis. Now that would be *pacifism*. The neutrality position is simply the position of abstaining completely from any non-violence, and if necessary, just allowing the steamroller to go over you. That is, the... it's a difference in technique; one being to accept punishment upon the body and the other to actively seek to overcome it.

[question asked in background, inaudible]

Well, I think he would... it depends upon the situation, but I think that Jesus would have been an active peacemaker, seeking to... in fact, his life is that of meeting a crisis in which there is

tension between God and man, and his whole life is an attempt to try to reconcile man to God. That's why I would say that I think he would be a pacifist in the active sense, not just a passive sense. Although he himself was crucified. But this can be a matter of timing. In fact, I would say that two thousand years would show that he was right.

SPEAKER [unidentified]: Dr. Fedde, in today's world, where the tensions not between... not only between God and man but between the world and man, would Christ be a success as a peacemaker?

FEDDE: Starting with my definition I'd say yes, because anyone... how successful have the Pentagon, the War Department and others been? I suggest—and the Japanese Imperial Cabinet—I think that they are the un-realists: the persons, the ones who did not see the realities of life, and that they are the unsuccessful ones. I think that this method of peace would be a successful one. Let me give you an illustration. One the borders of... or the frontiers of Pennsylvania, shortly after the settlement of the colony by William Penn and the Quakers, because of the fairness with which the Quakers, who were then the majority, dealt with the Indians, there was no substantial difficulty with the Indians. Now, I don't mean to say that the Indians were saints; they were just as human and perverse as the next person, but there was no major difficulty. Not until decades later, when settlers from other colonies came into this area and said, "All the other colonies have militia, we also should have a militia." And then, having gotten the weapons, they began having to rely upon those weapons. Then conflict broke out with the Indians. And yet, even then, I'll say there were instances in which the Indians seemed to distinguish between people who were their friends and people who were their enemies. And the instances are many in which Indians, intent upon a massacre, would bypass those whom they regarded as their friends.

And you recall I think, the story... or the tradition of the family that was too far... they heard that there would be a massacre, and they were too far out to get into the safety of a town even if they had wanted to. They decide to sleep in their cabin out in the wilderness, and during... as they went to bed, on the floor, they thought that the safest thing would be to pull in the latchstring this time. But then, the latchstring is a symbol of *welcome*. If you leave the latchstring out, anyone can open the door. If you pull the latchstring in, it means the door is closed. The father got up during the night and pushed the latchstring out through the hole. The Indian band came. They pulled the latchstring. They came in, saw the family sleeping there and of course, they happened to rouse one or two; no resistance was made, and the band realized they were not meeting any opposition; they were not meeting any enemies, and they left the family in peace. This has happened many, many times and I suggest this is success. It can work in group situations as well as in personal situations. I have, three times, faced personally,

situations of violence where... once where a policeman was trying to shoot me. And it happened—I don't believe in accidents—but anyhow it happened that the policeman got the revolver caught in his raincoat. And there was just that split second [snaps fingers] during which he couldn't get that revolver completely drawn and in which I managed, in the darkness of night, to flash my flashlight on myself. I use this as a personal testimony here... I flashed my light on myself and then I called out. I said, "Good evening sir, may I help you?" And apparently this wasn't what the officer was expecting. I didn't know I was going to say it either, I must add. It was purely spontaneous. And then, after a moment or so, leaving the light focused upon myself so I was a perfect target, then I flashed the light over there and I saw the officer. Now he had his revolver out and he came towards me, and he said, "Don't you know there is a curfew? People are shot on sight." This was in Palestine. I realized then what a close call I'd had, and if it had been that I had ducked into the doorway or I had run up the street, I'd be dead, I think. The policeman could shoot faster than I could run. So I think, again, this is a personal illustration of success, but I think community-wise as well as personally, it is a successful technique.

SPEAKER [unidentified]: Provided you... In light of your experience, Doctor, how do you explain the harassment of Morse and Fulbright today by the government?

FEDDE: [laughs, clears throat] Well, the... I may need some help on this one. [chuckles] I think that it may lie in the spirit in which the criticisms are being given by Morse. I know Wayne Morse personally and he is not the meek, gentle, soul that one might wish. On the other hand, he is speaking truth, I'm afraid, to a very sensitive situation. Fulbright is a different personality altogether, and I... all I can say is that people will be harassed even if they take the right position. The important thing is, though, that the person who is being harassed keep his spirit. That is, the... keep his *sense* of proportion and remember what he is witnessing for. It's not Wayne Morse. It's not myself. It is witnessing for a way of life, a Christian way of life. And therefore, you've got to keep that personality, the personality of Jesus, central.

SPEAKER [unidentified]: [off microphone and partially inaudible] You said that the ... Christianity wanted to free the holy cities in Palestine, but I think they established, [...] condemned in the Middle East. And they fought about four centuries there. You said that Jesus said you should... thou shalt not fight. How you explain this?

FEDDE: You're referring now to the Crusades, and the attempt of the Christians to recapture the holy places. Particularly Al-Quds, Jerusalem, and the various other places for the church. I think that at this point the church compromised and was trying to achieve certain ends. Namely, church unity, and in doing forgot that the means must also be examined. You can't accomplish good ends by bad means; they must be in harmony. And here the church, good

people, well-meaning people with a good end in mind, that of church unity, bungled. And this is a human failing. I think that we—all of us—will do that. I will, I'm sure. Yet, I hope that I will have the humility and the good grace to recognize that although I have done wrong, I will try to restore the spirit, the spirit of Christ, to the situation, to the crisis. And this is where I think that it... what started out as a well-motivated plan to win those holy places, Jerusalem, Bethlehem and so on, to the church, still, it was quickly taken over by the businessmen in the fourth Crusade. I think it was called the "Businessman's Crusade," where they decided that rather than freeing the holy places they would plunder Constantinople instead. There was more money to be had there. And this... it ended on those rocks. Then, from then on, the various crusades fizzled bit by bit until it became ridiculous. And they were no longer, I may add, no longer sponsored by the church. They were then pure business ventures. Tourist projects, and hoping to recoup their losses or recoup their investment through ill-gotten plunder.

SPEAKER [unidentified]: I think a lot of people wonder about the contradiction, the seeming contradiction in Christianity in that it has taught the simpleness of man or the depravity of man. And at the same time we have this philosophy that is being applied or is intended to be applied on a social scale of the idealism of Christianity. And since only about 8% of the world's population is Christian, and since we have this philosophy of the depravity of man, are you actually saying that this is going to work on a worldwide scale? Or, how do you [...] this world view?

FEDDE: Yes. You're looking at the question of a majority, getting at a plurality or majority. No revolution, ever, in the whole world, has ever been accomplished by a majority. Even the American Revolution, good as it was in many ways, had only about 15% of the people supporting it. 85% of the people didn't care two hoots, or were willing to leave the country. This by the way is the reason that Canada today speaks English instead of French. They left and went up to Canada. Rather, if there are French-speaking Canadians here I'll have to say English and French. But no revolution is ever accomplished by a majority. It's a small, dedicated group who will carry forward the ideas. It took twelve men by the sea of Galilee to start a revolution in the spirit of Jesus. And it doesn't take... it's desirable to have a vast number, but when you get vast numbers you have the problem—and let's hope we do get them—but you have the problem of trying to keep them in line so that they will not miss the purpose, will not miss the spirit of the movement. So I'm not afraid of...

[SPEAKER in background responds, inaudible]

FEDDE: As a Christian, I believe that it will come. Whether it comes today or a year from now I'm not sure. I can guess at probabilities and also at current events that it may not occur

immediately. But still, it seems to me that I'm on the winning team. And even though we win in the last quarter of the game we're going to play through the first, second, and third quarters. [chuckles] That's the theory that I follow and I think that the church follows also. We're on the winning side. And we have the nature of the whole world. That is... and Jesus told us about this nature; the meek, the pure in heart and the righteous and the merciful; this being the nature of humanity, the *real* nature of humanity, is the one that will eventually prevail one way or the other.

SPEAKER [unidentified]: I just thought I'd ask whether this concept of man, is it at all a sectarian matter among religions, so that some religions consider man more depraved than others... [chuckles]

FEDDE: Yeah.

SPEAKER: [continuing] ...And more generally, could you anticipate that the position of *Pacem in terris* and Vatican II, as I understand it is based quite a bit on the changed nature of...

[audio cuts out and resumes with FEDDE mid-response]

FEDDE: ...of Christianity, because there is a great deal in common even with worshippers in the Hindu, Buddhist, and other faiths. There is a great deal in common here. Not that we have the same creed, that isn't... I don't mean to say that, but there is at least, on a human level we have the same desires. That of achieving a world order in which each person can live his fullest, whether he be Buddhist or anything else. And in this sense, I'm sure not only in that sense, but that's one sense in which the *Pacem in terris* is a tremendous step forward. The Catholic Church, as well as the Protestant Churches, are moving for peaceful solutions to the problem. Way back there, yes.

SPEAKER [unidentified]: Mr. Fedde, as a tax lawyer, do you know is there any way that a person can get around the withholding tax business, so that you can indulge in the kind of protest that you mentioned earlier?

FEDDE: Withholding tax. Well, I know one who did it, but his wife divorced him. [laughter] What he did, was... you know, agricultural labor is exempt from the withholding tax, and he was a Catholic layman who felt very strongly that he ought to protest this withholding tax which is part... which is fed into the... 70% of it is fed into the military. And what he did was to get a job picking berries, picking beans and so on, working a day or two here and a day or two there. Never any withholding. The trouble was that he had to keep moving, and his wife and his

daughter didn't care too much about this, because it certainly destroyed home life. Another factor was that his income was not very great, and his wife had to get out and work on her own. The federal Internal Revenue Service eventually brought proceedings against him, but they couldn't attach to anything because anytime they got a warrant out... that is, if they determined that there was a deficiency, and there was plenty of tax deficiency, but anytime they determined it and got a warrant out, he would have moved to another job. And he just kept moving this way and I understand he kept this up for years. So he never had to pay any tax. Another one I know defeated the tax by—at least much of the tax—by having as many exemptions as possible. And, however, that's an expensive way to do it.

SPEAKER [unidentified]: If the United Nations would now, would bring about your new order, would you support such a... would you support this? In other words, what I'm saying is, do you think man could bring about the new order for himself? [continues, inaudible]

FEDDE: My—and this is my personal belief, I'm not referring to any church doctrine now at this point—my own personal belief is that God gave us brains to use, and we should use all the skills at our command to bring about a more acceptable social order. We've gone a long way. Remember now, back in the caveman days every square mile had its own private little wars. Gradually the territories were expanded, so that today we have 3000 miles from the Atlantic to the Pacific and Canada to Mexico where there are no wars as such. There may be occasional riots and disorders, but no outright wars. So we've come a long way in bringing about peace. We've also come a long way in the sense that war between England and the United States, between Canada and the United States, and most of the Western European countries and the United States is today rather unthinkable. Now I admit we've fought Germany twice, but we haven't fought France and we haven't fought the Scandinavian countries and most of the other countries of Western Europe. So the territory has been increasing all the time. It hasn't brought on utopia, but it is a step in that—a human step—in that direction, so I'd say that we can. Even through the United Nations, a secular organization, we can move in that direction. I'd be all in favor of every technique and every plan that would bring us closer to a greater area of agreement and settlement of disputes.

HOST: I don't know that I'm responsible for closing the evening, but since I'm here, Mr. Cohen tells me that there's coffee, and we would like to thank you all for coming.

[applause; some background conversation; program ends]