EUGENE BURKE LECTURE SERIES

Inaugural Lecture

by

Reverend Theodore Martin Hesburgh

Thank you very much, Chancellor Atkinson; Dick McCormack and your committee; members of the Burke family: brothers, sisters, children; and dear friends here at the University of California at San Diego. It is an enormous pleasure to inaugurate this lectureship.

I can remember back to the year 1943 when I walked into Gene Burke's cluttered room--he [Dick McCormack] was not exaggerating. I made a resolution at that point that if he took me on as my thesis director I would never give him chapters that I didn't also have a copy of because I might not ever see them again. All of you who have done theses know that once you get a chapter done you don't want to lose it.

He was a dear man. I should tell you that at the time I was a little pragmatic--even then--and, having already had four years of theology, I was trying to get through a three-year course in two because I wanted to be a chaplain in the Navy. It was during the war. Most people would have just turned me off; Gene didn't. He said, "If you want to do it, let's see if we can do it. You're going to have to work pretty hard." He wasn't kidding. I had to do three

times as much as I thought I was going to do for a thesis. He didn't lose any of it, and we did get it through the examining committee.

The subject was something that they took a very dim view of at a Catholic University. I wanted to talk about the place of the lay people in the Church because in 1943, much more than today, the Catholic Church was a very clerical outfit. I wanted to prove that, through baptism and confirmation, lay people have a metaphysical standing in the Catholic Church which gives them certain rights in exercising the priesthood and the liturgy and also in the work of the apostolate. Gene was with me on that. We had a difficult time selling it to the committee, but we did. We had a more difficult time passing it, but we did. I have always been grateful to Gene because he was a marvelous moderator and helper, and he knew so much about so many things. He had a very curious pastime--and this is the last I'll say about him. When I first met him as a thesis moderator, he was reading a large book, and I recognized it. It was the Dictionaire de Theologique Catolique, about twenty-seven large volumes on every possible, conceivable theological subject. The French do so well on their encyclopedic works. Gene started with "A" and read through to "Z"; I often thought that was why he was so encyclopedic.

Tonight, in honor of Gene, who was ordained forty-seven years ago today--which I think is a kind of serendipitous

occasion--I would like to do two things which I think he might like. First, I would like to address the proposition that universities are the greatest changers and shapers of the society in which we live because of the people they turn out and the ideas they give them. Education in the university context is not just a thing of the mind; it is primarily something of the mind, but it goes beyond that into the moral context. Second, I'd like to say something about the moral dimension of higher education--at least to get that settled--and if we're agreed on that, then I'd like to list some of the moral problems facing higher education today. I will do that very quickly and say that I am only going to speak about one of them, namely, the nuclear threat to humanity. That is really the main topic of what I am saying tonight, and I am going to skip some of the talk that I have written because I would like to leave a little room for questions at the end.

We begin by considering the fact that universities do indeed shape the future of our land and of our world. I'd like to speak particularly of the moral dimension of higher education and to look at some of the impending ethical questions that attend such a consideration and especially pay attention to one--the nuclear.

While I am speaking directly to my fellow educators, like the Chancellor and his faculty and staff here, I would like to say that what I have to say is a message for every-

one everywhere in the world this night. We have all been schooled in the proposition that the life of the university is indeed the life of the mind, the free search for truth and its dissemination to the upcoming generation. This is at first glance an intellectual and not a moral endeavor. Why, then, my emphasis tonight on the ethical or moral concern?

Well, first I do it as an introduction to my theme about the university's relationship to the nuclear threat and what it should do about it, but I'd also say that education, most fundamentally considered from the family all the way through, from kindergarten to higher education, involves more than the mind. We are educating human persons, that most marvelous of all visible reality. Jacques Maritain, the French philosopher, said of the person--and I've never seen it said better. He said:

> What do we mean precisely when we speak of the human person? When we say that a man [or a woman] is a person, we do not mean that he is [merely] an individual, in the sense that an atom, a blade of grass, a fly or an elephant is an individual. Man is an individual [and women too, of course] who holds himself in hand by [his] intelligence and [by his] will. He does not exist only in a physical manner. He has a spiritual superexistence through knowledge and [through] love; he is, in a way, a universe in himself, a microcosm, in which the great universe in its entirety can be encompassed through knowledge; and through love, he can give himself completely to beings who are to him, as it were, other selves, a relation for which there is no equivalent in the physical world. The human person possesses these characteristics because in the last analysis man [and woman], this flesh and these perishable bones which are animated and activated by a divine fire, exists 'from the womb to the grave' by virtue of the very

> existence of his soul, which dominates time and death. Spirit is the root of personality.
>
> The notion of personality thus involves that of totality and [of] independence; no matter how poor or [how] crushed he may be, a person, as such, is a whole and subsists in an independent manner. To say that [this] man [or woman] is a person is to say that in the depths of his being he is more a whole than a part, and more independent than servile. It is to say that he is a minute fragment of matter that is at the same time a universe, a beggar who communicates with absolute being, mortal flesh whose value is eternal, a bit of straw into which heaven enters. It is this metaphysical mystery that religious thought points to when it says that the person is the image of God. The value of the person, his dignity and his rights belong to the order of things naturally sacred [things] which bear the imprint of the Father of being, and which have in Him the end [of all] of their movement.[1]

These words were written towards the end of World War II in Paris in an article that Maritain published there called Principes d'une politique humaniste. I have cited at some length Maritain's eloquent description of the person for two reasons. First, it is persons, not minds, not hearts, that we educate. It is individuals, worlds unto themselves, the most sacred of all visible realities, the repositories of all rights and all obligations, the only free and intelligent agents in all of the visible universe. These are the persons that we educate in the totality of their being, mind and heart together. If you view persons as unfree or as totally dependent on society for all they have, even their rights, you are speaking of a completely different world than that we educators visualize in a free democracy. My second reason for quoting Maritain at length is that I have been unable to find a more eloquent portrayal of what it

really means to be a person, that which we can all claim to be and that which each of our students can claim to be, the exalted subject of all education, the hope of a better world yet to be created.

In educating those persons who will form the leadership of all other great institutions in our present and in our future, the family, church and state, the great business organizations and labor unions, the military, the many voluntary organizations that so enrich our lives and our professions, we must face the reality that our universities and our colleges are perhaps the most important element in shaping the future for our world. Students are at the heart of that importance, and it is to them and their totality as persons that we must apply our teaching. It is they, the persons, that we must educate. How we educate these student persons, I think, will have the most important of all influences on what kind of a country we will have and what kind of a world we will inhabit.

How we educate--think of those words--how we educate is perhaps the greatest moral dilemma of all, because there is all too little agreement among us as to what is right or what is wrong in what we purport to do as we educate. We have a lot of hints from the past, for example:

Plato speaks of knowledge as a completion and a concomitant to virtue. Concomitant perhaps, but I think all of us would agree that while knowledge is power, it is power for

good or evil, not necessarily virtue. Knowledge acquired at our best universities was the entreé for the young leaders in President Nixon's White House, but after the Watergate debacle, many of those people, educated at the finest universities in the land, admitted that they had learned how to use methods that were effective to achieve their purposes, but they had not been taught to ask whether those methods were right or wrong.

Augustine, a well-educated man who sowed his share of wild oats before becoming Bishop of Hippo and a saint, described education as working towards ordo amoris, putting order into the things that we love. I suspect that this insight, like others in his Confessions, came somewhat later than during his formal education as a Rhetorician. Thomas Aquinas is in the same line of thinking, saying that the truly educated person is the one who knows the right things to have faith in, the right things to hope for, and the right things to love.

Matthew Arnold speaks of studies that will quicken, elevate, and fortify the mind and the sensibility. I like that, and I would hope that our future leaders would lead better if their minds and sensibilities were quickened, elevated, and fortified. However, as I look at universities today, my own included, I would say that, as an honest moral judgment, "it is easier said than done," this quickening and fortification of sensitivities. Martin Buber and Gandhi,

too, to cite more modern observers of the educational scene, speak of education of character as the only education worthy of having. Another modern, Robert Hutchins, said "...the prime object of education is to know...the goods in their order." Again, I must say, easier said than done. What agreement is there then in most of our faculty on the "order of goals" or the "order of goods"?

William Bennett (who is presently Secretary of Education), when he was Chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities, cited a number of cases and he added one more, a Robertson Davies, whom I don't know, but I think he outdid them all, going all the way back to Plato and Aristotle. Robertson Davies said: "The purpose of learning is to save the soul and enlarge the mind." If I might speak for the Church, which I really can't, I would frankly admit that it has its hands full in its effort to save souls and probably envies the universities in their easier task of enlarging the mind.

What do we do when students are not particularly excited about enlarging their minds but would prefer to learn how to operate effectively as chemical engineers (say in a worldwide oil company), as lawyers in a lucrative practice (say tax law), as accountants in one of the big eight firms, or as physicists in a national weapons laboratory? It may be our moral dilemma as educators, but it is theirs, too. The rub is, we are the educators. We establish the

curriculum; we teach the courses; and we demonstrate what we think is all important in a total education--giving wholeness of knowledge, not just bits and pieces.

Again, I trust that I am not overstating the ultimate moral dilemma that faces us, which is how we educate, but there it is, notwithstanding Plato, Augustine, Aquinas, Arnold, Buber, Gandhi and even Robertson Davies. Their vision is, I think, quite far from our present reality.

In the horrible jargon of modern youth, we educators ought to "get our act together," but I doubt that we will do whatever that means unless we can at least agree on something not too popular in modern universities and colleges: defining what we are really trying to do, what we most fundamentally believe higher education to be, and what we deeply believe these future leaders, our students, should learn from us.

Doing this will require something even more unpopular in modern universities and colleges (my own included): spending a few moments to consider transcendentals like the true, the good, the beautiful, and the moral imperatives that flow from these great transcendental concepts. If indeed these concepts, these transcendentals, are relevant to what we are educating young people to be--truthful and good, to qualify them to lead us out of our present moral morass--then we had better start paying some attention to them. This will require, on our part, more than just

imparting useful knowledge, in the most pragmatic sense of that word, "useful." I need not insist here that if we, the faculty, do not see the road ahead fairly clearly, it is unlikely that we will surmount this moral dilemma in time to help our present students become effective leaders in a world of considerable moral confusion.

Let me begin with what I think most of us would agree with, whatever we think about Plato and Aristotle or whatever we print in our catalogues. In simplest terms, I assume that we all agree, in the university world, that we are mainly, but not exclusively, concerned with the first of these transcendentals, the truth. We all want to grow in knowing the truth, which is a road to wisdom as well as knowledge, and which indeed does make us free. We cannot, especially this Holy Week, be like Pilate who asked the Lord, "What is truth?" and then walked away before getting an answer.

Whatever else we do in universities, we spend most of our lives seeking truth, about our world, about ourselves, sometimes about God, about how we go about knowing truth on a wide variety of levels (scientific and technological truth, really the easiest because mathematics is a precise language), and then learning humanistic truth through literature and history, the social sciences like anthropology, sociology, political science, and economics (again with mathematics being a helpful aid in these latter approaches

to truth). We learn, too, through art and music and, perhaps most of all, through poetic intuition, which somehow brings us to the heart of truth in a hurry. At the core of it all, we know there is, of course, philosophy which puts it all together in some meaningful, rational synthesis. If we want to go still further in seeking truth, and here I speak of my own profession, we study theology. We call it all truth, and indeed it is, although we come to know it by many paths of learning--the more, the better, if we are looking for wholeness of knowledge, not just tidbits of this or that truth, quarks at the heart of matter or black holes amid the galaxies. I am fascinated by both of these searches, but not exclusively so.

The pursuit of truth is what makes our profession most exciting and what gives most coherence to our institutions. Jim Billington, Director of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars in Washington, recently said:

> The pursuit of truth is the highest form of the pursuit of happiness--and the surest way to keep us from the pursuit of one another. Truth is non-competitive; the discovery of one can benefit all. Truth is bigger than all of us, and [it] can be pursued by each of us wherever we are [and] with whatever we have at hand.
>
> The open, unlimited search for truth is a major source of hope for a free society--not because it offers easy answers, but because it offers a shared enthusiasm that threatens no one and can involve everyone. Only in the life of the mind and [the] spirit can the horizons of freedom still be infinite in an era of growing physical limitations.[2]

It would seem to me that the pursuit of truth is a good shared goal with which to begin to reorient and revivify our institutions as we attempt to shape the future through the education of our students. At least, it has been the inspiration in all of our lives, we educators, and we should be able to inspire our students to see it as the best and continuing result of their higher education. The pursuit of truth and the full transmission of truth is in the heart and at the heart of what makes educators and education interesting, even exciting, and at its best, fulfilling and inspirational.

I am really back now to where I began in the first part of this lecture, namely, that we should try to find some intellectually and morally coherent philosophy of education that can help us shape the future by pursuing it thoroughly. Our best goal is not just to educate in a thousand different ways--although we certainly do that too--but our best goal is to give a vision of truth, a zest for the pursuit of truth, along all the avenues to truth, that might well lead these young people to nobility of spirit and a commitment to do what each can do to create a better world of greater justice and greater beauty. In a word, our goal is to educate persons capable of shaping the future, not dull and drab practitioners of what is but seekers of what might be, what still may be created, and what needs changing to do that.

Perhaps I am being too idealistic, but I do believe, after living all of my mature life in a university, since the age of seventeen, that students do react positively to a great vision of what they and their world might become. If we really want to shape the future, I think the operative question is: Do we want to shape it in truth, in justice, in beauty, in the good and, yes, of course, in love, too? If we are unclear or less than enthusiastic about this, who will follow the uncertain trumpet? Certainly not our students. We all know we are a decent people, totally engaged in universities in a noble quest. But let it not be forgotten that how we think and what we do is much more important than what we say. Every act of ours as educators is teaching. Our words are only buttressed by our deeds, and our deeds are only inspired by our convictions. If we are not deeply concerned about truth and about moral concepts like justice, beauty, and peace and the good, if we are not inspired by these great transcendental considerations of every life, how will our students be? It is up to us to lead the way.

Perhaps I can cap this discussion of our greatest moral challenge as educators--how we educate--by making concrete how we might face the greatest moral problem confronting humanity today or ever. Weak tea will not do here. I speak, of course, of the nuclear threat to humanity.

I could speak of a whole series of other ethical challenges that face us today as educators and especially as universities: How to preserve excellence in a time of retrenchment (I think Clark Kerr and others in the Carnegie Commission have the ultimate word on this); how we preserve our freedom while seeking new and massive funding from business enterprises (we have had at times this same problem, of course, with government); how we respond to the legitimate desires of women and minorities when there are so few openings on our faculties; how we effectively reach out to potential poor and minority students when student aid is shrinking and more cuts are proposed; how we balance vocationalism and the humanities in our general approach to higher education; again, how we relate to Third World yearnings for development and human rights; how we sustain support for the fine arts in our institutions when all the emphasis is on computers which are basically uncreative (I know they can write symphonies, but spare me from listening to them.); how we concern our business and engineering students in not just being consultants but creative managers of greater productivity, without which we will not make it in a very highly competitive world market; how we inspire our lawyers to work for justice, whatever the cost, not just for profit, whatever the manipulation of the law involved; how we graduate physicians who care about people and persons, whose deep personal concerns transcend cat-scans and electro-magnetic machines; and how ultimately we reproduce

ourselves, not practicing celibacy as regards the most important cohort to come and the one with very little attraction today, namely, teaching and great teachers. All of these are fundamental moral concerns for our educational endeavor. I could say something about all of them, but just let me address the most important in my mind which is the nuclear dilemma. If we do not learn and teach our students how to cope with this primordial nuclear problem, we need not worry about all the others. After total nuclear conflagration, all human problems are moot.

I would appreciate it if you might spare me a couple of autobiographical notes here because I have to speak of myself to make the point I want to make. I have spent over three decades of coping with such urgent moral concerns as human rights (here and abroad), world hunger, immigration and refugees, transfer of technology for development, illiteracy, green revolution, food for the hungry, world education, and many others. One day, two and a half years ago, we joined about two hundred other universities ~~(we at Notre Dame)~~ in dedicating a whole day ~~(as we used to during the student revolution--a kind of study-in)~~ to the study of the nuclear threat to humanity. I have been involved in nuclear matters for fifteen years, representing the Vatican at the International Atomic Energy Agency (Atoms for Peace) in Vienna, and in several other capacities since the advent of the Nuclear Age some thirty years ago.

On a gray November afternoon in 1981, following Dr. Jim Mueller's, of Harvard, graphic lecture on what would happen to Notre Dame and South Bend, Indiana if a one-megaton bomb was exploded over it, I was walking back to my office & realized that this great University and all the other problems in the event of a nuclear catastrophe that had preoccupied me for so long would suddenly become totally irrelevant: no humans, no problems. Then and there it seemed important to disengage myself from all these other endeavors, except education, and to do whatever I might about this quintessential threat of nuclear annihilation.

I am often asked, "Why the sudden concern? The nuclear threat has been with us for about forty years, since the obliteration of Hiroshima and Nagasaki back in early August 1945. Somehow," people say, "we have survived."

I believe the sudden concern stems from the current accelerating trend to utter disaster which has, during the past 40 years and, increasingly in the last two or three years, been accelerating upwards wildly. Remember, it was in 1945 that Albert Einstein prophesied (and I repeat the words the Chancellor said earlier): "The unleashed power of the atom has changed everything except our mode of thinking--and we thus drift towards unparalleled disaster." We have made available a million times the destructive power of those primitive, yet devastating, bombs that ushered in the Atomic Age in Japan in 1945. There are now four tons of TNT equivalent available in the form of nuclear bombs for

every man, woman, and child on earth--that's 4.8 billion people--four tons apiece. That awesome destructive power is not just theoretically there, it is processed into warheads, it is targeted, it is pointed and poised on delivery systems, it is hair-triggered to very fallible computers. There is a decision time of ten to fifteen minutes on whether or not to fire them, and that is a decision on the end of the world or not. There is much less time for decision on the field of battle, and there will be practically no time for decision once these systems are placed right over our heads in space, as is now being planned by both the USSR and the U.S.

To give some small sense of the rate of escalation, we have been told in the last four years that the Russians are escalating wildly (which indeed they have been doing--one new SS-20 a week aimed at Europe, each with three warheads), while we have been sitting on our hands. Well, while we were sitting on our hands, we have developed the MX with ten warheads, a thousand warheads of infinite accuracy, not just ~~where~~ to land on a football field but ~~whether~~ on the forty or fifty yard line. We have developed the Triton submarines with new accurate, more powerful D5 missiles (a Triton submarine is somewhere between three and eight times the explosive power of both sides during the five years of World War II); the Pershing II, the cruise missile to be launched at sea, in the air, and from the ground; the B-1 bomber; the upcoming Stealth bomber; and now Star Wars. What would we

have done if we had not been sitting on our hands? It seems to me that this has all escalated to a point where we are not just adding warheads but we are adding totally new systems that enter into the whole equation, a great disequilibrium. The Soviets, I must say, are doing likewise.

All the movement, on both sides of the super powers, has been ~~massively upwards and massively~~ destabilizing an already very touchy political situation that exists between us--a really poisoned relationship at the moment. All of this is happening in a very volatile climate, where arms control talks seem to go nowhere or have become like a giant game of chess, and where the leaders of the super powers simply have not met since President Carter signed the SALT II agreement in Vienna, even though it is still unratified. As the little girl, Samantha (this is wisdom from children), remarked to Andropov when she got to Russia in the summer of 1983, "If both sides say they will not start a nuclear war, why do they both continue to create more nuclear weapons?" An interesting question from a little girl, and she is the right one to ask the question because this whole scenario is like Alice in Wonderland.

Never before has humankind--and I might say mostly mankind--had in their hands the power to destroy the total work of creation, not just destroy it, but destroy it fourteen times over, in a few moments, certainly within an hour, and even accidentally. As the generals say, "We can make

the rubble jump."

The newer weapons are generally destabilizing, because they are either non-verifiable, like the mobile SS-20s or cruise missiles that evade radar and defense systems, or they are offensive, first strike weapons, like MX and its Soviet counterparts, rather than defensive and deterrent weapons. The military on both sides are jittery and for good reason. Once the nuclear barrier is breached, for whatever reason, or no reason, or by mistake, it is bound to escalate. Limited or winnable nuclear war is a most foolish illusion. As a Russian scientist recently put it to me: "These are not weapons because weapons are to defend yourself, and if you defend yourself with this weapon, you are dead. ~~Neither, he said, is nuclear war,~~ war in any Clausewitzian sense of a continuation of politics by other means. Wars are won (or lost), but in nuclear war, there is nothing left to win. All is death, destruction, and devastation, your country and ours and probably most others."

If you still have any illusions about this, read the recent novel Warday that portrays America (and Russia) after a modest exchange of some fifty missiles apiece, mostly aimed at the silos. We each have thousands, of course. We each have at least ten thousand intercontinental ballistic missiles and we have another thirty thousand tactical missiles. If Warday doesn't impress you enough, I suggest you read Carl Sagan on nuclear winter--even following a modest

exchange of five to ten percent of nuclear weapons available and targeted right now.

It has to be the worst sin, the worst blasphemy, to utterly destroy God's beautiful creation, Planet Earth, which is the gem of our solar system, ~~as you know~~, to destroy all that we have created here, so painstakingly, in a few thousand years: all our institutions (like this one) that we have labored to perfect; all learning; all science and technology; all art; all books; all music; all architecture; every human treasure, everything, but especially hundreds of millions of men, women, and little children, all their future and all futures, utter obliteration at worst, and a return to the Stone Age at best.

It has to be utter insanity for rational creatures to have painted themselves into such a corner, to have created such a monster. But in freedom, what we have created, we can uncreate, we can dismantle, and we must.

It will require, most of all, hope that it can be done, and the beginnings of serious, high level conversations, with creative options on the part of the super power leaders. All movement must be reversed--downward for a change--and this must be done mutually and done in a totally verifiable manner. I am not for unilateral disarmament, and I am not for unverifiable plans. This is not a Russian or an American problem. It is a threat that profoundly affects every human being on earth, from whatever nation or whatever

part of the earth.

Hope that we can turn the tide is central to the task ahead. Otherwise, we are lost. The need for hope is implicit in a recent Leslie Gelb article in the New York Times, Sunday edition, entitled "Is the Nuclear Threat Manageable?"

> In nuclear doctrine, it is necessary to have choices between massive retaliation and surrender. But it is risky to assume, as current doctrine would have it, that once a war begins, it can be controlled. And it is downright dangerous to believe there can be meaningful winners and losers, as some strategists in this administration believe. These recent trends in strategic thinking are highly questionable.
>
> But what has to be understood now is that the future could be different, that the nuclear peace of the last forty years could be transformed into nuclear nightmare. What is in the offing is not simply another weapons system or two, not just another phase of the old arms race, but a package of technological breakthroughs that could revolutionize strategic capabilities and thinking.
>
> To be sure, there is time before all of these technologies mature into reliable weapons systems. But not much time.
>
> Meanwhile [he concludes], arms-control talks between the United States and the Soviet Union are getting nowhere. The two sides have not even been negotiating with each other for months. [As he wrote this. They are now back in Geneva, but I don't hear much movement.] And when the negotiations resume this year or next, it must be remembered that they deal only with reducing and limiting numbers of nuclear weapons, not with the broader technological problems described in this article. Most lamentable, there seems to be a habit of mind developing among Soviet and American officials that the problems cannot be solved, that technology cannot be checked, a kind of combination of resignation and complacency. [And Leslie really concludes that:] They have gotten used to both the competition and the nuclear peace. Mankind may not survive on that alone.[3]

And so, the need for hope, hope that we can change the present impasse becomes enormously important. Interestingly, just before this Leslie Gelb article was written, Freeman Dyson, a physicist at the Institute for Advanced Studies at Princeton, an Englishman, had addressed the same problem in the fourth article of a series in the New Yorker (February 21, 1983). Dyson had begun his series, which is now a book entitled Weapons and Hope, with this concept: that this discussion is always torn between the warriors (or the hawks) whose battle cry is "Don't rock the boat; we've got to do this; we've got to do that; we've got to have more MXs; we've got to have Star Wars," and the victims (us) who seem too easily to say "Ban the bomb" without really thinking it out. This is indeed, as he remarks, a dialogue of the deaf. Each side is speaking to itself and nothing really happens. Interestingly, after an exhaustive analysis and a choice of a position called "Live and let live," which you can read about in his book, Dyson concludes his analysis, his four articles, and the book with a call for hope. Let me give you his concluding words:

> ....The moral conviction must come first, the political negotiations second, and the technical means third in moving mankind towards a hopeful future. The first, and most difficult, step is to convince people that movement is possible--that we are not irredeemably doomed, that our lives have a meaning and a purpose, that we can still choose to be makers of our fate.
>
> This lesson, not give up hope, is the essential lesson for people to learn who are trying to save the world from nuclear destruction. There are no compelling technical or political reasons that we and the Russians, and the French and the Chinese,

> too, should not, in time, succeed in negotiating nuclear weapons down to zero. The obstacles are primarily institutional and psychological. Too few people believe that negotiating down to zero is possible. What is needed to achieve this goal is a worldwide awakening of moral indignation, pushing the governments and their military establishments to get rid of these weapons which in the long run endanger everyone and protect nobody.
>
> ...the basic issue before us is simple: are we, or are we not, ready to face the uncertainties of a world in which nuclear weapons have been negotiated all the way down to zero? [Are we or are we not ready for that?] If the answer to this question is yes, then there is hope for us and for our grandchildren.[4]

Dyson's final answer is to quote a ~~lady~~ I don't know named Clara Park, and he quotes her on the subject of hope. Park says: "Hope is not a lucky gift, or circumstance, or disposition, but a virtue like faith and love, to be practiced whether or not we find it easy or even natural, because it is necessary to our survival as human beings."[5]

Curiously, hope, like faith and love, is not one of the moral virtues, but it happens to be a theological virtue. It becomes even more necessary to transmit hope to our students, who so often feel hopeless in the face of such cataclysmic issues, when we consider the purely intellectual approach to this nuclear problem, which places us in another impasse, or dead-end if you will. Fred Kaplan, in a recent book, The Wizards of Armageddon, portrays the efforts of the intellectuals who have elaborated American nuclear policy while rotating between the Departments of Defense and State and the national think tanks. After about 400 pages of record, he concludes:

> They performed their calculations and spoke their strange and esoteric tongues because to do otherwise would be to recognize all too clearly and constantly, the ghastliness of their contemplations. They contrived their options because without them, the bomb would appear too starkly as the thing that they had tried to prevent it from being, but that ultimately it would become if it ever were used--a device of sheer mayhem, a weapon whose cataclysmic powers no one had the faintest idea of how to control. The nuclear strategists had come to impose order--but in the end, only chaos still prevailed.[6]

Is it conceivable that universities and colleges who traditionally have been the rational and objective critics of our society, local and global, can be silent in the face of the nuclear threat? Is it possible that our students can prepare to be future leaders of this country and the world and still not learn from us the dimensions of this nuclear threat, the moral problems involved, and some of the possible solutions, some things that they might work for? It is mainly of their futures that I speak tonight because, for many of us, our lives are on the downside. Their world is beginning.

I have spoken of the pursuit of truth as our greatest moral imperative. There is no truth about the world and humankind today that does not become darkened in the shadow of the thermonuclear mushroom and nuclear winter.

What to do? Many things. While the problem is fundamentally geo-political, politicians are mostly concerned with what their constituents are saying, and especially how to get reelected, and especially listening if the message

starts coming through loud and clear. Now I fully recognize that our opportunities for political action far transcend those in controlled societies, especially those behind the Iron Curtain. But even there, one finds great and, I think, even sincere concern about our future in this matter. One would have to be crazy today not to be concerned, and, whatever else they are, I don't think the Russians are crazy. Again, as a top Russian scientist told me not too long ago when I asked him what he was worried about he said: "I'm not worried about you attacking us because that would be suicide for you, and you shouldn't worry about us attacking you because that would be the same thing--mutual suicide. I'm really worried about your computers, and ours are worse."

Each of us and each of our institutions must do what we best can, and there are several things that we can do together. The nuclear problem, I think, involves the expertise of all of our departments and all of our faculties.

There is no dearth of intellectual materials. These are being multiplied like rabbits. In the last couple of years that I have been interested particularly in this subject, I get almost a book a week, and I have large bookshelves now filled with books I try to keep read on all aspects of the nuclear problem. There are just dozens of books coming out each year and even more articles. I have filled a whole file cabinet, all four drawers, with arti-

cles, resolutions, and new organizations working on the subject.

The book that I read first and that I found better at description of the situation than prescription of what to do about it was Jonathan Schell's Fate of the Earth, which again appeared in the New Yorker and was subsequently published by Knopf. He has just published another book, The Abolition, which again is an effort to prescribe for the problem, not all that ~~greatly~~ I think. But his description of our problem, in its historical setting, is superb. Dyson's four articles, now published as Weapons and Hope is, I think, much better at prescription--what to do about it--and he gives a lot of alternatives. As I say, he comes down to "live and let live," but within certain parameters. I think that this kind of prescription is what our universities should be opening up to our students.

Then came the Bishops' Pastoral Letter, "The Challenge of Peace: God's Promise and Our Response," with two commentaries by Philip Murnion and James Castelli. Murnion's book was Catholics and Nuclear War and Castelli's book was The Bishops and the Bomb. I wrote the preface for both of those books, and I think they are both fairly useful studies. The great virtue, in my judgment, of the Bishops' Pastoral is that, for the first time, the problem has gotten out of its technical parameters and is placed in a context of reason and of faith. It is rather modestly reticent in making

final moral judgments about all of this, but it does assert, unequivocally, that there is no possible justification imaginable for the killing of hundreds of millions of innocent people. There is no way on earth you can justify that, ~~that, anyone can~~. Given this, we have a rather compelling moral problem with offensive weapons, and also with deterrence, as long as there is not a serious effort right now to reduce and eventually eliminate nuclear weapons.

One of the difficulties is to negotiate in this matter with the Soviets, and we have all heard a lot about that. There are two fine studies in this particular area. One is by Glenn Seaborg's, ~~of~~ the University of California Press at Berkeley, entitled, Kennedy, Khrushchev and the Test Ban, and there is another by Jerry Smith, a friend of many of us here, who was a negotiator in the SALT I agreement. Doubletalk, The Story of SALT I, is the title of his book, published by Doubleday.

I have mentioned a very interesting novel, Streiber and Kunetha's Warday. Another is an earlier novel by Collins and Lapierre. They are the two who teamed up to write Is Paris Burning?, Old Jerusalem, and a number of other rather exciting books. Their novel, The Fifth Horseman, is authentically good. It is about a terrorist from Libya planting a bomb in New York City. Technically, it is well done, and it gives you some idea of what only one bomb can do to tear apart the social fabric of the world.

If you want to know what's been going on lately in negotiation, I suggest you read Strobe Talbott's book, Deadly Gambits, which appeared around Christmas time. What it boils down to is that, in the last four years, not anything very significant has been done by our President or by the Premier of the Soviet Union, and not very much attention has been given to this problem by our Secretary of State or our Secretary of Defense, who are both good men, but who have done very little in this particular field. For a country our size, a super power, the whole argument and the whole negotiation has been going on between the two Richards, one in the State Department and one in the Defense Department, both hawks, but both knifing each other, especially if we get anywhere close to some kind of arms control. It's not a very pretty story--the level of ignorance at the highest levels. When word came out of the White House that we were interested in intercontinental ballistic missiles because you could call back the missiles from submarines and airplanes, it was said that this came as a great surprise to the Navy and Air Force.

I think that many of these books, and many of the courses that have grown out of books like these, are starting to be proliferated in most of our universities for a very good reason. Also, there are a number of films and tapes, and somehow I think the films get through to people because they get at our emotions as well as our reason or a part of the moral fiber of our being, the revulsion. I

recall at a meeting we had recently in Villa Serbelloni, a Rockefeller think tank in Bellagio, Italy, we had fifteen theologians and fifteen scientists. We were looking at a film one night ~~there~~ in the Villa in this big, kind of medieval room. The film was called "Threads"; it was a BBC production and it really did get at our emotions. (It has been shown since by Turner Broadcasting in this country.) I remember so well looking around that room and seeing Russians, Chinese, Americans, British, French, Germans, Scandinavians, Brazilians watching this film showing just one bomb dropping on one English city and what happened over the next thirteen years. We had been talking at supper before the film with the Russians about "The Day After," which got a big bally-hoo in this country. They said they weren't impressed by "The Day After" because things were worse in Russia during World War II than in "The Day After" in the U.S. But that night as we watched "Threads," I was watching the Russians as well as the others, and there in the flickering light--we were showing it on a tape on a TV--people began to get more and more concerned with what was happening. Of course, there are always a couple who get up and walk out, but most of us stayed until the end. It was interesting that we got up and walked out in silence and individually. I suppose most of us were thinking the same thing--how can human beings conceivably do this to other human beings? I don't care if they are Russians, or Chinese, or Buddhists, or Muslims, or whatever; we're all

human beings and we can't do this to each other. We can't take this beautiful world and destroy it. How can we possibly let ourselves get backed into this corner and give up hope of ever leaving the corner alive? Well, I think we can, in our courses, do a great deal by the use of films and film clips.

I have to say that a number of professional groups ~~(and I'm going to briefly wind this up now),~~ are beginning to organize. For four or five years the physicians have organized because they call this the ultimate epidemic. If we don't cure this, the world will be wiped out. This group, the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, was formed by Dr. Bernie Lown of Harvard Medical School and by Dr. Chazov, who is the head of the Heart Institute in Moscow and the personal physician of both the Russian leaders. They met in Washington, and they met in Cambridge, England, and they met last, I believe, in Amsterdam and Helsinki. But after their Amsterdam meeting, Dr. Bernard Lown said the following in his report--and I think it speaks fairly bluntly for one professional group--the physicians. He said:

> We can and must instill a sense of moral revulsion [you've heard that word before] to nuclear weaponry and the Orwellian term, 'deterrence' which is but a sanitized word for indiscriminate and colossal mass murder. Our goal should be the widest conditioning of an anti-nuclear instinct as potent as hunger. Moral arousal, I believe, will help tilt the perilously balanced scale in world affairs towards survival.
>
> President Eisenhower predicted that there will

> come a day when the people will generate such a mighty popular groundswell for peace that governments will be forced to get out of their way. Such a day is no longer remote for it is beckoned by the unleashing of the deepest forces embedded in humankind when threatened by extinction.

The lawyers are now beginning to organize. We have a chapter on our campus. Business leaders are beginning to organize, and I think this is essential because many people are concerned about something that General Eisenhower also said in his Farewell Address about the military-industrial complex. There are many very responsible business leaders who are concerned about all this. A number of them are just north of here in Silicon Valley, and many of them, young, creative entrepreneurs, have retired early and are spending their whole lives, and their wives are spending their lives, and their kids, some of them, working on a movement called ~~"A World Without War."~~ "Beyond War" ** One of them, Henry Willens (a businessman, I should say), wrote a book called The Trimtab Factor which is a very interesting approach to business people on this subject.

The groups that I have been trying to get together are unusual in the sense that they haven't been together since Galileo--that is the religious leaders and scientific leaders. There's an old medieval adage that says ex malo bonum, that sometimes out of a great evil a great good can come, and I thought that maybe out of this great evil of the nuclear threat to humanity it might be possible to get a

~~**Here, Father Hesburgh refers to "Beyond War."~~

great good thing, which is to bring together people who have something to say to the world, religious leaders and scientific leaders. And I mean worldwide; I don't mean just Christian leaders. I mean Jewish leaders, Muslim leaders, Buddhists, Hindus, Confucianists, all of them. And I don't mean just American scientists, I mean scientists that we organize according to the national academies, which are generally the best collection of scientists in a given nation.

We got together a few years ago in Vienna. Cardinal Koenig and I put this meeting together, and then we had a number of other meetings in the Royal Society in London and a couple at the Pontifical Academy in Rome. (We veered that way because the Holy Father is the only religious leader who has a Pontifical Academy of Scientists, two-thirds of whom aren't Catholic. They advise him on moral problems connected with modern science, especially nuclear and environmental problems, and some genetic problems.) In any event, out of our meetings grew first a scientific statement which was signed by the presidents (twenty-three of them presidents) and the rest, representatives of the presidents of thirty-six academies of sciences, including our own Frank Press, who signed it for the National Academy of Sciences. Let me just give you one paragraph from that particular statement of the scientists. It is a five-page statement so this is just a single paragraph, but it gives you some sense of what the scientists were saying. They say:

The existing arsenals, if employed in a major war,

> could result in the immediate deaths of many hundreds of millions of people, and of untold millions more later through a variety of after-effects. [This was before we even knew about nuclear winter--they are thinking about radiation downwind.] For the first time, it is possible to cause damage on such a catastrophic scale as to wipe out a large part of civilization and to endanger its very survival. The large-scale use of such weapons could trigger major and irreversible ecological and genetic changes, whose limits cannot be predicted.

That statement was put into all the world languages--Chinese, Japanese, Hindi, Russian, English and all the European languages--and spread all over the world. It was published in Science magazine that goes to 100,000 scientists in this country, with an editorial. In Russia it was published--3,000,000 copies--in their most popular magazine which is something like Popular Mechanics. It was signed by the Bulgarians, the East Germans, the Poles, the Russians, of course, and the Czechoslovakians and Yugoslavians. We didn't have a single academy out of the thirty-six that refused to sign this--it was unanimous--and it was five pages of sentences like this.

Following that we got together a number of eastern and western religious leaders in Vienna, and they came up with a statement--I'll only read you one paragraph of theirs. Their statement was in reaction to the five-page scientific statement and their statement was much briefer--one page. But here is one paragraph from it:

> What faith impels us to say here in Vienna must be fortified by the hope that it is possible to build a world which will reflect the love of the Creator and respect for the life given us, a life

> certainly not destined [by God] to destroy itself. Because of the deterioration of the international political atmosphere and the great danger posed by the rapid developments in military technology, humanity today is in a critical period of its history. We join the scientists in their call for urgent action to achieve verifiable disarmament agreements leading [eventually] to the elimination of nuclear weapons. Nothing less is at stake than the [whole] future of humanity.

This statement was signed by the chief Catholic and Protestant leaders in America, and was signed by such widely diverse people as the Grand Mufti from North Yemen. Our friend Cardinal Koenig, Archbishop of Vienna, signed it. We had religious leaders from as far away as India and the southern peninsula signing it. I have to say that I have yet to meet scientists and religious leaders who are in disagreement about this.

There are a few fundamentalists who think that maybe it's a good thing that we have this method of destruction because that is the way God intends to destroy the world. I get letters to this effect from time to time, telling me I am going against the will of God. But I don't worry about that because if it is the will of God I haven't been manifested that will yet, and I don't intend to be party to the destruction of humankind by the greatest of all sins--a total genocide.

I'd like to return and end where I began--that we are educating persons in their totality, intellectually and morally. We are teaching students the wisdom of the past and, I hope, pointing them towards changing the future.

Their future, all of it, is threatened now as never before in the history of humankind. There may be no future if the nuclear threat is not immobilized. As I asked previously, is it conceivable that these students can spend four years with us in our universities without being confronted with this unprecedented threat, in all of its dimensions, especially its moral dimensions. At least they should understand it and the moral problems involved in it, understand what possible actions might be taken, but especially understand that they are not in a hopeless situation, that they can have hope, and that we are with them in that. We have founded an Inter-faith Academy of Peace in Jerusalem, run by a Quaker, and we are trying to do other things in the way of a course open to all of our students. I am sure there are several such courses here and in most universities today, but I think we have to do more and we have to be a little more enthusiastic about what we do. Many of our efforts will only touch a few hundred students, but through videotapes we can reach out across the world.

It seems to me that I have to confess to you, having given you this rather dire picture, that I have no magic answers. If the nuclear threat is all that I have described, as truthfully as I can, there has been no moral concern more threatening to us ever before. We must, as educators, I think, try to find some creative breakthroughs that are both strategic and possible. Even if we could influence our counterparts, educators in the Soviet Union,

to meet and discuss informally and unofficially with us our common interests in preserving the future for our students and for the world, that would at least be a beginning of some sort. I close by appealing to the most creative company I know, academia, and I appeal to them to make a move in hope that might reverse the present headlong movement towards the ultimate catastrophe--that would be an end to all we hold dear, to all that is good and true and beautiful, to all persons.

Thank you very much.

(Rev.) Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C.
President, University of Notre Dame

Notes

1. Jacques Maritain. Principes d'une politique humaniste (Paris: Paul Hartman, 1945) pp. 15-16.

2. James Billington. Commencement Address, The Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C., 21 May 1983.

3 Leslie Gelb. "Is the Nuclear Threat Manageable?" New York Times, 4 March 1984, Part VI, p. 26.

4 Freeman Dyson. Weapons and Hope (New York: Harper and Row, 1984) p. 313.

5 Dyson, p. 313.

6 Fred Kaplan. The Wizards of Armageddon (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1983) pp. 390-391.

7 Bernard Lown. IPPNW Report, Vol. I, No. 2, p. 15.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

I would like to have some questions because the beautiful thing about universities is that there are always a few people around who disagree and I say the greatest beauty of the university is that it is by definition a place where people can disagree without being disagreeable. I would welcome any challenges to what I have said or any additions because we need all the insights we can get on this problem. Who has the first question?

First Question: Dr. Helen Caldicott has given us a rather discouraging appraisal of our President's ability to grasp some of the issues you've talked about. I don't know whether you've had an opportunity to even talk with our President. I wonder whether you would like to comment or respond to what I've said as to your estimate of....

Answer: I have noticed a great difference in him as he begins his second administration. I know what Helen said because she said it to me too. I have to say that his performance on this subject during the first administration, if you believe what Strobe Talbott said (and I think it is fairly factual) is pretty dismal--both the level of understanding and the level of action. However, I was really amazed at the first press conference when the President said that one of the greatest aims of his second term would be to bring about nuclear arms control and the eventual elimination of all nuclear arms. I don't know what turned him

around to saying that--it was a little different than what he was saying at the beginning of the first term--but I applauded. I am willing to applaud good will in this area wherever I find it. I think that, whatever he said that she was referring to in the first administration, he certainly has come out loud and clear on this particular goal, at least during this admistration. I'm not that impressed by some of the people who are sent to negotiate because I'm not that convinced that (1) they are trying to negotiate that hard or (2) they are as enthusiastic about arms control as some of us are. I have to say that I thought it was a bit gauche when Max Kampelman, our chief negotiator, came back from a talk on arms control to support the build-up of the MX. It's like saying the way you cut down on arms is to add arms, and that doesn't make much sense.

Second Question: How can you explain that so many Christians have been or are for war, for weapons? I'm from Germany; we have a bad history about this. The official churches, both Protestant and the Catholic Church, were for Hitler, for instance, even though many persons were fighting against him. And now we have a Christian government. Almost all our Christian Democratic governments are for nuclear weapons. How can you explain that?

Answer: It really goes back to Einstein--that's the best explanation of all. Once this thing happened, called the splitting of the atom, or the Atomic Age, or the nuclear

(so-called) weapon or nuclear war, everything changed except our way of thinking, and our way of thinking has to change. One of the interesting things about the Bishops' Pastoral Letter, which was addressed to Christians, non-Christians and anybody who wanted to argue about it, was that they were approaching an unprecedented moral problem with almost no precedent. It would be like trying a case in the Supreme Court when there was no similar case ever tried before. They couldn't go back to Roe vs Wade or some other kind of decision.

The curious thing is that the only thing we have is a theology of war in the Christian religion, going back to Augustine, Aquinas, and the others, but we don't have a theology of peace. For some curious reason, the only precedents that the Bishops could find to appeal to in trying to put this in some kind of context of theological tradition was, first, pacifism, which has always been a kind of minority position, but a valid and good position in all the Christian churches--there's nothing wrong with being a pacifist. They made the point, which I think is valid, that individuals can be pacifist even until death, but it is pretty difficult for nation states, committed to the security of their people, to be pacifist because they are swimming in a sea of sharks.

The second thing they did was to go back and look at Augustine's theory of a just war, which is a fairly compli-

cated medieval theory or pre-medieval theory, although it was taken up again by Aquinas and commented on. There are two things that really don't bear examination or application and they are the two points that are key to the whole tradition of a just war. One is discrimination, and that is a very important element because discrimination means that you can do something without killing a lot of innocent people. But there is no way on earth you can take out the targets that the Russians have established in America or the ones we have established in Russia--and missiles are aimed at those targets, sometimes a number of them at the same target to make sure it gets blown up. There's no way on earth you can destroy those military targets (if they are that--airfields, industry, barracks, all that sort of thing) without destroying all the civilians who live around. In other words, you can't hit the Pentagon without destroying Washington, D.C., and just because it's government doesn't mean there aren't a lot of innocent people--wives, children, spouses, and other people--living there. So discrimination is absolutely impossible in the case of nuclear war, and that qualification for a just war can't be applied in a nuclear war. That's why our way of thinking has to be different; even the application of principles has to be different.

The second principle, of course, is proportionality. We are told in Augustine's theory of a just war that you can only use power proportionately. In other words, if somebody stepped on the emperor's skirt, you couldn't kill fifty

people because someone did that. There's no proportion between fifty people or one person in stepping on his skirt or stealing his favorite horse, if ~~you will~~. The proportionality is very important, but there's no proportionality possible ~~for killing~~ hundreds of millions of innocent people; you can't possibly find something proportionate to that. You can say that if the American people feel set upon, because taxation without representation is abhorrent, and because they are being pushed around by King George, they can put on a revolutionary war and a few people will be killed (relatively few), but at least the country becomes independent, and they feel good about themselves as a new nation. I think one could argue very well that there was a proportionality between the violence and the difficulties that were undergone in the Revolutionary War and the fact that this great nation was born from an oppressive situation to a free situation. It was a great new Constitution that was picked up by many other nations throughout the world. That's proportionality. But there's no proportionality for wiping out the northern hemisphere and everybody in it. I was talking to an Indian one day (an Indian Indian, from Calcutta) and he said, "Well, you guys go and destroy each other and we'll run the world." And I said, "You haven't been looking at the globe lately--all of India is above the equator--if we go, you go." He said, "That's different." And I said, "Well, that's the way it is."

So, I think even Christians, if you will, need a new way of thinking about war. I'm willing to say I've never been a pacifist--maybe it's because I'm half Irish--but anyway, I've never been (~~my mother was Irish~~) a pacifist, and yet I'm willing to say out loud that I'm a nuclear pacifist and argue for it. I would never, never, never conceive of being involved in a nuclear war if I could stop it, because there is no proportionality and there is no discrimination. I think the answer, as I started out saying, is Einstein's. We have to have a new way of thinking about even such commonplace things as war. I think that war has been made obsolete by nuclear weapons or so-called weapons.

Third Question: When you think about some of the things that powered the build-up on both sides, with the misapprehensions that we have of both people. You know the Russians are vilified in the press every day and I'm sure that the Americans are vilified in the Russian press every day. We don't have a very clear understanding of what Russian people are like or they of what we are like.

I heard one time that one proposal to at least delay the pushing of the button was to place the button inside a man's chest, and when the president had to take a knife and cut open the chest, he'd hit the button. Oh! he couldn't do that! He could never do that; he could never kill that one person to push the button! Not thinking about the hundreds and millions of people that would be killed when the

button was pushed. It's the reality of that one person versus the hundreds and millions that we want from the Russians and Americans.

How do you think that we can bring on a better understanding of the Russian people and them of ourselves? I think that that would go along with the....

Answer: You have put your finger on what is maybe the most central and most important addition to what I said tonight, which I didn't go into specifically. In our meeting in Bellagio and some other meetings, I remember especially George Rathjens of MIT, who has been very much involved in this, Victor Weisskopf, Carl Sagan, and a few others. We got talking one day, we were trying to produce a document at the end of our five-day session. And George said, "Look, let's begin at the beginning. There is no sense in talking about nuclear disarmament, there's no sense in talking about anything to do with coming to grips with this threat unless we begin to do something about the poisonous relationship with each other." Now there were two Russians in the room. There was the head of the Russian space research, Sagdeyev, and there was another Russian, Kokashin, who was the number two man in the America Institute in Moscow--two very important people in the Russian scheme of things. One would be the equivalent of our head of NASA. So they nodded their heads because they saw the truth of what George was saying, that the kernel here has to have a

better relationship between these two super powers. We can't possibly talk about making peace or making accommodations until we learn not necessarily to trust each other, because that distrust is so deep that if you waited for that to be cured, it would take a long, long time. I keep saying you can play poker with someone you don't trust as long as all the cards are kept above the table and nothing is coming out of the sleeves. Now the interesting thing about this discussion is that a number of us have been talking about what might be called very wild ideas.

I was talking to a number of the faculty people on this--we had a little seminar this afternoon--and one idea that I think makes a lot of sense would be to say, "We're going to take ten Russians and ten Americans who are beyond suspicion. I mean people who are obviously not going to sell out their country, be it Russia or the U.S. It would be people like maybe Cyrus Vance or even Jimmy Carter. You could get people who have had high, responsible positions. It might be David Rockefeller; you can name a whole lot of different kinds of people. It might be a university person. You would get ten people who ninety-nine percent of Americans would say were decent people weren't going to do in our country. There are a lot of such people around; I mean our country is full of such people who have served fully, who have given a lot, who have won their spurs as being dependable, conscientious, serious, honest people, and intelligent too, and creative. Those are all important adjectives. The

Russians certainly have people; I know some myself that I would put in that category. The problem is that when we discuss this with a fellow like Gromyko, he says, "Well, you have private people and they can be apart from the government. They can sit down and talk about these things and come to some agreements and your government is not bound. But everybody we send out on a meeting is a government person--we don't have any private people--everybody is a government agent. That's just the way we are organized." And all we can answer to that is, "Well, so what. If they are people who have been in and out of government or have been in different parts of government, who are people that you have confidence in and we know are honest, let's get our twenty people."

Now what do they talk about? If I were organizing or orchestrating this, first of all I wouldn't go to Geneva, and I wouldn't go to Vienna, and I wouldn't go to Helsinki. I'd put them, I think, out on a desert island someplace. If I could, I would put them in outer space and tell them you're not coming back till you come up with this agreement. But, anyway, put them on an island and put them on there with not too much food, or not too good food, and tell them you're going to have to cook it yourself and wash up afterwards. You're going to have to live in a tent, when there are mosquitos around and we're a little short of bug juice. You're going to have to do your own translating, no class E translators in booths and all that stuff. You're not going

to be able to sit on two sides of a table--there isn't going to be any table. You're going to be sitting on your haunches around a campfire and beating off the mosquitos, but you're going to have an agenda which is very simple.

We're going to ask you to come back with fifty propositions that are unanimously agreed to by all twenty of you. If someone disagrees, strike it. They are going to have to be unanimously agreed to by the Russians and Americans, all ten of each. I would hope in that group there would be not only men and women, but young people as well as older people, and certainly people of great good will and people of great creative imagination. I would hope that there would be a few artists in that group. But, in any event, they could live a fairly rugged life without the amenities of the DuBarle Hotel in Geneva or the Intercontinental or the Sacher in Vienna, and they could do their own cooking and washing, and they could fend for themselves but not in a terrible place; they could be out in the Seychelles. The sun shines almost every day, but it rains too, and that would be good for them on occasion.

But let's suppose that they came back with a rather interesting document of fifty things, starting with general things like: It's in our common interest not to blow each other up. It's in our common interest to understand each other's fears as well as each other's hopes and insecurities. It's in our common interest to just literally, as

people, get to know our different cultures better. It's in our common interest not to threaten each other, to live and let live, if you want to take Freeman Dyson's term. And then you would have to get down to more specific things, and I can think of a whole hatful of things like: exchanging 10,000 students a year between the age of eighteen and twenty, and making sure they go across both lands from coast to coast, live with families, have to learn the language. They would have to go to school, whatever school is available in the area, have to have Russian brothers, sisters, mothers, and fathers, and comparable American families for the Russians. Take a chance that some may not come back, take a chance that some may be perverted--you're not taking a big chance with 10,000. I also like to think that our President, whoever is in charge, would be a little slower to press the button on Russia when he knew 10,000 American kids were living there.

Anyway, this kind of thing may sound silly, but the fact is that the reason we don't think about attacking the British tomorrow morning, or the Canadians, or the Mexicans, is that we have been living next to each other. We know something about each other, and we have our family squabbles from time to time, but we're not about to start shooting each other, certainly not to destroying each other's countries and cultures totally.

It's that kind of imaginative thing that is lacking in this. The thing is too grim; the thing lacks spontaneity and imagination. If they could come back with this list, say fifty propositions, some very imaginative, some brand new, but all of them positive and all of them agreed to unanimously as being good--not only in the interest of the Soviets and the Americans, but for the rest of humanity. After all, God didn't give us the right to blow them up, nor the Russians. So let me just say that then you would have an agenda for a summit meeting. The two top people, whether it is Gorbachev and Reagan, or whoever is in charge at that point would be able to start out by saying, "Hey, I notice your guys all agree with this." and he would say, "Hey, I notice your guys all agree with it. What do you think? Did you read it?" "Yeah, I read them. You know some of them are a little far out, but we could do them tomorrow if we decided. Well, that is a new way of thinking, let's do them." And it moves. That would be like the McCloy-Zorin agreement that was signed many years ago. There has not been a better agreement signed since, although I doubt if many people in the audience even remember what was said. It was fine agreement about U.S. and U.S.S.R. in this kind of troubled world. We need something new like that, but what we don't need is that monumental chess game that goes on in Geneva where the only question the press has every night is: Who won what today and who lost today? It's not a game, it's too important to be a game. It's a total loss. You

don't just lose your paper money as in Monopoly; you lose everything. But that is one way of approaching it.

It's getting late and I know some of you want to be polite and not get up and leave so why don't we say one more question and we'll call it.... One more question.

Fourth Question: Father, if you actually managed to do that, if we managed to do it and get those fifty people who did their thing and then came back, I personally would be willing to bet that even though they hadn't decided the issue as to whether they were believers or atheists, that they could still do it because....What bothers me very much is to hear our government leaders telling us again and again that we, the believers, are against the nonbelievers. There was a fellow once, named Karl Rahner, a man that I respect, who used to talk about anonymous believers, people who might believe because they're human beings, and certainly not necessarily because they can quote their Christianity, or whatever, in certain phrases. I wonder if you can comment on that. I'm not asking you a question....

Answer: I can tell you quite honestly about the first meeting we had in November in Vienna, Thanksgiving weekend, after that walk across the campus where I was almost smitten with light from heaven to say you've got to do something about this, anything, but you've got to do something, even if you give up everything else except the university. We opened that first meeting; I remember so well because I

asked the Russian representatives--we had the Vice Chairman of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Velikhov; we had the foreign secretary, Skryabin, and they had a translator in Russian-English--and I said, "You guys are not exactly known by the fervor of your piety, and I am wondering how you would feel about this project. That's why we're getting together here, and this project is very simple; we're going to try to get religious leaders worldwide, and we're going to try to get scientific leaders worldwide, to make common cause against nuclear war for all the reasons we both know. Now, if you don't want to get together with religious leaders, this is the time to say so, and, if that is true, we can all go to the opera tonight and relax and go walking in the Tiergarten, but we will forget about this project." And they said, "Oh, no, no, no, no, no, no, no, we've been talking to each other as scientists and if the religious leaders can somehow give us credibility because of their moral stature and we can give them better information because we are the scientists and we create the thing, we'll do anything; we're scared." So I said, "Okay, the meeting will continue." And we went on for three days and that was the beginning.

Velikhov came to the next six meetings. Now I paid his way to two of them, and he paid his own way to four of them. The last time he said, "My funds in the Academy are getting low, could you?" And I said, "Sure." But it was interesting that after one of our lunches where we were discussing

ex malo bonum--how some good can come out of evil things--I said, "Yevgeniy, let's go out for a walk." (We'd had one of those typical heavy Vienna lunches.) So we went out to walk around the block to walk off the schlag and the beer and, as we were walking around the block--it was kind of a brisk day in January--he said to me, "Can you tell me why I should be as concerned about this as you are?" Because I was really emitting a little feeling of concern, obviously. And I said, "Sure, do you have a grandson?" And he said, "Funny you should say that, I just had my first grandchild, a beautiful little boy about three months ago." And I said, "Excuse the brusqueness of my response, but I have to answer your question. Would you like to have him vaporized?" And he said, "Oh God, no!" (They always invoke God when they are excited.) Anyway, he then began to talk to me about his grandson, and I said, "Well, you know the world is full of grandfathers, maybe we ought to start a grandfather's club and work against nuclear, and a grandmother's club, that would even be more potent. As a result of this conversation--little things that happen when you're at these meetings and you forget about them--three meetings later, we happened to be, of all things,... (And here you've got this very important communist scientist whom the Italians wouldn't let into Italy. The Vatican had to go over and fight with them to get the Communist into Italy so he could have a meeting at the Vatican. Everything was backed into, but that's the way this nuclear thing is.) Anyway, he was

there and we had a coffee break and he said, "Let's go out and get some air again as we did in Vienna." I said, "Sure." So we went out and we walked down this path. We were up behind St. Peter's, up on the hillside there. (There was a little castello where we had the meetings, headquarters of the Pontifical Academy of Sciences.) We went walking down towards an old building that was six or seven hundred years old. It was kind of a meditative moment and he reached in his pocket and pulled out his billfold. He reached in the billfold and pulled out a photograph and handed it to me. It was a beautiful little boy sitting in a field of yellow flowers, and he said "I just got back from vacation at the Black Sea, and that's my grandson, and that's why I'm here."

Now, I'm not going to be such a bum that I'm not going to believe that he's sincere. Well, you can say that he's conning you and he doesn't really mean it. When I hear grandmothers and grandfathers talk about their grandchildren, I think they mean it, and I'm willing to trust them.

EUGENE M. BURKE CSP LECTURESHIP
ON RELIGION AND SOCIETY • UC SAN DIEGO

July 12, 1986

Dear Father Ted,

Here is a slightly edited version of the transcription you already saw of your marvelous inaugural Burke lecture. Would you please look it over and send it back to me with any further corrections you might want so that we can get it off to the people who have ordered it. My address is:

1338 Eolus Avenue
Leucadia, California, 92024

We were all so very pleased to learn that among the fruits of your memorable visit here was Mrs. Kroc's gift. May your splendid work for peace continue.

Sincerely,

Nancy Hatch

UC SAN DIEGO FOUNDATION • Q-011 • LA JOLLA • CALIFORNIA • 92093

From the Desk of

RICHARD W. CONKLIN, *Director of Public Relations and Information*
UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME • NOTRE DAME, IND. 46556 • (219) 239-7367

7-29

Dear Ms. Hatch:

Father Hesburgh's speech text is attached, with a few changes. It is now in shape to send to those who have requested it. If there are any questions, kindly call me.

Richard Conklin

(copy of corrected text to Mtt)