

The Monk in the Diaspora

THOMAS MERTON

I. *The Diaspora Situation*

It is no secret that the Church finds herself in crisis, and the awareness of such a fact is 'pessimism' only in the eyes of those for whom all change is necessarily a tragedy. It would seem more realistic to follow the example of Pope John (and of Pope Paul after him) and to envisage courageously the challenges of an unknown future in which the Christian can find security not, perhaps, in the lasting strength of familiar human structures but certainly in the promises of Christ and in the power of the Holy Spirit. After all, Christian hope itself would be meaningless if there were no risks to face and if the future were definitively mortgaged to an unchanging present. Christian hope is confident not in metaphysical immobility but in the dynamism of unflinching love. 'Crisis' means 'judgment', and the present is always being judged as it gives way to what was, yesterday, the future. Only when we try to drag yesterday bodily with us into the future does 'crisis' become 'cataclysm'. An 'optimism' that insists on denying evident realities is hardly inspired by Christian truth, and true hope is that which finds motives for confidence precisely in the 'crisis' which seems to threaten that which is dearest to us: for it is here above all that the power of God will break through the meaningless impasse of prejudices and cruelties in which we always tend to become entrapped. It is in the crises of history most of all that the Church knows, from experience, that the truth shall make her free.

The life of St Fronton, apostle of Perigueux in South Western France, (a legend with little or no historical foundation), relates that the Emperor who had exiled the saint to that region with many companions, afterward repented of his act and sent seventy camels there, loaded with supplies for the exiles. Once when this story was being told to a catechism class at Perigueux, one of the children asked, with understandable curiosity, why there were no camels to be seen in the neighbourhood today. 'My child', replied the Abbé, 'we no longer deserve them'.

One of the problems of this present critical moment in the history of the Church is how to evaluate our Christian position in the world.

How do we look at our past? How do we interpret our present and our future in the light of that past? Sometimes one gets the feeling that we meet our confusions, resentments and disorientation with answers like that of the Abbé to the children. Once our world was Christian. The Church was omnipotent in public and private life. It could, and did, judge everything (*spiritualis judicat omnia*). Because of this there were saints everywhere. It was a world of miracles because it was a world of faith. There were enemies, no doubt. But they threatened us from outside our own civilization (Moslems, Turks) and they gave us opportunities to unite ourselves against them in crusades, thus consolidating our cultural and religious position in firm affirmations of our faith.

This, we have always assumed, is precisely the way the world is supposed to be. Of course, we admit we must not oversimplify. The middle ages were 'not ideal in every respect'. Yet let us face the fact: we are still overwhelmingly convinced that the part played by the Medieval Church in society is *normal* and that consequently our task today is to work toward the re-establishment of the norm: a world unified as was medieval Europe, under the benign and total guidance of the Church. To many, the function of the Vatican Council is simply this: *aggiornamento*, certainly, but up-dating in terms of reform which will restore to the Church the same efficiency and sweeping influence she exercised in the time of Innocent III. Meanwhile even the faithful are dangerously infected with modernistic notions. . . In a word, we no longer deserve those camels. Yet there is no other way out. We must strive once again to deserve them! We must get back to the days when camels came to Perigueux.

Modern theologians who are sometimes regarded as dangerous precisely for this reason have questioned the validity of such an attitude. We might well expect to find them writing in countries like Germany and Austria, where the Church has experienced, beyond possibility of doubt, that she no longer has the power she had in the Middle Ages. Such writers believe that the whole form of the Church's existence in the world is radically changing. It has indeed been changing for several centuries. We no longer have such a thing as a Christian society, or a Christian culture, and what is more these writers even go so far as to challenge the very concept of a Christian culture. Has there ever been such a thing at all? Catholics and Protestants are basically at one in these speculations. On the one hand we find men like Karl Barth, Rudolf Bultmann, Dietrich Bonhoeffer. And on the Catholic side Karl Rahner

who frankly declares, in *Mission and Grace*,¹ that Christians are now living in a diaspora, and that they had better take good care not to crawl still further into a spiritual ghetto. This view was presented with earnest conviction and great power twenty years ago by Fr Alfred Delp, S.J., who was put to death by Hitler.

Rahner's thesis is frank and it is one which many will find deeply disturbing. He is saying, in so many words, that the camels never came to Perigueux in the first place and that if we build our lives and our apostolate on the theory that Medieval Christendom is the norm for Christianity in the world, we are heading for serious trouble. He says, 'It is never possible simply to deduce from Christian principles of belief and morality any one single pattern of the world as it ought to be' (p. 9). 'Even in earlier times the particular concrete form given to the Christian ideal was not determined by Christianity as such (though indeed by Christians) but by other historical forces and influences. But it was possible in earlier times to *confuse* the original principles and the practice of them, with a particular ideal at work on the historical level and to regard this synthesis as final and obligatory' (p. 14 f). Hence we must face the fact that 'we do not have a complete recipe for the world's problems in our pockets'.

Does this mean that as Christians we take no interest in the problems of the world, and have no concern for them? That there is a complete fissure in our lives between the 'sacred' and the 'profane'? This is exactly what Rahner is not saying. When he denies that there is, or can be, one 'official' and indubitable Christian approach to economic, political and cultural matters, he is really throwing open the way to a much more living, more varied and more creative Christian action in the world. He is, in terms of a distinction which he himself makes, denying that all 'Christian' action is necessarily 'Ecclesial'. In other words there is a whole sphere of life where the Christian layman, precisely as Christian and as a responsible member of the Holy People of God, is called upon to take original and creative action in his own sphere. The principles to be followed are made plain on the 'Ecclesial' level, but the application is left to the prudence of the individual Christian.

Thus the political action of the Christian does not become confused with projects centered around clerical interest and advantage, nor is it inevitably associated with the propagation of an official message which the rest of the world is not disposed to hear. But on the other hand

¹Rahner, Karl, S. J., *Mission and Grace*, Vol. I, Sheed and Ward, 1963.

this Christian action is concretely ordered to advancing the work of Redemption and deepening the penetration of grace into the realm of society and nature. As Rahner says, this Christian action, though not 'Ecclesial' is nevertheless supernatural. It is 'action of Christians but not action of the Church' (p. 67).

Rahner wants to show that we must intervene in the social life of our world, and we must do so as Christians, guided by Christian principles. But he also wants to make clear that we cannot propagate all our social ideas precisely in the name of the Church, invoking her authority. We tend to think that loyalty to the Church demands truculent invocation of her authority even when this brings discredit upon the Church and causes Christianity itself to be attacked for political reasons. 'If we make some synthesis of Christian principles and our own historical preferences and then propagate that as what Christianity unconditionally demands, to stand or fall by it, then people will take us at our word in this false declaration. They will then unavoidably combat Christianity itself' (p. 16).

Rahner, speaking not as historian or sociologist but as a theologian declares not only that our present situation 'can be characterized as that of a diaspora', (p. 20) but insists (and this is more important) that *theologically* we are obliged to accept this fact as the starting point for all conclusions about our behaviour as Christians in the modern world. Our diaspora situation is then not simply an unavoidable evil, traceable to the infidelities of Christians and to the godlessness of neo-pagans and materialists ('we have not deserved the camels'). It is not just something we must put up with as 'permitted' by the divine will for our testing. It is not a state of affairs which we can hope to reverse by a more earnest apostolate supported by greater purity and zeal. It is irreversible, and it is moreover a state of affairs 'a "must" in terms of the history of salvation' (p. 20).

This is a strong statement. Rahner qualifies it. It is not what *ought to be*, (yet are we so sure we know what ought to be?) and it is in fact in contradiction with what we would expect after the Gospel has been preached for two millenia. It is not something we can accept with passive fatalism. Rahner is not a quietist. Nor should we simply sit back with grim satisfaction and wait for the bomb to confirm our apocalyptic prognostication by wiping out the whole intolerable mess. We must accept the diaspora situation *as existing* and as certain to go on existing. It is not something 'to be grimly endured and fought against', but it '*has a significance for salvation*'.

This is a very radical pronouncement, but we must pay serious attention to it. It is the kind of thinking that led Pope John XXIII to open a dialogue with the left, something which to the majority of the world's Catholics would have seemed entirely unthinkable if the good old Pope had not gone and done it. Nor is the seriousness of his step even now fully appreciated. There is a tendency to explain this and other 'revolutionary' steps taken by Pope John as the aberrations of a saintly old man.

But are we to assume that Pope John ought to have looked at Russia in exactly the same way as St Pius V looked at the Turk? Such an assumption, judged from Rahner's viewpoint, would sterilize all truly Christian action in the atomic age.

The future of the Church is in any case a totally new kind of existence in a world which is, and will continue to be, entirely secular. After all, is this new? The fact that the world remains worldly is not a disaster and it does not constitute a defeat for Christ and His Church. On the contrary, Rahner takes the view that the world is secular and will go on being secular in spite of our objections. The diaspora character of our age is going to increase. Rahner has little faith in such ideals as those of Fr Lombardi with his hopes of a 'better (Christian) world' as a result of better organized and more fervent apostolate. 'The new age of Jesus Christ, as prophesied by Fr Lombardi, is certainly not going to dawn for some considerable while. On the contrary, the Christendom of the Middle Ages and after. . . is going to disappear with ever increasing speed. For the causes which have brought about this process in the West are still at work and have not yet had their full effect' (p. 25).

These are statements which may perhaps seem gratuitous, and they can certainly be disputed. Our purpose here is not to argue with Rahner, but to get a good clear look at his thesis and to understand it correctly. He is certainly not saying that Christian action in the world has no hope of achieving anything. On the contrary, he believes that it is absolutely essential, especially now, precisely because we are entering the *diaspora*, when 'the Church's vital power and her salvational import for the world must be manifested' in the secular sphere (p. 60). We cannot understand this unless we see that for Rahner the 'world' and 'secularity' or even the 'profane' are not categories which by their very nature *exclude* and *obstruct* the action of grace. They are on the contrary fully embraced by the order of redemption and the world must be brought to an awareness of this, not however by official and

'ecclesial' intervention but by the witness of the Christian layman. To admit that the diaspora situation is one where clerical action will be frustrated and impeded, and to accept this fact is not, for Rahner, to admit defeat. On the contrary, refusal to accept this means that the Church's energies in the diaspora will be dissipated in useless and frantic struggles to assert her authority where that assertion has relatively little apostolic meaning or usefulness, and where much greater good would be done for souls by another approach. What is the 'diaspora situation'?

It is not a situation which Christians should desire, or even accept with full willingness. We must indeed regret it. It is therefore a situation which is deplorable because essentially unfavourable to the Church, now considered not as a political or social entity, but as the Body of Christ. However, we know from the Bible that hostility between the Church and the world is inevitable. It remains only for us to interpret this situation of conflict properly and take a genuinely Christian attitude. This demands faith in the promises of Christ that His Church will endure, and expectation of the combat, persecution, and ever more critical struggle in which 'the victory of Christianity (will) not be the fruit of immanent development and . . . progressive leavening of the world, (but will be) the act of God coming in judgment to gather up world history into its wholly unpredictable and unexpected end' (p. 27).

The diaspora situation is one then in which the Church is a stumbling block to the world, a sign of contradiction. In this situation the faith of the individual Christian is always threatened, never fully secure. Vocation to the faith is itself much more of a wager, because the Church is hindered in her (rightful) activities of preaching and teaching, and the prevailing secular culture is if not anti-Christian, at least un-Christian. The clergy will no longer have a privileged social status. They will be more and more a despised or at least unappreciated class. The 'problem of Church and state' will have ceased practically to exist except in secret conflicts of the individual conscience. But here it may indeed be terribly acute, for the individual Christian will be simultaneously a member of Christ and a citizen of a perhaps godless society. Indeed, the one thing above all others that will characterize the Church in Rahner's 'diaspora situation' will be the heroism and total dedication of those who take their faith seriously enough to remain Christians under such conditions. The Church will have no support from secular power, no subsidies, but will depend permanently

'on the good will of her ordinary members'. With all these obstacles the Church, even though to some extent reduced to silence, will *continue her missionary activity*, but now in radically new forms in which the purity of individual witness will take precedence over anything else. Not only will the Church continue to preach the Gospel, without defeatism and without rancour, she will *remain on the offensive*. But this 'offensive' will be completely independent of human power relying, like that of the Apostles, on the power of God.

In fact the word 'offensive' is perhaps ill-chosen. It is not meant to suggest truculence and aggression. Rahner is talking about an attitude of openness, understanding, and sympathy which enables the Catholic to discover unsuspected values in a secular world which he has hitherto regarded only with mistrust and with contempt. Rahner is therefore not prescribing a resolute and military advance to 'conquer' the world and bring it entirely into subjection under ecclesiastical influence or discipline. He calls for a positive and truly apostolic effort to encounter the non-Christian on his own ground in order to bring him the Gospel message, in a form in which he can best understand and receive it. But if we merely invite him to enter with us into a ghetto of antiquated customs and rituals, dominated by a censorious theology which seems grimly opposed to everything he experiences as 'life', he will turn away from us in despair.

2. *The Monastic Vocation*

Rahner's essay is addressed mainly to lay-apostles. Has it any relevance for the monastic Orders?

It is curious that the one saint singled out for mention as an example of one who understood a diaspora situation is St Benedict. Without necessarily agreeing with Rahner's statement that St Benedict 'refounded monasticism' (as if the copious monastic literature of fifth century Gaul did not give evidence of a rich pre-Benedictine monastic life in the West) we can profitably consider the author of the Benedictine Rule as one who, in a world which he saw was alien to his own ideals, nevertheless lived a fully Christian life which was fruitful beyond his own wildest expectations. And we must remember that in the sixth century the monk was still a layman not a cleric.

The much publicized monastic revival of our own time suggests that the monastic life is, or can be, one of the ways in which the Church can adjust to her 'diaspora situation'. We might however mention that the monastic movement in its present state of progress does not give us evidence that perfect adjustment is on the way, still less that it has been

already achieved. The development of monasticism in America so far may well turn out to have been more of a phenomenon than an achievement. In any case the vocational boom is over. The tidal-wave has receded, and it has left stranded on the world's shores a great number of disillusioned aspirants who, for a few months or years, had desperately sought happiness and peace in the contemplative life. Their failure is to be blamed perhaps on them, but also on the peculiar structural ambiguities of monasticism in its present state. One may well doubt that monasticism can be expected to solve the problems of the Church in the diaspora. This is not demanded of it. But let us at least hope that it can reach a creative solution of its own problems—and of this there seems to be some chance.

The effectiveness of the monk's presence in the world and of his monastic witness to the Gospel of Christ will depend on his ability to see his own place in the world correctly. He too must learn to understand his monastic vocation in relation to the general diaspora situation of the whole Church.

This is not going to be entirely easy, for while in theory, monks are supposed to think in terms of the original monastic ideals and the earliest sources, in practice they think, as they have been formed to think, in terms of an institution that preserves a set character, acquired in the days when the Church dominated all of society, and in which the monks played a most important part in helping her to do so.

Even though the *ordo monasticus* in Western Europe was swept almost entirely out of existence by the French Revolution and the Napoleonic wars, it was restored in the nineteenth century by men whose devotion to the medieval past made it impossible for them to conceive a monastery that was not a fortress of medieval ideas, culture, worship and life. The whole concept of monastic revival was at first largely a matter of keeping alive in the world the values and customs that flourished in the Middle Ages, and which present an undeniably convincing picture of the vitality that once resulted from the Church's pervasive influence in feudal agrarian society.

There can be no question of the reality of these values. No one who has lived for ten or twenty years in a Cistercian or Benedictine monastery, or for that matter no one who has lived there for even a few months, can deny that there is a basic sanity and order, a peace and sense of fulfilment, an authentic religious reality, that belongs precisely to the ancient and medieval aspects of the monastic life. The fact that

this authenticity exists, and that it makes possible a rare and balanced life in the midst of a convulsed and distracted world, certainly accounts for quite a few genuine monastic vocations. At the same time, it probably explains many of the failures and departures of vocations that were perhaps, if the truth were known, equally genuine.

The unquestioned beauty and perennial significance of such things as Gregorian chant, the monastic ritual and habit, the Carolingian style of life maintained by the observances, the study of monastic texts and so on, are offset by the fact that most modern men (at any rate in a country like America) are quite unable to live fruitful and 'meaningful' lives in a milieu where *everything* is regulated according to the outlook and the habits of thought that once prevailed in a now extinct culture. Monastic obedience, for instance, is not simply the charismatic obedience that was envisaged by the monastic fathers and laid down in ancient Rules or in the Apophthegmata of the desert. It is *also* heavily coloured by the authoritarian world view of an age in which the Church was a mighty temporal power and the monk regarded the world not only as the first Christians did (as something to be fled from) but also as the Medieval Church did (as a vast reservoir of secular power which could be harnessed for ecclesiastical use by commands and anathemas). The result is that monastic observance, poverty, obedience and so on tend to serve not only the purpose of the monk's own sanctification, but also the maintenance of an institution whose function is to proclaim the superiority of the feudal and hierarchical way of life as that which is fully and authentically 'Christian' because it bears witness to the days when the Church enjoyed an uncontested power. Note, too, that while modern monasticism goes back in its style and structure to the Carolingian monastic reform (the Cistercian return to Benedict was a not altogether successful attempt to get back beyond Charlemagne) it has also acquired numerous other features in the course of time. Even the more austere orders do not retain the pure and severe nobility of the eleventh or twelfth century. There have been all the nuances and insinuations of late medieval piety, of Post-Tridentine organization and of ecclesiastical baroque, so that now the monastery is a highly complex and antiquated organism where permanent and timeless values are confused with irrelevancies and impertinences imposed with all the solemnity of dogmas of the faith.

Much may still be said in favour of the order and beauty of this antique style of life, but, taken as a whole, it survives rather as an interesting anachronism than as an inspiration to the dormant religious

sense that is still present in every man, no matter how 'godless' he may claim to be. A monastery that simply offers an energetic and totally organized excursion into the past will not find much to recommend it in the diaspora as described by Karl Rahner.

Yet it would be a very serious mistake to assume that the monastic order simply needs to be reshaped in a new contemporary mode, without a painstaking study of what is really essential to monasticism and what is not. There is no question that a thorough revision is called for in the accidentals of monastic observance, particularly in all those matters that effect the outward forms, the 'style' of monastic life, work, obedience, silence, solitude, poverty and prayer. But any injury done to the essence of these things will cost dearly, and will threaten the existence of the monastery or Order that tries to dispense with what is indispensable.

Even in distinguishing substance and accident, we must remember that accidentals can have a serious importance of their own. Gregorian chant, for example, is *accidental* in monastic liturgy. Yet it has a timelessness and universality, a true spiritual depth which make it exceedingly difficult to replace by something even half as serious. Are we to assume that those who cling to Gregorian are merely antiquarian cranks? On the other hand, it would be vain to try to use Gregorian chant with English texts, and the vernacular liturgy is already well established in monasteries where the laybrothers have an English office.

An urgent need for new forms is now felt in monasteries everywhere. The danger, at least in America, is that the 'new forms' will be instituted by men who have not had sufficient formation or experience in the living monastic tradition. These will be men who do not have a real sense of monastic values and who tend to confuse the relics of medieval style and outlook with monastic tradition as such. They may at the same time embrace irrelevancies, and throw out values that are irreplaceable. In this way, the monastic community will be reduced to a group of devout and organized cheesemakers (or schoolmasters), relatively prosperous, moderately disciplined, sharing the consolations of the latest liturgical piety and togetherness around the TV. If Rahner's predictions about the diaspora are correct, such communities will not be able to exist in it, and there will be no serious reason for them to do so. The argument that this style of life can be better appreciated by the men and world of our time has no weight and in any case the monk should not concern himself directly with the impression he makes on

his fellow man, even though he imagines that by creating the 'right image' he is exercising an indirect apostolate. The mere fact of consciously courting the esteem and appreciation of modern man immediately makes us suspect (and rightly so) in his eyes.

Let us consider for a moment the man of our time, and let us assume that he is, by and large, already so indifferent to religion that he creates our diaspora situation for us. Whatever may be his state of indifference, this man still retains an ineradicable, though dormant, religious sense. He is, furthermore, receiving actual graces and may perhaps be united to God by grace without realizing it. Such a one may well know, intuitively, what to expect from a monastery. He may obscurely recognize that a monk is, or ought to be, a man who has gone through a radical experience of 'conversion' or *metanoia* (even though these concepts may not be familiar). As a result of this response to a mysterious call, the monk has dedicated himself *unconditionally* to a radical quest for truth outside the bounds of social convention and organization, in a *life of solitude*.

In Christian tradition, the monastic life is an ascetic charism, or a special call of grace, demanding complete and unconditional renunciation of the ordinary style of human life, not in order to become part of a *hierarchical institution with rigid rules and complex ceremonies*, but in order to 'seek God'. (St Benedict gives this sincere search for God, *si revera Deum quaerit*, as the first sign of a true vocation.) What is important is the radical change and the unconditional dedication of the monk's life, and not its sacred formalities, its ceremonies and its hierarchical organization. The chief means used by the monk in his ardently committed and deeply personal 'search' are silence, solitude, austerity, penance, poverty, obedience, meditation, reading, liturgical worship, productive work, chastity and other characteristic disciplines. Where these are seriously pursued, whether in a systematically organized communal structure or out of it, the monastic charism may clearly manifest its presence even to one who has no idea of 'charisms' or 'vocations' or indeed of religion itself.

This charismatic vocation of the monk does, in one sense, constitute a barrier between himself and the world. But we would show our total ignorance of the monastic life if we thought, by diminishing the seriousness of the vocation, to bring the monk into fruitful contact with the world. On the contrary, this *separation* from the world constitutes the basis, indeed the only valid basis, for his dialogue with the world. The monk, as such, is actually of no interest to anyone except in so far as he

is really a monk. It would be a pity indeed for him to try to arouse sympathy and initiate serious conversations by assuring everyone that he lives just as they do and shares all their interests without exception. Yet at the same time he must not insist so much on his difference that he withdraws into a resentful and negative solitude, completely turning his back on the rest of men, giving them up with their wickedness to justly deserved perdition. The monk who simply confronts the world of the diaspora with a polite curse, a formula of reprobation and disdain, or even a tear of genuine pity, will not justify his existence in it and will probably cease to exist.

What is really important is first of all a genuine renunciation of the world, a fully authentic monastic solitude and a serious life of prayer, which alone can guarantee the truth and the charity of the monk's contact with the world. But then there is required a *fruitful sense of polarity* in which the monk and, say, the atheist intellectual are able to discover not only that they can treat one another politely, *but that they are indeed brothers*, and that they share many of the same concerns, for example in the area of world peace, racial justice, and indeed everything that concerns the well-being and development of man. This 'dialogue' will remain, in the life of the monk, a secondary and accidental concern. The monastery will by no means be organized *for this as for an end*, even though secondary, since the monastic charism is not 'for' anything else. It is what it is: the search for God in unconditional renunciation. Yet it paradoxically liberates the monk so that he can, when occasion exceptionally demands, communicate with his fellow man and indeed do much to 'give full scope to the forces of redemption' (Rahner, p. 59) that must shape the world of his time.

The monastic apostolate is, of course, primarily one of prayer. But since some degree of hospitality is one of the essentials of Benedictine life the monastic community does remain in contact with the world, and should normally offer to men of the world a place of silence, peace and prayer. The need for such things in our world is now so serious as to make this an obligation of charity for the monk, but of course the monastery does not exist in order to maintain a retreat house. The monk may also accidentally exercise various other apostolic functions. The important thing however is for him not to become a prisoner of the routines and organization of an active life. He owes it to God, to the Church and to the world to preserve a certain monastic freedom so that his apostolic action, such as it is, will always retain a peaceful and charismatic character. It will be subject to the direct inspiration of the

Holy Spirit and obedience in *particular* situations, not to organizational pressures and the demands of an exacting programme. The diaspora situation may well make an organized apostolate of monks impossible in any case.

For monastic renewal to be anything more than a pious wish, the monastic institution as we now know it must undergo significant changes. It should, perhaps become far more flexible than it is, much more capable of original and indeed charismatic initiatives. Those who guide the destinies of monasticism must get rid of the fears and narrowness that make them dread organizational breakdowns and upheavals more than the loss of monastic spirit. These fears come from the bureaucratic character of the monastic set-up today and from its desperate determination to preserve a venerable and prosperous institutional structure as if this were an end in itself.

The Diaspora of Rahner may well call for the small, poor, isolated and unknown monastery instead of the illustrious 'plants' or our great American communities. But in any case the monk will have an important place in that diaspora, that is to say, not a pious organization man, but a true servant of God.

Discerning the Real Situation

WALTER STEIN

In Spring 1963 the British Council of Churches appointed a Working Group 'to study, as a matter of urgency, the question of Britain's continued possession of an independent nuclear deterrent'. The group (which included a Catholic observer, Father Corbishley, S.J.) reported back to the Council that 'there is no case for independent nuclear action—that is, without prior consultation with our allies—in any part of the world', and the Council of Churches endorsed the report in a resolution of October 16th, 1963. The Resolution, together with the Working Group's Report, forms a document of considerable importance.¹

¹*The British Nuclear Deterrent*: British Council of Churches Resolution, October 1963, and Report of a Working Group; SCM Press; 1s 6d.