

1. *Is an anti-war movement the same as a peace movement?* Overlapping, but with radically different centers--expressly, as different as + and -. This week (Apr/83), the USA RCC bishops whittled their anti-nuke statement all the way down to only a no-first-strike policy: Jesus says it may be OK to have nukes, but observe the correct sequence of their use! As clergy myself, this puerile behavior embarrasses me, especially when it parades itself as peace action.
2. *Am I a pacifist?* The-ist I am, but you can have the other ists. As a biblical person, I am pro-shalom (love fulfilled among whole persons under and in God within the whole creation), but in concrete situations that does not predetermine my attitude toward war/nonwar ("peace" being positive, "nonwar" being nothing but a negative, viz., the absence of war). This distinction is related to, and as vital as, the distinction in paragraph #1.
3. *When I am, in a particular crisis, nonwar, am I also antiwar?* Not necessarily. For a battery of possible reasons, I may not take a stand on a particular conflict in being or in prospect---just as, when spoken to, I am free either to or not to speak. Christians educating themselves in shalom need to help each other examine (1) the reasons (2) in particular crises at home and abroad.
4. *Do you participate in peace demonstrations?* The mode-tense of the verb implies policy: no, I have no policy here: I am a situationist on this. But the question needs more unpacking. In my lexicon, a peace demo is a sign of shalom and an antiwar (including antinuke) demo "sends a signal" to the powers that be: the heart is the center of the former, the government is the center of the latter--and I have done and do both, depending on the situation. Long before Martin Luther King Jr. I used "negro" toilets in the South in spite of the fear in black eyes and the rage in white eyes: that was to be a sign of the Kingdom; it was shalom action, a peace demo. Later, I got fired for refusing to let up on my antiwar demo-ing vis-a-vis Vietnam....In 1917, my father almost got fired for refusing to marshal, or even participate in, a prowar demo: that was a one-man peace demo + antiwar demo!
5. *Do you participate in deterrent antiwar (including antinuke) demos?* No, it's too confusing, and I'm undermotivated to action when confused. In action, weaponry is to constrain/defeat in aggression ("offensive") or protection ("defensive"). Weapons not in action are psywar, to deter aggression against the weapons' owners (feudal lords, "we the people," or "people's republics"). In the John Hinckley trial, the public got educated to the plain fact that shrinks can't predict behavior: here psychiatry is not science but, at best, art. So it is with military deterrence. Pro-weaponers claim that weapons deter; anti-weaponers rejoin with "They don't either! The more weapons, the more chance of war!" The issue is blowing in the wind, and I refuse to make an ass of myself by coming down on either side except for rhetorical purposes (in which instances I keep in mind that I am speaking poetry to incite, not fact to illumine: I'm appalled at the self-blinding ignorant arrogance of peaceniks who don't observe that distinction).
6. *Do you have any other reason for not participating in deterrent antiwar (including antinuke) demos?* At least two:
 - (1) There's a difference between rhetoric-poetry on a matter unknown (as, above, psywar deterrence) and on a matter known (as the history of warfare) and on a matter probably known (as scenarios

over

A 20-year continuing peace-action: Howard Kurtz's WAR CONTROL PLANNERS (Box 19127, Wash.DC 20036). Worthy of support.

of nuke war). Truth is the issue here:

(a) History as fact is a "matter known." It includes Hitler's false notion, on which he acted to invade Poland, that the Anglo-American "peace" (read "antiwar") movement was strong enough to deter military reaction against him. Note the ironic force of "deter" here: the "peace" movement deterred us, not Hitler: it was counter-productive, even spurring Hitler to attack! It wasn't a waste of time/energy that might have been used for God: it turned out, by what Niebuhr called the irony of history, to be a work of the devil--and I thought so at the time, especially after addressing 500 Nazis (we called them "Bundists," at the time) in a Chicago hall and thereafter having dinner in the home of their gauleiter (who was trying to recruit me, as I was trying to convert him). *Pari passu*, I consider the 1983 "peace" movement probably a work of the devil in the name of God (as was, in NT, the crucifixion of Jesus). My theory here is more sinister than Reagan's, who's plain wrong in thinking the Russians started our "peace" movement.

(b) Nuke-war scenarioing is a "matter probably known." Nuke end-of-the-world screeching is based on paranoid contrary-to-fact rhetorical scenarioing, not on *hard-fact* scenarioing. The film on Helen Caldicott is appalling-naive both technologically and politically. As an M.D., she's doubtless correct in displaying the projectible medical effects of nuking, and almost certainly wildly and irresponsibly incorrect in her projection of the extent of nuking. For political and (in her case) parapolitical reasons, leaders' rhetorical calculus does not include the self-correcting, self-canceling factor. We laugh at "If it ain't busted, don't fix it." Here's another wise-word: "If it's busted, who's to fix it, or will it fix itself?" Military history displays the self-adjusting factor in weaponry, and nukes (which only in rhetoric are something new) will take their place in this history. Consider just one factor, the EMP (ElectroMagnetic Pulsation: 1 Hiroshima-type bomb exploded 100mi. above Lincoln NEBR would knock out all the microchips, and thus all nukes, in the USA: a nuke war would be severely limited for both sides). You don't have to know much subatomic physics or military applications thereof to be wary of all those on both sides of the nuke mouth-war who are trying to paranoidize the public with apocalyptic visions of Sorcerer's Apprentice, Frankenstein all-is-destroyed-foreverness. Reagan is fully capable of manipulating Americans afraid even of computers into a first-strike nuke war, and the Helen Caldicotts are in this his handmaids. Because I want to be both honest to truth and honest to hope, I cannot participate in deterrent antinuke demos.

(2) Fear (as implied in the above) is my other reason for not participating in deterrent antiwar (antinuke) demos: I'm afraid of going to hell doing hell's work. (Cf. my Kirkridge '83 lectionary: God's brilliant, the devil's bright, I'm dumb--and I'm smart if I keep the three facts in view.)

7. *On nukes, you sound do-nothing. Are you?* Almost, not quite. I hedge my bets by giving feeble support to the freeze: signing petitions, doing nothing else except peace action (prayer and love from the heart, personally and, where possible, collectively). The window to the right provides a discussion-model for sorting out, in the freeze and others crises, what Christian action toward shalom might/should be. For me, biblical theology is not among the "iffys"; virtually everything else is.

K
I
N
D
O
F
A
C
T
I
O
N

		ACTION	
		my/our	their
e v a n g e l i c a l		A	B
e c c l e s i a l		C	D