

Jurgen Moltman
2-22-82

-1-

CAPPS: --when the governor is here on Monday, he will address a meeting in Storke Plaza, sponsored by the student lobby, and it has to do with the national financial aid day, and that will be a twelve o'clock on Monday, following the governor's talk in Rob Gym. I also would like you to know that we are taking advantage of our distinguished guests and doing some television taping while they are here. And we have William Billings speaking on Carol Howard's KEYT Issues show, this will be on Sunday evening at six o'clock, KEYT. That's William Billings who was here two weeks ago, the National Christian Action Coalition. There are other announcements that I would like to make, but I don't want to take any further time this evening for that, because we have another special treat in store for us. We all know, living in this country, that what happens here is felt and experienced by people who live outside the United States of America. And one very keen observer of American events has been and still is Professor Jurgen Moltman, who is professor of theology at Tubingen University in West Germany. A few years ago Professor Moltman gave a paper at the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions on the theme, "The American Dream, Dreamed By a Non-American." He is very close to the writings of John Steinbeck. I understand that one of his favorite books is Travels with Charlie. He loves California, loves Santa Barbara, and brings a very distinctive perception of our American cultural life. He is the author of a great many books, The Theology of Hope, a book called The Crucified God,

Moltmann

-2-

a book that is required reading in our mysticism course, The Experience of God. He has been involved in Christian-Marxist dialogue in Europe, involved in the work of Ap--- Gesellschaft, and he is here this weekend because he and his wife, Professor, I mean Dr. Elizabeth Moltmann Wendell, has just given the Earl(?) lectures at the Pacific School of Religion in Berkeley. I have asked him if he would speak to us tonight about the European and the German peace movements, or the peace movement in Europe. And I am very happy that he has consented to do that.

Professor Moltmann.

MOLTMANN: Thank you very much for your kind introduction, Walter. It is certainly very difficult to find a relationship between the Moral Majority in this country and the peace movement in Europe. I am a, I seem to look like a member of the Moral Majority, with a tie and a suit. But I am actually a member of the peace movement in Europe.

Let me first of all say that there is at least one relationship. The rise of the peace movement in Europe is certainly one result of the policy of that movement which Robert Bellah calls the counterrevolution in America. For there is a connection between these two movements. The more conservative movement is alive in America, the more European special interests are coming up, and they are expressed in the peace movement in Europe. What I can do is try to paint a picture of the special characteristics of the peace movement in Europe and then give an introduction to the internal debate on peace and war in a nuclear age in Europe.

First of all, a historical perspective. There was already a peace movement in Europe in the fifties. The name was Kampf dem Atomtod, Fight Against Atomic Death. At that time we debated against plans from Polish politician, Rapotsky(?), on a ^{zone in?} ~~for~~ and Europe free of atomic armaments. This old peace movement faded away when the new policy of Willy Brandt, the peace policy, in the sixties, came into existence, when the cold war ended in Europe, and there were made treaties in West Germany and Russia, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Romania, et cetera, et cetera. Then this old peace movement just faded away, because the expectations that we would come to a peace policy were very high at that time. I must, may add that at the time that the time between 1966 and the beginning of the seventies, the U.S.A. were engaged in the Vietnam war in Asia, so there was some peace on the European frontier.

This changed very quickly with the beginning, at least two or three years ago, the peace movement, the new peace movement, in Europe, came into existence, for three reasons. First, the Russian armaments with missiles, SS20 missiles. These are middle-range missiles, directed not toward the U.S.A. but toward Europe. The second reason, President Reagan came into office in this country, and a new policy of armament came, pressing for the increase of defense budget on the European side, and this brought the peace movement out on the streets. And number three, I think this is the most crucial point, there was always the threat of a nuclear war, a nuclear

holocaust. But Europeans were used to think this may happen in East Asia, in Korea or Vietnam or near East Asia, but not in Europe. This time we got a lot of public speculations and calculations from the White House and the Pentagon, on the possibility of a limited nuclear warfare in Europe. And then all of a sudden, people, my people said, well, this time it's we. So our own interest, our own life now is at stake, and therefore the peace movement grew very rapidly.

I am coming now toward the internal features of this peace movement. It's not the same movement as in the fifties, because this time the peace movement has a universal concern, save the world from an atomic or nuclear holocaust, combined with a special European interest. Only détente and disarmament of the superpowers can give us life, and a little bit freedom in Europe. If there is a tension growing up between the superpowers, then we on the border between East and West are suffering first. Therefore there is a combination between a universal concern and our own European interest in the peace movement.

The goal is certainly, first of all, to get a zone in Europe free of nuclear missiles and nuclear armament, including the USSR. These European, special European interests, are not against the interests of the United States in America. There are some journalists and politicians claiming that the peace movement in Europe as being anti-American. This is not true. This peace

movement is perhaps anti-the American counterrevolution, under President Reagan, but for the values for which the U.S.A. stood for many years, the values of freedom, peace, and democracy. So we in the peace movement in Europe do not feel as implying anti-Americanism, but there is a special problem with this administration in Washington at the moment.

??
The first argument in the debate, about Pershing II and cruise missiles stationed in West Europe, brought all of a sudden many people in Germany to a new awareness of the limitations of our own situation. Some talked about West Germany being a country of limited sovereignty. There is not much choice left for a government in Bonn. Others talk about, we are still an occupied country, because we don't have a peace treaty with Germany. We live in East and West Germany without a peace treaty since 45. So all of this happened, we became aware of the reality of our situation, not just being a member of the Western world, which is fine, of course, but also about our special situation, a divided country, between East and West, limited sovereignty inside of the Western treaties, and, you know, a country which at least is full of foreign armies. I think that apart from Korea, the one country in the world which employs four large armies, the Russian Army in the DDR in East Germany, the Americans, the British and the French armies in West Germany, and our own army also. Nowhere else in the world is such a concentration of military armaments than in the two Germanies we have at the time. We can

see where the _____ bombs and the missiles are, both countries, West Germany and East Germany, are packed with military armament.

The peace movement in these years in Europe is not just a movement of students, and left-wingers, it is a people's movement. Because all of a sudden the people become aware that their own life is threatened. It started, for example, at Tübingen, looking around where the next atomic warheads are, and found thirty miles outside of Tübingen a U.S. depot, near Grossen_____ where they have this lands(lens?) artillery, with warheads. They have a range of 120 kilometers. That is, they are directed toward Augsburg and Munich, so whenever the Russians would invade West Germany and would come into the plains of Munich and Augsburg, then these missiles would come to them. Then the population of Augsburg and Munich will be annihilated. And then the people at Tübingen and also another smaller cities in Germany, asked the city council, why don't you get away with these depot so near our cities? It's a, really, it's a people's movement, and not just a students' movement. And furthermore, it is a Christian movement. There was a large gathering of more than three hundred thousand people at Bonn, on the tenth of October, last year. This was not organized by Communists, not at all. The organizers were, first, the (long German term), what, a Christian organization called Action Reconciliation, an organization which worked in Israel and Poland since 48, for reconciliation. And another Christian movement

called Christians for Peace, they called in this great gathering, and three hundred thousand people came.

The peace movement is partly for total pacifism, partly for a special atomic pacifism. So it's a mixed group. There are certain relations which are of significance. One relation is with what we call the green party, the ecologists, those who protest against more nuclear power plants in our country, et cetera. And another combination with the group for alternative life styles, a combination with feminist groups, because many people feel this nuclear armament race, which leads us to atomic holocaust, is not only a crisis of military policies, it is a crisis of our whole political-industrial system. And therefore we must look for new values of life.

It may be worthwhile to know that the peace movement is not only alive in West Germany, there is a growing autonomous peace movement also in East Germany. For the first time in the existence of the DDR, they allow an autonomous peace movement to grow in Dresden and East Berlin. And this is also coming out of the Christian groups of the Christian churches. They ask publicly for not being drafted into the East German army, but to work instead for peace programs in East Germany and other East European countries.

Well, what I can do now, in the second part, is to let you know some of our debates, which may be similar to your debate in this country. We begin with a major pronouncement of the Reform(?) Church in the Netherlands and the Protestant Church in Germany. As we do this, let

memorandums to public questions of our people, the so-called Denkschriften. This is a way how our church addresses the public in certain questions. And we have two major memorandums on peace in a nuclear age, one from 69 and one from 81. If we follow this, these announcements, then we must assume that peace is the order and the promise of God. God wants to live with human beings in a kingdom of peace, because of this the people of God are given their task of peace and the service of peace. Peace, we say, means not only the absence of war, but also the overcoming of suffering, anxiety, injustice, and oppression. Peace is the blessed, affirmed good life with God, with human beings, with nature, what is called in the Old Testament Shalom. So it is not only something negative, no war, but it's the fullness of life itself. It is the commission of Christians to serve this peace in all dimensions of life, to promote it, protect it, and in particular, resist war, which is the most dangerous form of a lack of peace.

Christian churches have always used their position against war, as only one part, one part of their comprehensive service of peace.

Now, in view of the fact of the possibility of war, there have always been two approaches. One is the principle of pacifism, the other is the doctrine of a just war. And we will try now, we will see now whether this doctrine of a just war can be applied to nuclear warfare. If this cannot, then nuclear warfare and the preparation for nuclear warfare is not justified. This

is the idea. The elements of the doctrine of a just war are simple. First, war must be declared by a legitimate authority. It must serve the common good of a state. There was some debate, ___ know, in this country, as to whether the Vietnam war was an illegal war, because it was never declared. And perhaps there is a, there is coming a war in El Salvador which is never declared, but is there. And then it is an illegal war, and therefore the first principle is of some importance.

The second principle, it must be conducted with a good intention.

Third principle, must be conducted with the expectation of a good outcome. The general situation after the war must be better than the situation before it.

Four, number four, all peaceful means for resolution of the conflict must have been exhausted.

Number five is the principle of proportionality. The means of the war must not be worse than the evil which is supposed to be overcome by it. That is, the means must stand in the right relationship to the ends.

And number six, there must be a distinction between soldiers and citizens. The civil population must be protected.

Now, let's see how this works in a nuclear age. First, the doctrine of a just nuclear war. According to this doctrine, nuclear war is not to be directed, directly justified, but rather kept in limits. The possession of weapons is not refused. Having weapons

is part of the present deterrent system, which secures peace. The use of the weapons is subjective to the norm of appropriateness of the means, and the norm of the differentiation between military and civilian population. This means that the massive destruction of large cities is not allowed. Only the selective use on military objectives is allowed. Therefore, according to the doctrine of a just nuclear war, the strategy of massive retaliation is not to be justified. That in attack on military installations, civil population will be destroyed is a pity, but inevitable, they say. These inevitable ? ity is furthermore a part of the deterrent strategy.

Now, in the further development of its nuclear weapons, the government of the United States is obviously following this position of this theory of a just nuclear war. The neutron bomb, Pershing II and cruise missiles, can be employed with precision against military objectives without causing massive destruction on civil population. So out of the old strategy of massive destruction has developed the more finely tuned strategy of limited nuclear war. As a result, nuclear weapons are made usable. The process of increased armaments is accordingly organized. With this, however, the threshold for the beginning of a nuclear war has been considerably reduced. And because no one knows whether a nuclear war can really be kept within reasonable limits, the situation in Europe has not, has become not more secure, but less secure.

Perhaps there are only a few in Europe who really like this theory of a just nuclear war. But there is another theory, that many people like and agree with. That is the doctrine of a just nuclear armament. This doctrine of just nuclear armament, not of a just nuclear war, is maintained in both of the memorandums of the Protestant Church in Germany, by means of the parity of armaments, the present peace is preserved, they say. Mutually credible horror of attack prevents a nuclear war, because disarmament steps can be taken only on the basis of military parity, armaments must be increased, they say. But this can be justified only if the the breathing space, the grace period, as it is said in these memorandums, is magnified, the time which is left to us is used, to move from an armed peace to a security system without nuclear weapons, and to build an international order of peace. According to this doctrine, therefore, only the possession and the threat, but not the use, of nuclear weapons may ethically be allowed. If, however, one is not ready to use what one possesses, no deterrent results.

To this extent, there is an illusion here. On the one hand, it was already recognized in the 69 memorandum, I quote: The expectations which in the early sixties were connected with international politics on the basis of armament control can no longer be maintained. The breathing space of the grace period was not used for peace. Why not? Because the possibilities did not

actually exist. In the midst of an armaments race, one can hardly speak of disarmament. Because the speed of increased armaments is always many times greater than the speed of disarmament talks.

Now, number three is the expectation or the feeling of an apocalyptic threshold. In many people today, the impression is growing that the increased armaments of nuclear weapons do not secure peace, but rather lead more and more into a collective insanity. The deterrent systems have their own laws. Within their logic, it is not asked whether something serves peace and life, but whether it increases the enemy's fear of one's own strike capacity. Peace based on nuclear deterrence must be called an ultimate threshold, because nuclear deterrence presents the threat of an enemy as world destruction. The securing of peace by means of assuring world destruction cannot be stabilized as a permanent condition. This situation is therefore unsuitable as a foundation of a permanent order of peace. That an apocalyptic peace of deterrence is not even capable of gaining democratic consensus shows that in the nations there is still a healthy human understanding.

There is ethically no conceivable justification of a possible destruction of humanity and of life on earth in order to protect the rights and the freedoms in one of the social systems in which human beings live today. A peace which is bought with a threat of world destruction is no peace. The peace of deterrence through mutual fear is a non-employment of weapons, but no condition

of peace. Mutual deterrence through fear is a condition of extreme lack of peace, because of increased violence. Even without a nuclear war, the armament spiral already destroyed the life of human beings and the natural environment, and the military-industrial complex spreads itself also over my country, like a cancerous growth, and infects all dimensions of life. Unnoticed, a silent but total mobilization has come into being. We demand, therefore, the withdrawal from this apocalyptic threshold in terms of a gradual nuclear disengagement and a gradual dismantling of conventional armament. This is the so-called gradualism in the debate that we get out of this apocalyptic threshold in order to have options again, political options. But if a withdrawal from this apocalyptic threshold is still possible, does not the turning back from an apocalyptic death zone into life again mean a comprehensive transformation of the whole system in which we live and work? If for just one moment we imagine that the nuclear threat did not exist, then we would have to disband the military, dismantle the armament industry, establish a state economy without a military budget, free our own souls from anxiety and aggression. That this idea sounds so utopian that we have never thought through it, seriously so, that many of us quite pessimistically or apocalypticly believe that the point of no return has already been reached, and we have become prisoners of the deterrence system. Therefore, there is this, the other alternative, to live without armaments. In German, ohne Rüstung leben.

A person that recognizes that mutual deterrence through fear is based not on a parity of armament, but on an armament race, which is already now bleeding the nations to death, and can lead to no good end, stands before the decision either to go along or to protest against. It is therefore understandable that the old movement, which worked under the slogan, fight against nuclear death, is being resurrected in Europe today, under the self-obligating formulation, live without armaments. The logic is clear. The use of nuclear weapons is irresponsible. If the use is irresponsible, then the possession can also not be considered responsible, for the possession binds the possessor to rearmament, improved armament, modernization of his armament, and also to their use.

If, however, the possession is not to be considered responsible, then one must withdraw from the universal arms race and devote all of one's efforts to an alternative service of peace, just as the Anabaptists and Mennonites and Quakers who were prepared for peace have done for a long time. Now, this movement to live without armaments, ohne Rüstung leben, has two dimensions: a personal dimension and a political dimension. First, Christians who place the discipleship of Christ over the responsibilities of the world, can deny themselves without making their own denial a model for all human beings, Christians and non-Christians. That was the way of the Anabaptists, defenselessness, bound with a readiness for suffering and martyrdom. This, they said, is the way of faith, and this faith is

not everyone's thing.

Second, Christians and non-Christians who want to end the arms race deny themselves and make their readiness to live without armament a political proposal and invention for argument _____ the nations. In the first case, the risk is personal. In the second case, it is also political. First case, one takes the consequences on oneself. In the second case, one must think of the consequences for the family, for one's own people, for others.

Wherein does the risk lie in the second case? Well, whoever disarms from nuclear weapons, one side at least, and brings to the enemy preliminary achievement for peace, can, of course, by this very action provoke the foe to aggression. Even if no aggression results, one can thereby become subject to extortion, to the threats of the adversaries. In this way, one delivers oneself and one's own to the most powerful foe. Therefore, whoever believes that the nuclear war can be prevented only by unilateral disarmament, must be ready to sacrifice not only himself or herself, but also his own people. Such a? That the people must risk the freedoms, all right, and security, not only of his own life, but also of his own country, in order to save the whole of life on earth from nuclear death.

The slogan, live without armaments, serves not the resistance but the intensification of military practices in the world politics.

There is another group in my church under the slogan,

secure peace, fighting against this group which wants to live without armaments. To be sure, this risk is not yet provable, because as yet no one has made the experiment, but it is a fear which cannot easily be laid to rest, as long as the adversary is believed to be capable only of the worst, but not of the rational. So it depends on the trust or mistrust in the enemy's, whether we take the risk or not.

Number five is a very, we come now to a kind of a combination, which is perhaps singular in my church, with a people's church, or a state church, which wants to serve everyone. It is the idea of complementarity.

In and of themselves, the two basic decisions, a just nuclear armament and refusal of nuclear weapons, contradict each other. The memorandum of my church from 69 and 81, however, recommend a third combined standpoint. It is a series of the complementarity of both positions, which, just as much as they mutually exclude each other, also limit and in view of the common goal, peace, even complete each other. Out of this idea, then, has developed this formula, much used in my church, of service of peace with and without weapons. The service of peace without weapons is not seen as an alternative service, but as directed toward the goal of international solidarity. It should be possible for an individual to engage in the service of peace without weapons in place of his or her military service. This was the demand. Well, if the service of peace without weapons did not exist, this is the argumentation, then the armament would become total and without limits. And therefore we need this

service of peace without weapons, conscientious rejectors^[sic] as you say. If the service of peace with weapons did not exist, then the service of peace without weapons would be overcome by the weapons of the enemy.

Well, this idea of complementarity is illuminating only so long as a military armament has a goal of preventing nuclear warfare in order to gain time for building another system of peace. But this is an illusion. There is no such a time. And the complementarity thesis does not remove the personal decision of any Christian, or non-Christian, for no one can decide complementarily by himself. It is a position of church leaders who believe that they must always stand for everyone. But it cannot be the position of a Christian person, who might decide this way or that way.

Now, let me end with a kind of personal, confessional statement, under the title, remembering the Sermon on the Mount.

Up to now, both sides of this issue have made calculations as if neither Christ nor the Sermon on the Mount existed. With Christ, there comes into the reckoning a factor which suspends the whole process and changes everything, and this is the reality of God, who actually bears us all. You are children of your father in heaven, says Jesus. And this remembrance[?] calls us to conflict, because whoever engages in a struggle, and arbitrates a conflict, stands under the law of retaliation. Otherwise the parity in the conflict cannot be maintained. Eye for an eye, tooth for a tooth, armament, counter-armament,

proliferation, counter-proliferation, et cetera. When we engage an enemy on the basis of the law of retaliation, however, we ourselves enter into a vicious circle from which we can no longer escape. Because then we become the enemy to our enemies. We threaten what threatens us, we hate what hates us. We are more and more determined than by the enemies, and become glowingly similar to the enemies.

When evil is retaliated with evil, then there arrives one evil after another, and that is deadly in our situation. We can be freed from such vicious circles only when our orientation to the enemy ceases, and another one becomes more important to us. Love, which Jesus puts in place of retaliation, is the love of the enemy. Mutual love is nothing special, it is only retaliation of good with good. The love of the enemy, however, is not recompensing, but rather anticipating, and must be a creative or, as Carl Friedrich von Weisäcker put it, an intelligent love. Whoever repays evil with good, is really free. He or she is no longer in the stance of reacting; such a person creates a new situation, for himself and for the enemy. He follows his own intention and no longer allows the law of action to be prescribed by his enemies.

Jesus did not die with a curse on his enemies, but with a prayer for them. In his life, his passion, and dying, he revealed the perfection of God. Be perfect, even as your heavenly father is perfect.

Now, of what does God's perfection consist? It is in no way a moral perfection. It consists of that love

which is said, be long⁵suffering, friendly and patient, which does not act evil or carry a grudge, which bears all things, believes all things, and hope all things. God's perfection lies in the sense that he loves his enemies, that is, us, blesses them, does good to them, and does not return evil for their evil. It is precisely from this that we and our enemies, wherever they are, all live. The whole world lives from this reality, even if it does not know it. God bears all, maintains all, because he hopes for each one. So God's perfection is a limitless ability for suffering, his almightiness is his patient suffering from and with all things. His uniqueness is his creative power of love.

In former times, and perhaps even now, if we are inside of a vicious circle of military thinking, we have only ask, what serves our security, the security of our nation? What serves our survival? But now, the basic question must be rephrased in terms of creative, intelligent love of the enemy. What is most, the most helpful thing for the enemy? In what way can we best bless those who curse us? How do we do good for those who hate us? Or, let me remain concrete. We Germans fear the Russians and otherwise almost nobody in the world. Therefore we must ask, what helps the Russian people to gain freedom and peace more? Our further armament, or our disarmament? In what way can we bless the Communists who curse us? In what way can we do good for the people in the Third World who consider us their enemy?

The politics of national security is in large degree a politics of anxiety and fear. And that's the most dangerous thing. Because we have anxiety, we demand security. Because we demand security, we increase our armament. As we increase our armament, we give terror to our adversaries. Therefore, our adversary also increases arms. Quite to the contrary of this system, intelligent love arises out of freedom. Out of the freedom to be a child of the eternal God. And this means, translated, out of the freedom from the fear of temporal death. Can one really become free from this anxiety? I believe one can become at least a little bit freer from it when one recognizes the danger and consciously enters into the risk, the risk which goes along with the life without armament.

To the degree that the risk of the vulnerable, defenseless, but creative life becomes conscious to us, the more free and patient we become. Only the unknown and the repressed fear makes us anxious.

Let me end with a kind of over-all statement. Atomic pacificism, that is, to get out of the death zone of an atomic holocaust and get political options back, is not illusionism or utopianism, but the only realism of life left to us in this apocalyptic situation of the danger of the world annihilation today. Further armament, preparing for a nuclear warfare, is in my eyes, a negative utopianism, and serves the holocaust more than it prevents the holocaust.

Thank you.

Moltmann

-20-

CAPPS: We are going to take about ten minutes only for questions. Those of you who are thinking of leaving, and I am, I guess I'll help out here a little bit--

Q: Unintelligible

CAPPS: I didn't hear that. No, this is it, this is it tonight. I would like another question.

Q: Unintelligible

MOLTMANN: I understand the question. Do you really suppose that Jesus meant love your enemy, is not your fellow Christians, or those who are also Christians? I think he really had in mind those who are your enemies, in the full scale of life. And this love your enemies does not mean to subjugate to your enemies, or deliver to your enemies, but to overcome the enmity through creative and intelligent love. And this can be done over against the Russians, as well as he did it over against ? and the Romans and whatsoever. It does not depend on whether the Russians are Christians or not.

Q: Unintelligible.

MOLTMANN: It depends on how intelligent your measures are.

Q: Unintelligible

MOLTMANN: Well, are you sure it's the same God? Excuse me, this was a rather harsh statement. The theologi--

END OF SIDE I OF TAPE

SIDE II OF TAPE:

MOLTMANN (CONTINUES): -- cal foundation of the love of the enemy in the Sermon on the Mount is that Jesus points to the sun. Look at, the sun rises over the good and

the evil, and over the evil first. Or look on the rainfall, the rain comes down, makes everything fruitful for the good and for the evil. So be like your father in heaven. That is, be like the sun or the rain, that's come to both, regardless whether they are good or bad. And this is then the revelation of God, through our love of the enemy, that we create ni ? for the enemy, peace for the enemy, and overcome enmity by this. That we, you see, there was a reference to the Russians. The Russians are full of anxiety. They fear, for example, the Germans, because they have suffered under the German army, the last war. Around twenty million Russians died in the last war. It is completely understandable that they fear a, and the nuclear armament of the Germans, West German army. And they fear also the United States of America, as it is. So for them, you are the enemy, and therefore if one begins to realize this, one must try to get out of this role, out of this picture, and to show that one is not an enemy toward the other nation. And in this, one shows, then, God. God is not who is full of wrath and judgment. He is first of all like the sun and like the rain, according to the Sermon on the Mount. If you take another text out of non-Christian religion, may be different.

Q: Unintelligible

MOLTMANN: Ja. Let me first make one statement, and then more statement. We discovered that the forced armament race, the increased military budget in the North Atlantic nations, is one reason, because, of the

underdevelopment in the Third World. That is, that we let them pay for our armaments and our security. And therefore the peace movement in Europe, and disarmament, détente, serve the nations in the Third World, indirectly, because there are already people starving and dying because of our forced armament. I think we must be aware of it. People will not only die if it comes to a nuclear war, they are already dying here and now because of our nuclear armaments and the armament race. And therefore, stop it, and then you will save lives in the Third World.

The second point brings me into some embarrassment. I came out of the war and a long time of imprisonment after the war, in prisoner of war camps, with two promises. First, never again a war, work for peace all your time. And use the right to throw away arms. And second, be ready for the murder of a tyrant. I know this is incompatible, but this was my original feeling when I came home, that this happened with Hitler in Germany, and nobody assassinated this tyrant and saved millions of lives. There was only the one attempt in 44. This was really a shame for me and for my country, fellow men, et cetera. So the murder of the tyrant, but for peace. And therefore I understand the Sandinistas. They tried everything to overthrow Somoza with peaceful means, there was no possibility left, so this was the last possibility that they had, and I understand this. I do not blame them. Perhaps as a Nicaraguan, I would have

Moltmann

-23-

taken an arm or a gun myself. But this is deeply below the threshold of a nuclear war, which cannot be limited, and then escalate inside of ten or fifteen minutes, into a complete world destruction. And therefore one can combine, I believe, these two standpoints. In an emergency case, be ready to save your people and become guilty by murdering a tyrant.

On the other hand, work for peace so that life will be preserved on earth. I am embarrassed with myself, but that's the case.

CAPPS: I think we have come to a natural ending tonight. I feel a lot better about life than I did a couple of weeks ago. And I am deeply grateful to our distinguished guests, Dr. Bellah and Dr. Moltmann for these very, very provocative, stimulating statements.

END OF MEETING