tional economic structures affect the poor nations. These particularly involve trade, monetary, investment and aid policies.

Neither of the superpowers is conspicuous in these areas for initiatives designed to address "the absolute poverty" in which millions live today. (110)

From our perspective and experience as bishops, we believe there is a much greater potential for response to these questions in the mind and hearts of Americans than has been reflected in U.S. policy. As pastors who often appeal to our congregations for funds destined for international programs, we find good will and great generosity the prevailing characteristics. The spirit of generosity which shaped the Marshall Plan is still alive in the American public.

We must discover how to translate this personal sense of generosity and compassion into support for policies which would respond to papal teaching in international economic issues. It is precisely the need to expand our conception of international charity and relief to an understanding of the need for social justice in terms of trade, aid, and monetary issues which was reflected in Pope John Paul II's call to American Catholics in Yankee Stadium:

"Within the framework of your national institutions and in cooperation with all your compatriots, you will also want to seek out the structural reasons which foster or cause the different forms of poverty in the world and in your own country, so that you can apply the proper remedies. You will not allow yourselves to be intimidated or discouraged by oversimplified explanations, which are more ideological than scientific — explanations which try to account for a complex evil by some single cause. But neither will you recoil before the reforms — even profound ones — of attitudes and structures that may prove necessary in order to recreate over and over again the conditions needed by the disadvangated if they are to have a fresh chance in the hard struggle of life. The poor of the United States and of the world are your brothers and sisters in Christ." (111)

The pope's words highlight an intellectual, moral and political challenge for the United States. Intellectually, there is a need to rethink the meaning of national interest in an interdependent world. Morally there is a need to build upon the spirit of generosity present in the U.S. public, directing it toward a more systematic response to the major issues affecting the poor of the world. Politically there is a need for U.S. policies which promote the profound structural reforms called for by recent papal teaching.

Precisely in the name of international order papal teaching has by word and deed sought to promote multilateral forms of cooperation toward the developing world. The U.S. capacity for leadership in multilateral institutions is very great. We urge much more vigorous and creative response to the needs of the developing countries by the United States in these institutions.

The significant role the United States could play is evident in the daily agenda facing these institutions. Proposals addressing the relationship of the industrialized and developing countries on a broad spectrum of issues, all in need of "profound reforms," are regularly discussed in the United Nations and other international organizations. Without U.S. participation, significant reform and substantial change in the direction of addressing the needs of the poor will not occur. Meeting these needs is an essential element for a peaceful world.

Papal teaching of the last four decades has not only supported international institutions in principle, it has supported the United Nations specifically. Pope Paul VI said to the U.N. General Assembly:

"The edifice which you have constructed must never fail; it must be perfected and made equal to the needs which world history will present. You mark a stage in the development of mankind for which retreat must never be admitted, but from which it is necessary that advance be made." (112)

It is entirely necessary to examine the United Nations carefully, to recognize its limitations and propose changes where needed. Nevertheless, in light of the continuing endorsement found in papal teaching, we urge that the United States adopt a stronger supportive leadership role with respect to the United Nations. The growing interdependence of the nations and peoples of the world, coupled with the extragovernmental presence of multinational corporations, requires new structures of cooperation. As one of the founders of and major financial contributors to the United Nations, the United States can and should assume a more positive and creative role in its life today.

It is in the context of the United Nations that the impact of the arms race on the prospects for economic development is highlighted. The numerous U.N. studies on the relationship of development and disarmament support the judgment of Vatican II cited earlier in this letter: "The arms race is one of the greatest curses on the human race and the harm it inflicts upon the poor is more than can be endured." (113)

We are aware that the precise relationship between disarmament and development is neither easily demonstrated nor easily reoriented. But the fact of a massive distortion of resources in the face of crying human need creates a moral question. In an interdependent world the security of one nation is related to the security of all. When we consider how and what we pay for defense today, we need a broader view than the equation of arms with security. (114) The threats to the security and stability of an interdependent world are not all contained in missiles and bombers.

If the arms race in all its dimensions is not reversed, resources will not be available for the human needs so evident in many parts of the globe and in our own country as well. But we also know that making resources available is a first step; policies of wise use would also have to follow. Part of the process of thinking about the economics of disarmament includes the possibilities of conversion of defense industries to other purposes. Many say the possibilities are great if the political will is present. We say the political will to reorient resources to human needs and redirect industrial, scientific, and technological capacity to meet those needs is part of the challenge of the nuclear age. Those whose livelihood is dependent upon industries which can be reoriented should rightfully expect assistance in making the transition to new forms of employment. The economic dimension of the arms race is broader than we can assess here, but these issues we have raised are among the primary questions before the nation. (115)

An interdependent world requires an understanding that key policy questions today involve mutuality of interest. If the monetary and trading systems are not governed by sensitivity to mutual needs, they can be destroyed. If the protection of human rights and the promotion of human needs are left as orphans in the diplomatic arena, the stability we seek in increased armaments will eventually be threatened by rights denied and needs unmet in vast sectors of the globe. If future planning about conservation of and access to resources is relegated to a pure struggle of power, we shall simply guarantee conflict in the future.

The moral challenge of interdependence concerns shaping the relationships and rules of practice which will support our common need for security, welfare and safety. The challenge tests our idea of human community, our policy analysis and our political will. The need to prevent nuclear war is absolutely crucial, but even if this is achieved, there is much more to be done.

IV. The Pastoral Challenge and Response

A. The Church: A Community of Conscience, Prayer and Penance

Pope John Paul II, in his first encyclical, recalled with gratitude the teaching of Pius XII on the church. He then went on to say:

"Membership in that body has for its source a particular call, united with the saving action of grace. Therefore, if we wish to keep in mind this community of the people of God, which is so vast and so extremely differentiated, we must see first and foremost Christ saying in a way to each member of the community: 'Follow me.' It is the community of the disciples, each of whom in a different way—at times very consciously and consistently, at other times not very consciously and very consistently—is following Christ. This shows also the deeply 'personal' aspect and dimension of this society." (116)

In the following pages we should like to spell out some of the implications of being a community of Jesus' disciples in a time when our nation is so heavily armed with nuclear weapons and is engaged in a continuing development of new weapons together with strategies for their use.

It is clear today, perhaps more than in previous generations, that convinced Christians are a minority in nearly every country of the world—including nominally Christian and Catholic nations. In our own country we are coming to a fuller awareness that a response to the call of Jesus is both personal and demanding. As believers we can identify rather easily with the early church as a company of witnesses engaged in a difficult mission. To be disciples of Jesus requires that we continually go beyond where we now are. To obey the call of Jesus means separating ourselves from all attachments and affiliation that could prevent us from hearing and following our authentic vocation. To set out on the road to discipleship is to dispose oneself for a share in the cross (cf. Jn. 16:20). To be a Christian, according to the New Testament, is not simply to believe with one's mind, but also to become a doer of the word, a wayfarer with and a witness to Jesus. This means, of course, that we never expect complete success within history and that we must

---

By FR. PATRICK T. CAWLEY

Our Lord's call to "Come, follow me" is easier to cope with if we think it's addressed to someone else. After all, "I'm doing the best I can." However, if the truth be known, the call is to you — the one sitting in your seat. The call is directly personal, individual, intimate. It's for you and me, and it's now.

The beginning of section four of the pastoral letter focuses on the implications of being a community of Jesus' disciples in these days of moral crisis. The question might be put to us, "What are you followers of Jesus all about, anyway?"

How we approach the problem of war and how we view our responsibility in this area are crucial questions for all of us. The future of the planet is in our hands. It is also a gift to us and we owe it to each other and future generations to protect, enhance, and celebrate the earth.

Each diocese and parish is urged to develop balanced and objective educational programs to help all people understand better the issues of war and peace and the teachings of the pastoral. The letter itself must be used as a tool, a guide, a framework to construct and develop our conscience on the moral problems of war and peace. "We must learn together how to make correct and responsible moral judgments."

The pastoral points out the different levels of moral authority between Universal Church teaching and principles and the application of these to concrete situations. Such principles or teachings "seek to make explicit the Gospel call to peace and the tradition of the Church." These, then, are applied to specific situations where legitimate options may be possible. Such options and their consequences must be clear. Honesty and charity are required, but we must not disregard Church teaching.

The Lord calls to each of us — "Come, follow me." He means *you, the one sitting in your seat.* He means me. The Pastoral states: "We are called to move from discussion, to witness and action."