

Mama

O Mary, did you pity me
when I, a child, tried to dig up
my mother from her awful grave,
drank to the dregs the orphan cup?

Once I went lonely to a church;
I sat and prayed and made a vow:
Each day my soul shall bring you a rose,
if you will be my mother now—

my mother, not an olympian Goddess
nor princess from a fairy tale.
I want to feel you in my thought
and fill the void I so bewail.

O Mary, did you plant in me
the spirit of the holy scroll?
I feel an all-embracing love—
gone is the dark night of my soul—

a love for Moslems, Christians, Jews.
My spiritual hands embrace
the cow, the tree, the stone, the star.
You, Mary, made me full of grace.

You took me in to meet your children
and smiled, "I am your Jewish mother."
I said, "I'll stay, I love you all,
and Jesus is my favorite brother."

—William Hermanns

Jesus, the Jew

Anything Jesus has said, together with what the Gospel writers, who wrote 30 to 50 years later, collected from oral accounts, as Mark from Peter, and from hundreds of written stories of which they used those fitting their purpose and put into Jesus' mouth—anything Jesus said or was said to have said is inspired in its highest ethical utterings by the 150 Psalms, especially Psalm 23, "The Lord is my shepherd," and Psalm 91— "He who dwells in the Sacred Place." Jesus was born a Jew and died as a Jew. And the hate against the Jews fed by some passages of the Gospel writers, with the purpose to found a new religious group called Christians, under the motto "We are better than you Jews; we have the whole truth," - this hate is testified by the Crusades, witchburning, the Inquisition, and the Holocaust. Hitler himself boasted: "I learned my anti-Semitism from the Catholic Church." Einstein said to me regarding Rome's concordate with Nazidom in 1933: "How can the Pope make a pact with God and the Devil at the same time?" He also said: "Thoughts are energies; no energy is lost. What is sown as thoughts will be harvested. As the Jews tell us in the Bible: 'A thousand years is a day to God.' The world can escape the new nuclear Holocaust only by founding a Cosmic Religion. There is no love without justice, no justice without love."

When Jesus was asked what the most important commandments were he answered: "Thou shalt love God; and equal in importance: love your neighbor." Wherever religion craves for political power and earthly possessions, its vibrations are fed by demonic emissaries. Any religion choosing worldly powers as its ally cuts its spiritual roots and changes from a blessing to a curse.

It is known that Pius XII, an aristocratic admirer of German military order and obedience, considered Germany the fortress against Russia and granted Hitler freedom to act with the blessings of the Church as long as he guarantees the freedom of the Church to act within her religious domain and guarantees the safety of her properties.

Cardinal Tisserant told me that he had insisted in 1939 that Pius XII should publish an encyclical about the duty of each individual to obey the dictate of conscience. Two years later the German Bishop von Preysing asked the Pope to condemn publicly the mass murder of the millions of Jews by the Nazis— the response was Pius XII's silence. It was a peasant's son, Pope John XXIII, who condemned his predecessor's silence by accusing the Catholic Church to have for 2000 years worn the Sign of Cain on her head by slaying her brother Abel, the Jews.

—William Hermanns

Prof. Hermanns is a Visiting Scholar at Stanford. He was in WWI on the side of the Kaiser; served as a major in WWII against Hitler. At Harvard he did research and was a lecturer and was a professor at SJSU.

Can A Nuclear War Be Avoided?

Last week I went to hear retired Admiral Eugene Carroll, from the Center for Defense Information in Washington, speak on the question "Can A Nuclear War Be Avoided?" He began by pointing out that there are two assumptions behind the question: that we must be getting closer to a nuclear war, and that it will occur unless we do something to stop it.

In addressing the first assumption of whether the risk of nuclear war is increasing, Carroll spoke primarily about the United States, because this is where we live and have some influence. He remarked that it is equally important for the Soviets to review and change their situation. Our foreign policy is based on the concept that the USSR is at the root of all the problems in the world. This concept tends to operate with the tendency to militarize the circumstances of every conflict or problem, whether or not the problem is amenable to a military solution. Another factor is our tendency to proceed by means of confrontation and challenge: to take the adversarial position. Finally, we are in the process of developing a nuclear war fighting capability: in the budget currently before Congress, money is asked to develop weapons "to fight nuclear war successfully".

Adm. Carroll pointed out that these four factors do not operate independently: each makes the others more dangerous. He said that we have nuclear parity today, but that military types are not normally satisfied with parity, but are always seeking superiority. Therefore we are in a situation in which we can destroy each other 5 times over at present, and are planning to develop weapons systems in order to be able to destroy each other 15 times over (for the Soviets will build to match our increase). The only change that such a buildup produces is an increase in instability.

The important question is how we can change this outcome. Carroll advocates a three-step process: 1) slow the arms race by a total ban on testing nuclear weapons; 2) cease producing and deploying new nuclear weapons; and 3) reduce existing nuclear arms. The basic issue, however, is the fear and distrust which exist between the US and the USSR. We have to stop thinking that what is bad for them is good for us. A stable and prosperous USSR will be interested in a peaceful world order. Then perhaps we can deal with the real human problems: starvation, disease, pollution, energy resources.

A response to Adm. Carroll was made by Dr. Condoleezza Rice of the Stanford Arms Control and Disarmament Program, who added that there are two additional destabilizing factors: the misjudgment on the part of national leaders that there might be some advantages to nuclear war; and the possible initiation of nuclear war by accident. Dr. Rice then posed an interesting question: what does defense of the US really mean? Is it purely a military matter? What about defense of our democracy, defense of the social/political consensus that the present system is worth keeping? The loss of that consensus could be much more destabilizing than any Soviet arms buildup.

Wendy Smith

Memorial Church Times & Tenth



Volume 5
Number 11
5 May 1982

Review of Christianity, Social Tolerance & Homosexuality

Occasionally one discovers a book that reveals that one has been living in a very small corner of the world. It may be that the book reveals that a personally held belief is in fact held by lots of other people or vice versa. John Boswell's book *Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality* is one of those books. By combining careful scholarship, clear and incisive writing, and a strong moral sense, Boswell has produced a book that is required reading for anyone who has ever been concerned about the role of gay people in the Church. The book itself is very powerful both because it reveals a large amount of material about the Church's past acceptance of gay people and because Boswell really analyzes the material in order to discover what the various writers he quotes are saying. Boswell's ability to move behind 'accepted views' and stereotypes of all the concerned individuals to see with what they are really concerned produces some startling revelations. 'Startling' very much described my reaction to much of what Boswell says. Like many people I had assumed that the Christian Church had always been more or less hostile toward gay people and that the current efforts on the part of many people to counter that hostility represented a new position for the Church. To discover that gay people were accepted, honored, and even made bishops in the Church for more than a 1000 years was quite a surprise. It suggests that those working for greater acceptance of gay people within the Church have a lot more precedent for their goals than was previously thought.

Boswell's intent in the book is summarized nicely in the one of the early chapters, 'the present volume...is intended to refute the common idea that religious belief - Christian or other - has been the cause of intolerance in regard to gay people.' The book itself is divided into four major sections with two rather extensive appendices. The first section is termed 'Points of Departure' and contains the introduction, definitions, and an extensive discussion of homosexuality in ancient Rome. It is this last part that is the most interesting. As Boswell points out, it is often assumed that homosexuality in the ancient world was a rather depraved affair performed in a loveless manner. In fact some supporters of gay people in the Church today often suggest this in order to demonstrate that Paul was talking about that kind of sexuality rather than today's 'loving relationship' model. Boswell demonstrates that such a view is incorrect. In terms of excesses, it is not clear whether the homosexuals were any worse off than heterosexuals. In fact Boswell quotes various debates about which form of sexuality was the most 'civilized' and 'rational.' In a world where heterosexual marriage was often more a business agreement than a personal one, homosexual relationships were one of the areas where 'romantic love' and erotic attraction could operate.



continued on page 2

A Day with Bruno Bettelheim "On Violence"

"Violent delights have violent ends" quoted Bettelheim. The line from Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet* expresses the ironies and frustration we encounter in trying to understand violence. The subject is one which is rarely pursued in a satisfactory manner, and the solutions can never be true solutions unless one does away with the human race. These were the themes of a day-long seminar this spring led by Bruno Bettelheim discussing violence. The seminar was sponsored by UC Berkeley Extension.

The history of the Christian church is full of violence: wars were fought, whole communities destroyed, heretics burned at the stake, people were ostracized in the name of Jesus Christ whose teachings and lifestyle are of non-violence.

Parent-child relationships contain the same dichotomies between love and abuse. Love and discipline are needed to raise a child. Yet too much love causes confusion, too much discipline denies the self-will of the child and stunts the development of decision-making.

In domestic violence, says Bettelheim, one needs to consider carefully from where the cause is generated. The victim is often as much the cause as the obvious abuser, especially in chronic abuse. A common, yet true example is the nagging spouse. More subtle forms of tempting abuse are the child who will act as a lightning rod to attract abuse away from a loved one, i.e. the mother. And some women suffer chronic abuse because their self-esteem is so low that they feel they deserve punishment. Even after much physical abuse, a wife will say her husband beats her because he loves her.

Suicide is violence turned inward.

Scientists have tried to understand violence and its causes through experimentation. Their methods and conclusions still belie confusion and improper assumptions on the nature of human violence. Studies using rats to show that inner-city overcrowding causes violent behavior ignore the fact that there are other creatures, i.e. ants, which even use the same conditions to instinctively construct a highly organized social system. The Jewish ghettos of Europe were highly-regulated, nonviolent communities, yet grossly overcrowded. The definition of overcrowding itself is ambiguous since there are many European cities with large families sleeping several to a bedroom and yet will not have it any other way.

Violence occurs when human beings deny they have the capacity for violence. Bettelheim, himself a victim of Hitler's "Final Solution," argues that so many Jews were exterminated because they would not believe the reports that the Germans were transporting them to systematic death-centers and not just prisoner-of-war camps. One must know the nature of the beast before one can control it effectively.



continued on page 2