

For more information ...

Acronym 020 7503 8857 <http://www.acronym.org.uk/dd/dd76/76news04.htm>
BASIC The Grayston Centre, 2nd Floor, 28 Charles Square London N1 6HT, 020 7324 4680 <http://www.basicint.org/nuclear/beyondtrident/>

CND 162 Holloway Road, London N7 8DQ, 020 7700 2393 enquiries@cnduk.org
<http://www.cnduk.org/pages/campaign/ntdtrep.html>

Greenpeace Canonbury Villas, London, N1 2PN Tel 020 7865 8100 info@uk.greenpeace.org <http://www.greenpeace.org.uk>

Medact The Grayston Centre, 28 Charles Square, London N1 6HT 020 7324 4739
info@medact.org http://www.medact.org/article_wmd.php?articleID=387

Methodist Church Methodist Church House, 25 Marylebone Road, London, NW1 5JR 020 7486 5502 <http://www.methodist.org.uk>

Peacerrights Report on the legality of the Trident nuclear missile system
Newhall Place, 16 - 17 Newhall Hill, Birmingham B1 3JH
<http://www.peacerrights.org/reports/195>

Trident Ploughshares 42-46 Bethel St, Norwich NR2 1NR Tel 0845 45 88 366
<http://www.tridentploughshares.org/index.php3>

Quaker Peace and Social Witness

'Don't Replace Trident! New campaign pack available. For your pack, write to Peace & Disarmament Programme, Quaker Peace & Social Witness, Friends House, 173 Euston Road, London NW1 2BJ, Email disarm@quaker.org.uk or call 020 7663 1067.

Booklet produced by Christian Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament,
162 Holloway Rd., LONDON N7 8DQ
tel.: 020 7700 4200 fax: 020 7700 2357 email: christians@cnduk.org
web: <http://ccnd.gn.apc.org>

Christians working and praying for a nuclear weapons free world.



Christian Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament

Trident Replacement - What does Theology Say?

Theology Day School



Introduction

What is Trident?

Trident is the UK's nuclear weapons system. It consists of four Trident submarines which carry nuclear warheads. Each of the warheads is many times more destructive than the bomb dropped on Hiroshima. A decision has to be made during this parliament on where to start the process of renewing these warheads because the system will require replacement or scrapping within the next 20 years.

We now have a window of opportunity. If the government would only agree that the system is not to be replaced, this would be a big step towards nuclear disarmament - at least in the UK - and offers a good example to the rest of the nuclear weapons states.

Why involve the churches?

Christian anti-nuclear pacifists have always claimed that nuclear weapons are immoral, in addition to the negative economic, political and practical factors.

As a contribution to this discussion CCND organised a Theology Day School on 25 February, in which 3 eminent theologians discussed why nuclear weapons were contrary to the Gospel. The speakers were the Reverend Professor Marilyn McCord Adams, Father Gerry Hughes SJ and Peter Hunter OP.

This booklet contains transcripts of their presentations and a short description of the workshops that followed in the afternoon.

Our thanks go to ...

Our speakers, the workshop facilitators, helpers and organisers especially the Oxford group and all the attendees. Special thanks to David Platt for chairing the event. We are also grateful to Rev Dr Liz Carmichael and St John's College Oxford for their hospitality.

We also would like to thank *all* our members, and all who make donations or leave legacies to CCND, without whom we could do none of this work.

Workshops

Dr Kate Hudson

Parliamentary and legal issues

A 2005 public opinion poll showed that 54% of the population were opposed to Trident Replacement when they know it may cost up to £25 billion. The challenge now is to build on that narrow majority to make it an overwhelming view across society. That challenge is being taken up on many fronts, and a number of key areas are being developed. Our work in Parliament is central, because this is where we aim to have not only a full debate but the deciding vote. Both MPs and government need to experience the maximum pressure from their electorate. Another key pressure point comes from the trade unions, not only because of their role within the Labour Party, but because they are the largest participatory organisations of civil society, communicating with literally millions of members. Our work with both these sectors is underpinned by questions of legality relating to Trident replacement - in terms of international treaty obligations and recent legal opinions in Britain. This workshop will explore and develop these themes to support effective campaigning in the months ahead.

Angie Zelter

Nonviolent civil resistance

Angie will talk about the need for serious nonviolent civil resistance against the UK's WMD and will lead a discussion on Faslane 365 - a new initiative to apply critical public pressure by a con-

tinuous peaceful blockade of Faslane starting on October 1st 2006.



Dr Sian Jones

Aldermaston: Responding to the next generation of nuclear weapons

On 30 January 2006, as building work started on the new laser facility at Aldermaston, a multi-faith service took place in the middle of a blockade at one the gates. According to one of the participants: "it enabled some of us to be aware of peace, beauty and compassion in the moment in the face of evil activity at AWE." This workshop will to inform participants about the new developments at Aldermaston and how they can join the growing opposition campaign, and aims to encourage discussion of creative and strategic ideas for challenging the development of the next generation of nuclear weapons.

Michael & Patricia Pulham

Campaigning in the churches and faith communities

How do we get 'No Trident Replacement' on to the faith agenda? Help us to plan an outline campaign.

soldiers and perpetrated on our enemies in war.

Any and all of us who are not hermits, who live in warring and war-mongering societies however otherwise enlightened, are complicit in this. To whatever extent we protest, we also--by living here--benefit and many ways acquiesce in the system. And so it is not just they, but we who have dirty hands.

We have come to Ash Wednesday. Christians confess, the Reign of God is upon us: time to repent and believe the Good News. For nation-states as for individuals, repentance is both episodic and continual: first reversed direction, then one step at a time, then mid-course correction, etc. We work to eliminate bestiality within our society, for an end to slavery and then to classism. Then we work to eliminate human degradation at

the margins of our society. Eventually, human sympathy spreads more universally, and we recognize our call to recognize God's hand in all God's works and God's image in all God's children.

Among nation-states and empires, Great Britain has a good record for repentance. Among nation-states and empires, she has been a leader in setting degrading practices aside. Long ago, she gave up drawing and quartering, hanging and burning at the stake. All too recently, she was a leader in ending the slave trade, in abolishing the death penalty, and in training and maintaining a relatively non-violent police force.

Trident is one more opportunity for Great Britain to take the lead in withdrawing the threat to destroy the work of God's hand, in refusing to deface God's image in any of God's children.



Left to right: Gerry Hughes, David Platt, Peter Hunter and Marilyn McCord Adams

Father Peter Hunter OP

Peter Hunter is a Dominican priest based in Blackfriars, Oxford.

So we're agin it, but lots of people are forrit, and that means we need to explain why we think it's wrong to be building these kinds of weapons, why we think they should never be built, why we think they should certainly never be used.

It's a little bit more difficult to know how to make that kind of argument in the modern world, partly because a very clear argument for nuclear weapons has rather gone away. There was once a very clear argument of a certain kind, a kind I disagree with of course, which said, 'We have them so that the Soviet Union won't use theirs. We have these weapons in order to threaten the Soviet Union that if they ever do use theirs, we'll use ours. So hopefully these weapons will never be used by either side.' That was the theory.

Now clearly that argument has gone away, at least in this most straightforward sense. The Soviet Union had large cities that Britain could threaten with death. We are still threatened, I suppose, but the threat is supposed to come from smaller states, ones we're encouraged to think of as 'rogue states'. Of course, our politicians call them 'rogue' or 'evil' to justify military action against them. It's a way of avoiding thinking of them as using reason the way we use it. 'These people aren't reasonable people, so we can do anything we like to them. Certainly, we can't discuss anything with

them!' This is clearly wrong, but nevertheless, if that's how you think about them, you can't very well argue that they would behave rationally over nuclear weapons.

So a certain kind of argument in favour of nuclear weapons has more or less, I think, evaporated and nothing very clear and obvious has been put in its place, so we may feel we're arguing against a bit of a straw man. Still, the argument against a deterrent is an important one to make. In my community, I was sitting at lunch saying I was going to be speaking today at a conference about nuclear disarmament. One friar said, 'Surely you're not for it?' I said, 'Of course I'm for it!' At least two of my brothers were horrified. Even amongst intelligent people, even amongst Dominicans, there are those who still hold that the deterrent is necessary. So it's not clear what argument we're dealing with, but nevertheless we have to deal with it.

What I want to say next naturally falls into three bits. The first bit is, as it were, the moral argument against the deterrent. I will make a strictly philosophical argument, and I think that's important because making an argument



that's philosophical and not theological, not relying on matters of faith, means that the argument will have some weight, some kind of value for everyone we're talking to. It's a purely human argument. Then I want to look at two very different kinds of replies to that argument.

The argument against the nuclear deterrent is, I take it, as straightforward as it is possible for an argument in moral philosophy to be. The main premise is: It is immoral to do something, it is surely immoral to threaten to do it. That's true because a threat is a stated intention to act in certain ways under certain conditions. You're saying that if certain things are done (or not done), you will act thus and so. But if acting thus and so is immoral, you cannot say that under any conditions you will behave in those ways. My second premise, minor premise as logicians use to say is: The nuclear deterrent threatens to kill millions of people, millions of people who are not actively trying to kill us, and killing millions of innocent people is immoral. And when I say threats to do what is immoral are immoral and that killing millions of innocent people is immoral, I mean by 'immoral' what the previous Pope meant in *Veritas Splendor* by 'intrinsically evil', something you should never countenance doing in any circumstances.

Consequently for me, the practical arguments about 'Will the deterrent really work? Is this a practical way of pre-

venting nuclear war?', of all those arguments are strictly speaking irrelevant if my argument succeeds. If this argument succeeds at all, it establishes that however the practicalities turn out, whatever the matter of fact is about whether the strategies will be successful or not, that is just irrelevant. Threatening to kill millions of innocent people is an absolutely immoral act which we should never use under any circumstances, whether it is effective in preventing deaths or not.

Now there are two sorts of replies to the argument I've just given you. The first is, in some way, to deny that what we are doing in using nuclear weapons is threatening some great moral evil. So they won't deny my major premise (if something is wicked, then you can't threaten to do it) but they deny my minor premise, which is that nuclear deterrence is based on such a threat. 'Well, we could be bluffing' goes the argument. Now that seems to me to be patently ridiculous, but nevertheless it's an argument which is made by some thoughtful commentators, so I think it deserves some form of serious reply. So the argument here is: 'Nuclear deterrence isn't based on a threat to kill millions of people but on a bluff. If the conditions of the 'threat' were fulfilled, we wouldn't carry it out.'

Here, I'm afraid, to answer this argument, we have to get into some of the practicalities of how the deterrent works. How is it, if the deterrence is to be effective, that the apparent threat

Marilyn McCord Adams is an American philosopher of religion, a theologian and a writer on medieval philosophy. She is the Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford University.

"Almighty God, you have created the heavens and the earth and made us in your own image: teach us to discern your hand in all your works and your likeness in all your children; through Jesus Christ our Lord, who with you and the Holy Spirit reigns supreme over all things, now and forever. Amen." (CW 2000, Second Sunday before Lent)

Theology can become complex and technical, but the Gospel is simple at heart: "God created all things"; "God hates nothing that God has made"; "Jesus loves me, this I know, for the bible tells me so!" To a Christian, taking these truths home is what life is all about.

The bible sends many messages about warfare. But I am a Christian pacifist, and that limits what I have to say to a simple "no"--"no" to Trident, "no" to the war in Iraq, "no" to war of any kind!

The first simple truth to which I pledge allegiance is that war is bestial. In war, society commissions and/or coerces some of its members to act in its name to do things that go way beyond the pale of human decency, deliberately to degrade and destroy the image of God, to become persons who can ignore

Godlikeness in human beings, to become people who can torture and kill them. In war we descend with the beasts into the darwinian struggle: dog eat dog, and only the fittest survive!



The second simple truth is that nuclear war is diabolical. Nuclear weapons bid fare to undo the very structures of creation, to join the Satan in unravelling the works of God. Nuclear warheads have remarkable capacity to incinerate in seconds, leaving a faint film or shadow instead of human or skyscraper or tree. Nuclear warheads have lingering after effects, damaging our gene pool and wrecking our environment.

War suggests, nuclear warfare proves, human beings are willing to hate what God has made if self-preservation seems to require it. Most human societies, nearly every developed nation state, certainly our own have shown themselves willing to engage in warfare. This means that our high cultural achievements, including any intra-mural human rights traditions and civilities, are built and secured on the foundation of bestiality, which we have required of our

to local property values?

You now decide you must not keep Jesus all to yourselves. You arrange for him to go to the local church to address the congregation. You remember the address He once gave to the Chief Priests, the Scribes and the Pharisees in which He assured this very religious gathering that the prostitutes and the tax gatherers would get into the Kingdom of God before they did. He gives substantially the same sermon in your parish church. There is uproar. The parish loses its principal benefactors. You return home and you have a problem on your hands. What to do with Jesus? You know have trouble at home, trouble with the neighbours, trouble with the Church. You cannot throw him out of your house, because he is the Lord of all creation.

Look around your house carefully. Find a suitable cupboard. Clear it out, decorate it, have good strong locks put on it. Invite Jesus in, lock the door, place a lamp and flowers in front. Each time you pass the cupboard door, you bow most reverently. You now have Jesus where you want him and he does not interfere any more!

Is that what we have done with God, with Jesus?

One consequence of this split is the support which our national policy of nuclear deterrence has had for the last sixty years. It is not enough to get rid of nuclear weapons. The root of the evil lies in our minds and hearts. Without a

change there, we could get rid of nuclear weapons one day, then start creating them again on the next.

How can we heal this split?

The only effective place any of us can start is within ourselves. 'All change beings within ourselves, or it does not begin at all.' (Jung) 'Act as though the Kingdom of God has already come.' This is a quotation from the German peace activists, Dorothee Soelle in her book 'The Silent Cry' (Mysticism and Resistance).

We need prayer and holiness, but both prayer and holiness are affected by the split. We need a prayer which is earthed in reality and a holiness which is of God, not of our own making. Holiness is the presence of the Holy One, of God, the God of compassion who loves all creation. Finally, 'act locally and think globally'.

If we can face up to the criminality of our nuclear deterrence policy and work perseveringly against it, we shall not only get rid of nuclear weapons, but discover a new way of living in the village of humanity, cooperating not competing, encouraging not terrorising, being life-givers to all creation, not life threateners to all life.

Some books which explore the roots of human violence:

- ✦ Rene Girard: 'Violence and the Sacred.' 'The Scapegoat' 'Girard Reader' (a summary of his writings)
- ✦ Dorothee Soelle 'The Silent Cry' (Mysticism and Resistance)

must be made? For clearly, whoever it is we are trying to deter, the Soviet Union in the old days, goodness knows who now, has to believe that the threat is real and not a bluff for the deterrence to work. The whole way it works is that 'they' (whoever 'they' are in this modern world) think that under certain circumstances we would be willing to kill millions of their people. Now I take it that that means that there is no way we can do this effectively and really be bluffing. I think that's true partly because of the way in which the government works and partly because of the way the structures of the military have to work.

So there are any number of soldiers who have been trained to arm and then fire our nuclear weapons when given appropriate orders. And there have been, of course, every interesting studies, as you probably all know, into the ways in which the moral fibre of those soldiers was destroyed, really, by their having to be ready to do something which is both grotesque and straightforwardly immoral. These people are trained, in certain circumstances, having received the right orders, to be ready to arm and fire the weapons. They clearly can't think we are bluffing.

And equally, I don't think we, the electorate, can really believe that the government are bluffing. If we did believe the government were bluffing about this, I mean believed it for good reasons, then surely our enemies, 'they', would have the same reasons to think

our government was bluffing and the deterrent would have no value. We can't be bluffing. The only person who is capable of bluffing is Tony Blair. So if you argue like this, the morality of the deterrent will come down, for you. To whether you think Tony Blair is himself bluffing. Now it seems extremely bizarre to think that we could know it was all a bluff and yet our enemies would think it was all a real threat. So for these reasons, it seems this kind of approach isn't going to derail our argument.

The other kind of argument that's offered in favour of the nuclear deterrent will deny that there are any kinds of acts that are, in my strong sense, immoral. This reply is based on denying what is the larger moral principle behind my moral argument. The principle we find in St Paul (perhaps not intended as a principle by St Paul, but certainly taken as such by the Christian Church): You cannot do evil that good may come (Romans 3:8). You see, some people are willing to say, 'Yes, the nuclear deterrent is evil, but nevertheless we should use it. The ends justify the means. If the nuclear deterrent saves millions of lives, then it's worth doing, even if it is, in itself, simply speaking, wrong. So the consequences of the action justify the means.' There are various ways of making this argument. Some might prefer to say 'OK, the nuclear deterrent is a kind of threat, that's true, but it has another moral character, namely of protecting the lives of people from nuclear war,

saving millions. While it might be evil under the description of a threat to do evil, it might be good under this other description: saving millions of lives.' This version is preferred by people who don't want to deny that certain kinds of action should never be done, but who think that it matters a great deal what I am intending: am I intending to threaten death, or am I intending to save millions?

Now I think this second version is just as wrong as the first, and essentially because it really is a species of the first. What is being forgotten is that acts don't just have two moral descriptions, but those descriptions must somehow be related. In this case, they are clearly related as means to ends. My way of saving millions is to threaten millions of others with death. My means of achieving an uneasy peace is to make this terrible threat. The threat is not intended. It's my means of getting the job done. So ultimately we come back to whether it is ever right to do evil that good may come. There are lots of good reasons for thinking it isn't - those interested should look at the relevant chapter in Finnis, Boyle and Grisez's great book, *Nuclear deterrence, morality and realism* - but I take it that it can be argued and certainly that the Christian Church has definitely rejected the idea that it can ever be right to do evil that good may come.

Now there is a problematic point I

want to make. Some of you won't like it. Elizabeth Anscombe has argued, and I have some sympathy with what she says, that this second kind of argument for nuclear deterrence is a kind of variant of the pacifist arguments. She claims that pacifists have persuaded people generally that war is evil. The argument then goes like this: 'War is evil (pacifist principle) but sometimes we find ourselves in war (practical principle). But if war is itself wicked, then what I do within war doesn't matter. I'm doing something wicked already in being at war. So I may as well do whatever is necessary to get the job done as quickly and with as little loss of my own soldier's lives as possible.'

This is the kind of argument that is used (some think naively) to justify the dropping of the atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. 'The second world war was wicked, and since we were dealing with an irrational enemy who wouldn't surrender, we could justify doing anything, even obliterating an entire city, to bring it to an end and save the lives of our soldiers.' We've all heard this kind of argument, and similar arguments can and have been made about the fire-bombing of Dresden, or the carpet-bombing of Cologne.

What Anscombe argues, and what I think she's right in arguing, is that if you think war is always evil and then you find yourself in one, you haven't prepared yourself in advance as to what

on hearing this news, met frequently and decided that they were going to take their protest to the bishop. However, before they had organised the meeting with the bishop, the new parish priest made a fatal mistake. The parish had a club and the parish priest had changed the beer without consulting anyone. The men of the parish rose up in revolt with a unity of purpose they had never before experienced. The new parish priest had to give way.

The moral of that story is in the question it raises for all of us. 'What is my beer factor?' What is it that moves me to action, as distinct from what I say moves me to action?

The Third World group were admirable in many ways but they did not have the 'oomph' of the beer men. This split in our spirituality weakens us at a central point of our being. We are like cars without clutches. Our engines may hum and roar, but they do not move the wheels: we can talk eloquently and loudly, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing. This split debilitates us and renders us ineffective. There have been many studies done in the last fifty years on the subject of poverty and world hunger. Somehow, the conclusions cannot be translated into effective action for the people at starvation level and the differences between rich and poor are increasing.

A final example of the split: Imagine that one evening there is a ring at your

front doorbell. On answering there on the doorstep is the Risen Lord himself. Somehow you know, beyond any shadow of doubt, it is he. What do you do now? Quick genuflection and sign of the cross? Presumably, you invite him in, get in touch with as many people as you can, inviting them to meet the surprise guest. And in the course of the evening you hear yourself saying fatuous things to the Lord of all creation such as, 'Do make yourself at home.' Jesus replies 'How kind! That is why I came.'

Now you take a leap in your imagination of two weeks. Jesus is still at home. How is it at home now? To help your imagination, recall some Gospel passages, for example, Jesus saying, 'I have not come to bring peace but the sword.' A family of five will be divided, three against two, two against three, father against son, son against father: mother against daughter, daughter against mother: mother in law against daughter in law, daughter in law against mother in law. What has Jesus said or done which has caused one or more of the family to have a tantrum and stomp out of the house in a rage?

You invited Jesus to make himself at home in your house, so he has begun inviting his friends. Who were his friends in the Gospel, what kind of people were they? So, who is coming along your road now and what is happening to the curtains in the house opposite and, even more important, what is happening

pilot whose attention will be primarily on spirit, God, the soul etc., or would you prefer a good solid atheist whose primary interest is the instrument panel and the safe arrival of himself and his material load of crew and passengers?

We take great care to keep God out of the ordinary details of our lives. We can all pray together for peace and no one is likely to stomp out in indignation, provided we keep the prayer very general, but if we allow God into the details of our prayer, then the troubles begin. Imagine I am a supporter of nuclear deterrence and on Peace Sunday I am invited to pray for peace. In this prayer I shall include what I really think and feel as a supporter of nuclear deterrence. The prayer is not an argument against nuclear deterrence; it is a prayer which expresses the split between our reason and our emotions, an effect of our split spirituality.

‘Dear Lord, inspire our scientists that they may invent more lethal weaponry, because the more lethal it is the more effectively it will deter. Preserve us from any unfortunate accident in its testing, less Chernobyl becomes a sideshow in comparison with the devastation that might ensue. Bless our economy that we may put these weapons into plentiful production, otherwise they will fail to deter. Have a special care of the poor, the sick, the hungry and the aged of our own and of other lands until such time as our defence commitments enable us to contribute a little more to these good

purposes. Strengthen our leaders in a strong defence policy. Drive out from our midst any who by thought, word or deed undermine our national security and grant us the protection of nuclear weaponry now and forever. Amen.’

Notice our felt reaction to this prayer. Most of us have been brought up in a culture which considers feelings to be a dangerous distraction from the serious things of life. ‘Ignore/overcome your feelings and do what you are told by those who know what is best for you.’ Our feelings and emotions are very wise. They register the significance of things for us before our logical minds have discovered why they are significant. One result of our split spirituality is that our logical minds become separated from our emotional life with disastrous consequences for both. The following story can help us to grasp the consequences of this split.

A priest, who had been a military chaplain for years, took over a parish in England. Within a week he had changed everything he could find. The parish included a very lively Third World group. They brought in visiting lecturers, ran a bookshop and Traidcraft stall. They had arranged with the previous parish priest to have a monthly collection for a Third World project, digging wells in India. The new parish priest told the group that there would no longer be such a monthly collection; he reckoned that an annual collection would be sufficient. The group members seethed with anger

you would be willing to do within war. The traditional Catholic position is of course that in certain very extreme circumstances, war is the right thing to do - not ‘evil that good may come’, not ‘the wrong thing but the best wrong thing of the lot’ - but actually the right thing to do, and that means you can then think hard about what kinds of moral strictures you then place on conduct within war. What kinds of things can we morally do for this war to still remain moral? If war is not always evil, this is an open question, one you can actually think about intelligently and give answers to. So the challenge of Elizabeth Anscombe is that pacifism itself has made it hard for us to argue about what morally can be done within war. ‘War is evil, you find yourself in war - you’re in the midst of evil so everything you do is evil. You may as well do the most effective thing to get the war done’, including many things everyone here would find morally reprehensible.

Nevertheless, (I don’t want to end there because I can see many of you frowning at me) I think the argument against the nuclear deterrent is obvious: if it is evil to do something, it is evil to threaten to do it. Nuclear deterrence must involve a threat and then, therefore, whoever it is we’re trying to deter, we mustn’t use that deterrence. This

method of achieving our goal is intrinsically evil and can’t be used in any circumstances. It is evil to do what is horrendous.

Now I want to finish on one final point, which is: One of the ways in which we might be tempted away from a strict pacifist position and towards the position saying ‘war is evil, but sometimes it happens and you must be willing to do what is necessary to bring it to an end’, one way in which we might be tempted away from the principle that we cannot do evil that good may come, is the idea that there are certain situations in which we really want to be able to act. We want to find some way of doing something about the situation and the nuclear deterrent (or some other evil action) is our only option. We then need to remember that in some situations there may be nothing morally we can do, and that is part of discovering that we live in God’s world, not ours, the world where He might be the only agent who can act to fix things. That might be our discovery, that there is nothing we can do in some situations, and we wait on Him.

Father Gerry Hughes, well known for his spiritual writings, was our second speaker.

This is not an accurate account of what I said. I spoke from very brief notes. As far as I can remember the following includes most of what I said plus a few clarifications.

A welcome to you all. I am very grateful for this invitation. It forces me to try and put into words what I think and feel after years of struggle with the question of nuclear deterrence. I still stutter and stammer, unable to find words adequate to convey the horror of it all.

The horror is not primarily about Trident and its proposed renovation: primarily: primarily it is what the submarines and bombs tell us about ourselves; and that is very disturbing. If we can allow ourselves to be disturbed, we can also be enlightened and encouraged: if we refuse to let ourselves be disturbed, we are a people without hope.

Let me begin with some general reflections. I remember where I was when I first heard news of the H. bomb on Hiroshima. I was on the beach at Prestatyn, North Wales. Someone said, 'They've dropped an atomic bomb on Hiroshima and the war with Japan is over'. I remember my immediate reaction - 'Thank God the war is over - pity about the bomb'. It took many years before the horror of it began to disturb me.

Over twenty years later, I attended a dinner at Glasgow University, seated next to a Polaris submarine commander,

a magnificent human specimen, very healthy, pinkish complexion, clean shaven, immaculate white cuffs, with lots of gold braid on his sleeve. He consumed his steak with obvious relish while regaling us with the firepower of his submarine.



A second picture: In the eight years I spent as a chaplain at Glasgow University, I used to spend most Saturdays on the hills with groups of students. One summer's day we were sitting by the banks of Loch Lomond, when one student pointed out a valley leading from Loch Lomond to Faslane. He told us that the largest store of nuclear weapons in the UK were stored in the hillside, now occupied by NATO.

The third picture was the Holy Loch where the Polaris submarines were based. I climbed the hills overlooking the Holy Loch on a beautiful day in spring. The sky was cloudless, the sea like glass, not a submarine in sight. I imagined a Polaris periscope leaving its gentle ripple of water behind as it moved out to sea...

In all these pictures there is the contrast between the surface view of things and the monstrous reality which lies beneath the appearances. Do those three images mirror something that is also in

us? The destructive power of nuclear weapons does not lie in the submarine, or in its weapons: it lies in us. Where is the source of this evil? If that is true, then to rid ourselves of nuclear weapons, does not solve the problem. The collapse of the Soviet Empire and the end of the Cold War did not bring about disarmament of the nuclear weaponry of US, NATO and UK, built to defend us from the Soviet threat. It seems that we have to have an enemy if we are to feel secure.

This is a meeting of Christian CND. As Christians, could the root of our problem lie in the split nature of our spirituality? We have become so accustomed to it, that any attempt to question it begins to sound like heresy.

What I mean by split spirituality is the split between the faith we profess with our lips and the atheism we declare by our behaviour. We can be very fussy about our liturgies, about the precise formulation of our beliefs, every ready to declare each other unorthodox. We give great attention to these matters while, at the same time, taking remarkable and subtle care not to let God interfere in the ordinary everyday things of life because, as we all know but do not dare utter, God is utterly impractical. Try putting the Sermon on the Mount into practice and see what happens! Can you imagine any great Christian political leader basing his manifesto on Jesus' teaching about turning the other cheek and not asking for your money back if

someone robs you?

The Labour Party was against nuclear arms, then realised that they could never get into government unless they supported a policy of nuclear deterrence. In the last fifty years, no political party in Britain could oppose our nuclear policy and hope for election. There is now an anti-nuclear movement in the Churches, not deafening, but audible.

I spent three years in the 1950s in Germany. The question which struck me then and still remains is 'How was it that such an intelligent, educated, cultured and religious a nation could possibly fall for Nazism?' It is still a mystery, but any nation is liable to this national madness. I do not believe we are going to make much progress in banishing nuclear arms until we acknowledge the split nature of our spirituality.

Let me explain in more detail the meaning of this split. Take, for example, our vocabulary, natural and supernatural, sacred and secular, material and spiritual. Look up the word spiritual in a modern dictionary and you will find such enlightening information as 'concerned with the spirit, the soul, God etc., not with physical, material matter.' So the meaning is clear: the spiritual has nothing to do with material things, nothing to do with the here and now.

A simple question: Imagine you are going on a long distance flight and find yourself praying to God for a safe journey. What kind of pilot would you like God to vouchsafe unto you? A spiritual