Conscientious Objectors in the Armed Forces

I. Introduction

Many C.O.'s in the armed forces get along as well as the men on combatant duty. Some have been decorated for heroism, and Army Medical Corps officers have expressed general satisfaction with I-A-O's. Most of the difficulties arise because of lack of information available to these C.O.'s before induction. Some men had not even heard of the I-O classification, but the larger group had extremely erroneous ideas about the training program and army life through which I-A-O's must go.

Still others become C.O.'s after becoming members of the armed forces, adopting either the non-combatant position or the alternative service position.

It is the purpose of this section of the Handbook to provide helpful information about the nature of the noncombatant assignments performed by most C.O.'s in the armed forces. If the training program and assigned duties do not conflict with a man's conscience, presumably he can be a good soldier. But if an objector decides in advance that he cannot conscientiously become a noncombatant member of the armed forces, he can consider other C.O. positions while he still is a civilian subject to the draft law, rather than a soldier subject to the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

II. Obtaining Noncombatant Status

CLASSIFICATION BY DRAFT BOARD

Men with C.O. status in the armed forces have received that status through Selective Service prior to induction or have obtained it by transfer to noncombatant duty under Department of Defense regulations.
Those men who receive C.O. status from Selective Service follow the classification procedure outlined in Part 1 of this booklet. I-A-O's have the same rights of appeal and special appeal procedure as I-O's.

TRANSFER TO NONCOMBATANT DUTY

Some members of the armed forces become conscientious objectors to combatant duty after induction, and seek transfer to non-combatant status. Obtaining such a transfer is provided for by Department of Defense Directive 1315.1, dated June 18, 1951. This directive covers all branches of the armed forces. It is implemented in the Army by AR 614-260, in the Air Force by AFR 39-51, in the Navy by Bureau of Personnel Instruction 1610.5, and in the Marine Corps by MCO 1306.16.

To transfer from regular duty to noncombatant C.O. duty, written application should be made to the appropriate commanding officer, together with a full statement of the basis of one's conscientious objection to combatant duty.

If a member of a church, one should obtain a substantiating letter from the pastor. If not a church member, supporting letters should be obtained from friends.

The applicant must be assigned to noncombatant duties while a decision is pending. If the application is granted, the man is transferred to noncombatant duty with the same legal provisions as the I-A-O, although his Selective Service classification is not changed.

Nonetheless, CCCO recommends that the local Selective Service board be asked for a SSS Form No. 150, and that this be filled out and returned. For further details obtain the CCCO memo entitled “The Conscientious Objector and the Armed Forces.”

NONCOMBATANT DUTY DEFINED

Noncombatant duty for conscientious objectors in the armed forces was defined by the President in Executive Order No. 10028, dated 13 January 1949, as follows:

(a) service in any unit of the armed forces which is unarmed at all times;
(b) service in the medical department of any of the armed forces, wherever performed; or
(c) any other assignment the primary function of which does not require the use of arms in combat; provided that such other assignment is acceptable to the individual concerned and does not require him to bear arms or to be trained in their use.

“The term ‘noncombatant training’ shall mean any training which is not concerned with the study, use, or handling of arms or weapons.”
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III. Basic Training of Noncombatants

The basic training program for the Army Medical Service* is designed to prepare men for front line duty. When assignments are given a C.O. medic is just as apt to be assigned to a combat area as a non-C.O. This relation to combat points up the necessity for certain types of training to which some I-A-O's have objected. For instance, medics study squad tactics because they move through combat areas with combat squads; in modern warfare, ambulances or medical field stations are subject to bombing or strafing, so medics must know how to take cover.

"Medical problems are highly correlated with tactical problems. The same hostile fire that stops combat troops retards or prevents the evacuation of casualties. Terrain that is difficult for troops to traverse lends even more difficulties to the movement of the wounded. Weather that embarrasses tactical operations usually increases the number of sick to be evacuated." (Army Field Manual FM 8-10, page 26)

The following detailed description of basic training in the medical service shows how the Army tries to train its noncombatant soldiers to meet these combat situations.

At present, all I-A-O's inducted into the Army are sent to the Medical Training Center (MTC) at Fort Sam Houston, San Antonio, Texas, for sixteen weeks of training; the first eight-week period is for basic training and the second half for individual training. All I-A-O's must take this training before being assigned to a military unit or installation.

The Army describes the general importance of basic training as follows:

"There is no Army training more vital than that received by the individual in basic, general military subjects including the fundamentals of basic infantry tactics. It is during this training that the individual receives his first impression of the Army and learns of his obligation to fight. The kind of start he gets will have a profound effect upon the Army in the accomplishment of its training mission or subsequent deployment and combat. The better he understands the reason for his actions, the greater will be the likelihood of his ready adjustment to Army life and its demands upon him. While he must

*Most of the information in this section on the basic training of noncombatants is based on Army Training Program; No. 21-114, Basic Combat Training Program (November 14, 1958) as modified by USAMTC Memorandum No. 350-2, Modified Basic Training Program for Conscientious Objectors (I-A-O), issued at Fort Sam Houston, Texas, November 3, 1959. Reference was also made to the earlier Army Training Program No. 8-111, dated April, 1954.
learn to conform to the Army pattern, observe its customs and traditions, and fit into its discipline, within these boundaries he remains an individual."

MTC basic training seeks to prepare soldiers to carry out the prime mission of the medical service, which is "to keep the manpower of the Army at the highest possible peak of efficiency... Manpower is the indispensable element of a military establishment. When sickness and injury cut down the availability of servicemen, the military mission is seriously hampered."

FIRST EIGHT WEEKS TRAINING PERIOD

The objective of the first eight weeks of training is "to produce a confident, alert and physically fit soldier trained in basic military subjects and in the fundamentals of combat as they are applicable to conscientious objectors."

All I-A-O men assigned to the Medical Training Center at Fort Sam Houston are trained in separate units during the first eight weeks training period since I-A-O men are not given any weapons training, even those who might volunteer for it.

Regardless of the complete absence of weapons training, the I-A-O is a part of the Army, is subject to its discipline, and must share in camp and barracks life.

Following is the complete list of subjects given to the I-A-O during his first eight weeks of training. The numbers following the subjects indicate the hours devoted to that topic and give some indication of the relative importance as viewed by the Army. The schedule calls for a total of 352 hours of training.

Troop Information and Indoctrination (27)
Orientation 1
Achievements and Traditions of the Army 2
Military Courtesy and Custom 3
Character Guidance 4
Military Justice 7
Maintenance, Supply Economy and Cost Consciousness 1
Troop Information 6

General Military Subjects (198)
Drills and Ceremonies 25
Field Sanitation and Personal Hygiene 2
First Aid 8
Individual Protection Against Chemical, Bacteriological and Radiological Attack 8
Guard Duty 4
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Inspections 25
Intelligence Training 4
Physical Training 24
Map Reading 18
Signal Communication 12
Military Driver Training 68

Tactical Training (72)
- Infiltration Course 6
- Individual Day and Night Training 12
- Marches and Bivouacs 16
- Squad Patrolling 22
- Squad Tactical Training 8
- Anti-Infiltration and Anti-Guerilla Warfare Training 4
- Land Mine Warfare 4

Miscellaneous (75)
- Proficiency Testing 3
- Bivouacs Critique 2
- Processing 15
- Commander's Time 55

SECOND EIGHT WEEKS TRAINING PERIOD

Under normal circumstances the trainee will be given a furlough at the end of his first training cycle. He then returns to Fort Sam Houston for the second eight-weeks training period. I-A's assigned to the medics join the I-A-O's for this training. Neither I-A-O's nor I-A's are given any weapons training during this period. Although this training period includes some general military subjects, the training is primarily devoted to medical subjects.

IV. Assignments After Basic Training

When the I-A-O man completes the 16 weeks training he receives a "Military Occupational Specialty" (MOS) number, designating his availability for a particular area of military work. The I-A-O man most likely will receive a MOS 910 (Medical Corpsman). With four weeks additional training he could receive a MOS 911.1 (Medical Specialist). The two MOS are described below. Many other MOS are offered but assignments depend upon military need and preference is given to Regular Army enlistees. Obviously the I-A-O's wishes can

have little effect on the assignment process, and his particular abilities may not be utilized constructively.

MEDICAL CORPSMAN

Duties— "Performs routine phases of patient care and treatment in combat areas, hospital units, dispensaries, clinics, and other medical facilities under direct supervision of commissioned officer or enlisted specialist of the Army Medical Service. Carries, directs or escorts patients to appropriate medical facility. Administers emergency first aid. Dispenses simple medications; cleanses and dresses minor wounds, cuts, and abrasions; and attends to routine need and comfort of patients as directed by medical officer, nurse, or enlisted specialist. Takes patient's temperature, pulse and respiration. Determines patient's height and weight. Collects and labels urine specimens and performs other simple tasks in physical examination procedures. Washes, bathes, and shaves patients. Make up beds and litters and disposes of soiled linens. Empties, cleans, and sterilizes bedpans and urinals. Obtains food or prepares simple nourishment and serves patients. Gives bed care such as baths, enemas, and alcohol rubs. Assists in disrobing and dressing patients. Assists in quieting or otherwise restraining excited patients. Delivers messages and performs errands. Reads literature to or writes letters for patients. Assists in central material services and performs duties essential to patient's environmental health."

Skills And Knowledge— "Must know basic anatomy, physiology, materia medica, and first aid. Must know basic emergency medical care and treatment including checking of hemorrhage and cleaning and dressing of minor cuts and abrasions. Must know general organization and function of the Army Medical Service. Must know nomenclature and usage of basic drugs contained in medical kits and medical chests used in hospital wards. Must know methods of pitching and striking various types of tentage including basic principles of camouflage and concealment. Must know methods of transportation and evacuation of sick and wounded. Must know basic principles of field sanitation and prevention of diseases. Must know basic nursing principles and techniques. Must know care of supplies and equipment."
relieve pain, prevent infection, or treat patients in state of shock. Carries, directs, or ushers patients to sheltered area or treatment facility. Assists medical officer at aid station or dispensary in receiving, sorting, treating, and preparing patients for further evacuation. Sets up equipment and administers plasma or other blood derivatives, and required vaccines. Dispenses medications for minor injuries and ailments. Assists in operation of oxygen tents and related apparatus. Gives general mouth, hand, ear, eye, foot, throat, and nose care. Takes and records blood pressure and other vital signs. Performs duties essential to complete patient hygiene. Collects and labels specimens. Stays with and observes select patients such as those recovering from general anesthetics, shock, or emotional disturbances. Cares for prosthetic appliances and applies or assists patients in applying them. Participates in sanitary inspection of field units to aid in control and prevention of diseases. Carries out medical asepsis as instructed, including disposal of infectious materials and wastes, and decontamination of communicable disease area. Assists medical officer by conducting routine diagnostic tests and administering prescribed medication. Conducts tests to determine patient basal metabolic rate and makes and develops electrocardiograms as directed by medical officer. Assists in selecting sites for treatment facilities; planning operation orders; and supervising movement and setting up of medical unit. Plans and organizes work schedules, assigns duties, and instructs subordinates in proper work techniques and procedures. Requisitions, supplies, and reviews, consolidates, and prepares technical personnel, and administrative reports.” (MOS 911.)

Skills And Knowledge—

"Must have basic knowledge of anatomy and physiology including functions of skeleton, muscular, circulatory, respiratory, digestive, nervous, and endocrine systems. Must know basic anatomical structure and function of eyes, ears, nose, mouth, and throat. Must know casualty evacuation techniques and procedures. Must know general principles of nursing for sub-acute general medical and surgical patients. Must know purpose and use of medical records. Must know function of patient care team both in hospital unit and combat area. Must be able to manage a casualty from time of wounding until seen by medical officer, to include control of hemorrhage and shock, application of dressings and splints, and administration of intramuscular, subcutaneous, and intravenous injections. Must be able to dispense medications as directed. Must be able to collect, label, and measure urine, feces, vomitus, and sputum specimens.” (Applies only to specialist under MOS 911.1.)

*The descriptive materials for MOS 910 and 911.1 are taken from Personnel Selection and Classification, Manual of Enlisted Military Occupational Specialties,” Department of the Army, AR 611-201, September, 1956.
V. Mission of the Army Medical Service

"The primary duty of medical troops as of all other troops is to contribute their utmost to the success of the command of which the medical service is a part."

This plain statement of fact from Army Field Manual FM 8-10 (page 195) is perfectly logical. The purpose of armies in combat is to win military victories. Every part of the Army is coordinated towards this goal. Evident as this appears to be, some men are actually inducted into the medical service thinking that the medics are instruments of mercy apart from the Army and its primary objectives. This erroneous conclusion can lead to serious personal difficulties. True, the medics save lives and ease suffering, sometimes in a manner which takes real heroism. But the medic is a soldier, and the ultimate objective of medics is to win battles.

This point is made again and again in Army Field Manual FM 8-10 (Medical Service Theater of Operations, dated March, 1951), which outlines the work of the medics in combat areas. Quotations within the text which follows are from the manual, and page references are given.

Saving lives and easing suffering are not even mentioned as part of the mission of the medics. The manual states, "The mission of the medical service in a theater of operations is to contribute to the success of the military effort through—

"a. Conserving Manpower. Military strength is preserved by seeing that only the fit take the field, by the protection of troops against unnecessary hazards to health and efficiency, and by effective care and early return to duty.

"b. Preventing Adverse Effects of Unevacuated Casualties on Combat Efficiency. Casualties within any combat unit restrict its movement. Lack of care and proper evacuation reduces the soldier's willingness to take necessary risks. Both can be prevented by adequate medical aid and rapid evacuation." (page 20)

Casualties are called "non-effective" (page 22) since they cannot contribute to military success.

Maintaining combat efficiency of the rest of the Army is stressed as important for the medics. "The essentiality for physical fitness is a critical factor in the combat efficiency of troops. Military history is rampant with examples of battles that were lost and campaigns that failed solely because the troops were immobilized by disease." (page 22)

"Simple measures, instituted early, often contribute more to combat efficiency than more elaborate measures instituted too late." (page 21)
VI. Obtaining a Discharge

Department of Defense Directive No. 1300.6 (dated August, 1962) standardizes the procedure for obtaining a discharge from all branches of the armed forces, both active and reserve units. This Directive has been implemented by the Army with AR 635-20; the Air Force with AFR 35-24; the Navy with BUPERS 1616.6, and the Marine Regulation MCO 1306.16A. For men in the National Guard or Army Reserves AR 135-25 applies.

Men in the armed forces who apply for discharges as conscientious objectors prior to having served 180 days become liable under Selective Service upon discharge. Applicants therefore must agree to perform civilian alternative service for two years if called upon to do so. No man is eligible for discharge who claimed to be a CO prior to accepting induction. Veterans' rights must be waived.

Servicemen contemplating discharge on the grounds of conscientious objection to all war should obtain from CCCO the memo "The Conscientious Objector and the Armed Forces," which incorporates Department of Defense Directive 1300.6 and outlines the procedure to follow. Copies of the regulations implementing the Directive are also available on request.

Although many men were discharged on grounds of conscience during 1964 and 1965, since the spring of 1966 virtually all applications have been denied regardless of merit. Those who refuse orders are court martialed and generally released on other grounds after serving one or two prison sentences.
Thinking Through the Basis of Conscientious Objection

I. Introduction

The primary purpose of this section of the Handbook is to raise questions which will help the C.O. examine and clarify his own beliefs. Having done this, the C.O. will be better able to explain and defend his position.

Part 1 of the Handbook gives the details of information requested on Form 150 and reports the nature of the personal appearance before the local board and the interview with the Department of Justice Hearing Officer. In addition to these official requests for information about the basis and exact nature of his belief, each C.O. frequently interprets his position to other interested persons.

Special reference is made to the basis of conscientious objection recognized by law, for some C.O.'s are reluctant to label themselves "religious." Because of difference in terminology, some men have stated their beliefs in a way which results in their ruling themselves out of consideration for C.O. status.

II. What is Religious Training and Belief?*

RELIGION DEFINED

"Religion" has been variously defined. We quote here some of the definitions which may be helpful to men seeking to make their own positions clear.

The Shorter Oxford English Dictionary defines religion as "devotion to some principle; strict fidelity or faithfulness; plus affection or attachment."

The New International Encyclopedia divides definitions of religion into two classes: "The first class defines religion as an attitude of con-
duct and life, directed towards a power without . . . (The second class) regards religion as experience without regard to the object towards which it is directed.”

According to the Dictionary of Philosophy and Psychology, “a man’s real religion . . . is that set of objects, habits, and convictions, whatever it might prove to be, which he would rather die for than abandon.”

It has generally been held that religion of the subjective type (that is, religion as inner experience rather than as outward devotion) may be judged objectively by standards of conduct. The Quakers, without creed or body of dogma, have evidenced the religious nature of their opposition to war by their conduct during three centuries. “The humble, meek, merciful, just, pious and devout souls are everywhere of one religion,” said William Penn.

Others of our country’s founders expressed a similar opinion. “My religion is to do good,” wrote Tom Paine. Benjamin Franklin said: “Vital religion has always suffered when orthodoxy is more highly regarded than virtue; and the Scriptures assure me that at the last day we shall not be examined on what we thought, but by what we did.” Thomas Jefferson wrote in a letter to a friend: “He (God) has formed us moral agents . . . that we may promote the happiness of those with whom He has placed us in society, by acting honestly towards all, benevolently to those who fall within our way, respecting sacredly their rights, bodily and mental, and cherishing especially their freedom of conscience, as we value our own. I must ever believe that religion substantially good which produces an honest life.”

Great religious leaders have often defined religion in terms of inner feeling and right conduct, rather than of membership in an organization or conformity to its rules. Jesus said: “The Kingdom of God is within you,” and James wrote (James 1:27) that “pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this, to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world.” The views of Hillel, the great Jewish scholar and rabbi, and contemporary of Jesus, are summarized in the Jewish Encyclopedia thus: “Love of man was considered by Hillel as the kernel of the entire Jewish teaching. When a heathen who wished to become a Jew asked him for a summary of the Jewish religion in the most concise terms, Hillel said, ‘What is hateful to thee, do not to thy fellow man: This is the whole law; the rest is mere commentary.’”

Immanuel Kant defined religion as that “. . . which in instructing us animates us with basic principles for action, and wholly subjects whatever Scripture may contain for historical faith to the rules and incentives of pure moral faith, which alone constitutes the element of genuine religion in each ecclesiastical faith.” According to Auguste Comte, often called the father of sociology, “religion . . . finds its
actual expression in the active service of humanity." John Stuart Mill held that "the essence of religion ... is the sense of unity with mankind." John Dewey wrote: "It is widely supposed that a person who does not accept any religion is thereby shown to be a non-religious person ... The adjective 'religious' denotes nothing in the way of specifiable entity either institutional or as a system of beliefs." He specifies that "any activity pursued in behalf of an ideal and against an obstacle, and in spite of threats of personal loss because of conviction of its general and enduring value is religious in quality." One of the finest of all philosophers' statements on religion is that of Whitehead in *Science and the Modern World*: "Religion is the version of something which stands beyond, behind and within the passing flux of immediate things; something which is real, and yet waiting to be realized; something which is a remote possibility, and yet the greatest of present facts; something which is the ultimate ideal, and the hopeless quest."

Scientists have also contributed their share to this understanding of religion in terms of inner conviction expressing itself in the moral life. Albert Einstein spoke of a stage of religious experience which he called cosmic religious feeling: "The religious geniuses of all ages have been distinguished by this kind of religious feeling, which knows no dogma and no God conceived in man's image; so there can be no church whose teachings are based on it. Hence it is precisely among the heretics of every age that we find men who were filled with the highest kind of religious feeling, and were in many cases regarded by their contemporaries as atheists, sometimes also as saints." Sir Arthur Eddington said: "Rejection of creed is not inconsistent with being possessed by a living belief. We have no creed in science, but we are not lukewarm in our beliefs ... in religion we are repelled by that confident theological doctrine which has settled for all generations just how the spiritual world is worked; but we need not turn aside from the measure of light that comes into our experience showing us a Way through the unseen world."

**CONTEMPORARY DEFINITIONS**

Some contemporary religious thinkers have attempted definitions which may be helpful. According to John Haynes Holmes: "Religion is the consciousness of some power manifest in nature which helps man in the ordering of his life in harmony with its demands ... (it) is the supreme expression of human nature; it is man thinking his highest, feeling his deepest, and living his best." Georgia Harkness holds that "religion means fundamentally faith in a meaningful existence ... (this) implies wholeness—the integration of life about a center with radii extending in proper balance to every aspect of life."
The opinion of the Director of Selective Service as to the meaning of religious training and belief is important:

"It is my feeling that each case must be considered individually and that no presidential appeal decision can be considered as a binding precedent. In each case I must be satisfied that the objection is based on 'religious training and belief' which contemplates recognition of some source of all existence which, whatever the type of conception, is Divine because it is the Source of all things. Religious belief, however, is more important than 'training' because we are too prone to have the schoolmaster in mind and hours, days, weeks, years of study when we weigh the meaning of training. Even there, one gets it by the long process—another by 'cramming.' Does he get it? That's the question. If so, it involved training of some kind. I have some doubt about absorption through 'bolts from the blue' even though I do not toss aside entirely St. Paul's experience on the Road to Damascus. These are the exceptions, and probably he had a lifetime of training crammed into that one hour. Somewhere I think the record will tell the story satisfactorily in the given case whether it is in the form of long-drawn-out processes of schoolmaster training or otherwise. Whatever it is, the weight of the evidence is strengthened or diminished in consideration of all the facts."* 

The federal courts have given little interpretation to the meaning of the term "religious training and belief." However, in hearing an appeal from Fredrik P. Nissen, an alien C.O. seeking American citizenship, the U.S. District Court in Massachusetts ruled that "so far as Congress was thinking of training it regarded it as meaning no more than individual experience supporting belief; a mere background against which sincerity could be tested."** 

Later, in another C.O. naturalization case the U.S. District Court in Minnesota held that "no attempt is made in the statute to define training and belief as separate elements. The phrase is defined in toto as a single concept, and to attempt an independent consideration of the word training would be to ignore the apparent scheme of the statute."*** 

The U.S. District Court for Michigan, in acquitting Peter Horst of the charge of refusal to accept induction into the armed forces, interpreted the statutory definition of religious training and belief to mean "any belief, orthodox, or unorthodox." The court also held that Congress did not intend "that a registrant's claim of exemption—must carry with it any concept of fear of religious sanctions, such as punishment after death or excommunication from the church ..." The

*Letter from Lewis B. Hershey, Director, Selective Service System, to the Department of Justice, March 5, 1942.
***In re Hanson, 148 F. Supp. 187, February 8, 1957, at p. 190.
court ruled that the appeal board had misinterpreted the meaning of religious training and belief in denying the defendant a C.O. classification because his description of the Supreme Being as "God is Love" raised doubts in the minds of the appeal board members that the defendant's claim was based upon belief in a Supreme Being as envisaged by the draft law.

III. The Supreme Being Clause

Section 5 (g) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 reads "Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to require any person to be subject to combatant training and service in the land or naval forces of the United States, who, by reason of religious training and belief, is conscientiously opposed to participation in war in any form."

Section 6 (j) of the present law reads much the same, but continues from there as follows: "Religious training and belief in this connection means an individual's belief in a relation to a Supreme Being involving duties superior to those arising from any human relation, but does not include essentially political, sociological, or philosophical views or a merely personal moral code."

The Supreme Being clause was used to narrow the definition of conscientious objection. The courts and the Department of Justice tended to interpret "religious training and belief" more broadly than did Selective Service under the 1940 law. Now the Supreme Court has defined the Supreme Being clause very broadly.

MEANING OF THE SUPREME BEING CLAUSE

For the purpose of this discussion we are interested only in the legal interpretation of the clause. In the Seeger case†, the Supreme Court interpreted the clause this way:

"... the test of belief in a relation to a Supreme Being is whether a given belief that is sincere and meaningful occupies a place in the life of its possessor parallel to that filled by the orthodox belief in God of one who clearly qualifies for the exemption. Where such beliefs have parallel positions in the lives of their respective holders we cannot say that one is 'in a relation to a Supreme Being' and the other is not."

†U.S. vs. Seeger (380 U.S. 163).
"... Under the 1940 Act it was necessary only to have a conviction based upon religious training and belief; we believe that is all that is required here. Within that phrase would come all sincere religious beliefs which are based upon a power or being, or upon a faith, to which all else is subordinate or upon which all else is ultimately dependent. The test might be stated in these words: A sincere and meaningful belief which occupies in the life of its possessor a place parallel to that filled by the God of those admittedly qualifying for the exemption comes within the statutory definition."

The Court reiterated its position later in these words:
"... While the applicant's words may differ, the test is simple of application. It is essentially an objective one, namely, does the claimed belief occupy the same place in the life of the objector as an orthodox belief in God holds in the life of one clearly qualified for exemption?... In such an intensely personal area, of course, the claim of the registrant that his belief is an essential part of a religious faith must be given great weight."

The Court continued by stating "... we believe this construction embraces the ever-broadening understanding of the modern religious community." In recognition of the trend toward using non-traditional or unorthodox terminology to express personal beliefs, the Court referred to the following quotations:
"... I have written of the God above the God of theism... In such a state of self-assertion the God of both religious and theological language disappears. But something remains, namely, the seriousness of that doubt in which meaning within meaninglessness is affirmed. The source of this affirmation of meaning within meaninglessness, of certitude within doubt, is not the God of traditional theism but the 'God above God,' the power of being, which works through those who have no name for it, not even the name of God." Paul Tillich, Systematic Theology.

"... But the signs are that we are reaching the point at which the whole conception of God, our store which has served us so well since the collapse of the three-decker universe is becoming more a hindrance than a help." John A. T. Robinson, Honest to God.

"Ever since primordial days, numerous peoples have had a certain perception of that hidden power which hovers over the course of things and over the events that make up the lives of men; some have even come to know of a Supreme Being and Father. Religions in an advanced culture have been able to use more refined concepts and a more developed language in their struggle for an answer to man's religious questions." from the Schema of the recent Ecumenical Council.
"Instead of positing a personal God, whose existence man can neither prove nor disprove, the ethical concept is founded on human experience. It is anthropocentric, not theocentric. Religion, for all the various definitions that have been given of it, must surely mean the devotion of man to the highest ideal that he can conceive." David Saville Muzzey, *Ethics as a Religion.*

The Court has clearly recognized the individualistic and personal nature of religious beliefs. Any firmly held belief may be religious for the purposes of this law. Thus, COs who do not ordinarily state their beliefs in terms of a relationship to a "Supreme Being" may still qualify for a CO classification. It is not necessary to express one's beliefs in traditional or orthodox religious terminology; it is necessary to state clearly and affirmatively the nature of one's beliefs and to communicate them as effectively as possible. Individualistic COs should take full advantage of the opportunity to qualify which the Court has given them.

A registrant who affirmatively states that he is non-religious or holds a merely personal moral code is ineligible for classification as a CO. It should be emphasized that atheism was not at issue in the Seeger case for Seeger had left the Supreme Being question unanswered. Many others who do not affirm a belief in God hold beliefs which are religious within the broad interpretation of this decision. Registrants are advised to state affirmatively what they believe rather than what they do not.

The Supreme Being clause still remains a requirement of the law, but the Court has sought to interpret it in such a fashion as to include within its purview the multitude of beliefs held by sincere religious objectors. Whether this has been accomplished was not clear at the time this was written. All COs seeking recognition on the basis of the Seeger decision should keep closely in touch with CCCO.

**Supreme Being Questions**

The CO who has no reservations about his belief in a Supreme Being will have no difficulty answering items number one and two of Series II on Form 150. However, several have had difficulty answering these questions because of their uncertainty about the meaning of the Supreme Being clause or the applicability of their beliefs to the definition.

No man who wishes a I-O or I-A-O classification should rule himself out of the chance of securing his desired CO classification. Form 150 should be filed with the registrant's local board and the decision left to the local board and the appeal board.

The thorniest problem for the man who is doubtful about whether or not his belief fits the Supreme Being definition comes when he is asked on Form 150 to check "yes" or "no" to "Do you believe in a Supreme Being?"
To check "no" means probable elimination from consideration for I-O or I-A-O classification. Therefore, every C.O. whose belief has any religious basis should check "yes" if it is possible for him to do so in the light of the broadest possible meaning of Supreme Being.

If a C.O. cannot conscientiously check "yes," the next best thing to do is check neither square but write in following the squares, "It depends on the definition," or some similar phrase which is satisfactory to him.

As a last resort, the question should be left blank rather than to check "no."

In every case, the man then goes ahead to tell specifically and in detail what he does believe in the next question on the form. State your belief in a positive form. Always say, "I believe . . ." rather than "I do not believe . . ." The space for this is inadequate for most men, so extra sheets should be attached to the form.

THE NON-RELIGIOUS OBJECTOR

Only the man whose sole basis for objecting is sociological, political, philosophical or merely a personal moral code is prevented specifically from obtaining C.O. status. However, he can request C.O. classification, file Form 150, and use the regular C.O. appeal procedure unless he has answered "No" to the Supreme Being question. He then may be restricted to a personal appearance and one appeal.

At first glance, it may appear useless for the non-religious objector to request C.O. classification, but there are possible benefits. Sometimes a liberal local board will give the registrant the classification he requests. In every case, it puts the man on record as to his reasons for refusal to submit to induction when he is ordered to report.

A third advantage may be that it postpones the C.O.'s probable eventual sentence to prison.

Unless the non-religious C.O. objects to using the procedure of a system which denies him consideration of his sincere objections to war, it is generally considered advisable for every C.O. to file Form 150, irrespective of the possibilities of the acceptance of his claim to exemption from combatant or all military duty.

IV. The Use of Force

When the conscientious objector is face-to-face with his draft board or Hearing Officer explaining the replies he has made to the questions on Form 150, they are likely to show most interest in (or even pounce upon) his response to Question 5: "Under what circumstances, if any, do you believe in the use of force?"

Set among some posers, this question is so easy that anyone can answer it without really thinking, and that's where the trouble begins. We all have pat answers, draft board members as well as objectors, and when these different answers collide, the unprepared objector suddenly may discover that he really has not thought out his relationship to force. His own answers to different phrasings of the question may be inconsistent with each other. Any wavering is suspect and increases the difficulty of making his position clear.

Every war objector rejects force at some point, but there is no "right" answer as to where. The important point is that each must resolve this question consistently with his fundamental beliefs.

**FORCE DEFINED**

Webster's Collegiate Dictionary defines force, the noun, as:

1. Strength or energy; vigor; as: (a) Physical force or vigor. (b) Power to affect strongly in physical conditions; as, the force of a blow. (c) Power of effective action; as, force of character. (d) Power to persuade or convince.

2. Strength for war; hence, any body of soldiers. Hence, a body of men prepared for action; as, a labor force; the police force.

3. Power, violence, or constraint exerted upon a person or thing.

4. Physics. The cause of the acceleration of the movement of material bodies, as the cause of a body falling freely, of the movements of two billiard balls in collision, or of the movement of two related magnets.

An unqualified denial rejects not only the Army, but character and billiards.

We are brought nearer our problem by the contrast of synonyms following the dictionary definition:

"Force, violence, compulsion, coercion, constraint, restraint, imply the exertion of power against will, wish, or consent. Force and violence, regularly in this connection physical, may be used on either person or things; compulsion, coercion, constraint, restraint, either physical or moral, on personal agents only (except in certain figurative uses)— compulsion and coercion being usually exercised on others than oneself; Constraint or restraint on either. Force, the most general term, implies physical power exerted on persons or things. Violence denotes unjust or unwarranted exercise of force, usually with vehemence or outrage. Compulsion and, still more, coercion imply the application, usually by an active agent, of physical or (in the case of coercion more often) moral force to control the action of a voluntary agent. Constraint and restraint may be exercised either by an active agent or by force of circumstances."

The definitions remind us that part of our difficulty lies in the use of words. Force has so many meanings that it is hard for two honest
men to exchange thoughts, even when their prejudices are the same. But however elusive, the essential questions are there.

**QUESTIONS ON THE USE OF FORCE**

Here are questions some American draft boards and British tribunals have asked about the use of force:

"What method would you use to resist evil?"

"Would you forcibly restrain individual lawbreakers?"

"Didn't the United Nations carry out police action in Korea?"

"Aren't you just approving whatever use of force benefits you, and rejecting that which would inconvenience you?"

"Would you use force to prevent a maniac from killing an innocent person? From killing you? From killing himself? Wasn't Hitler a maniac?" (Substitute here whatever name is currently most apt.)

"Would you use force to restrain a child from rushing into danger?"

"Can't non-physical force (strikes and the boycott, for instance) be just as painful and destructive as physical violence?"

"Did you ever spank a child?"

"Didn't Jesus use violence in driving the moneychangers from the temple?"

"Would you force medical treatment upon a delirious patient? Upon a child? Upon an imbecile? Upon an attempted suicide?"

These mostly are trick questions, but the underlying question is valid: "Why do you reject some uses of force while employing others?"

Varying bases of discrimination have satisfied varying moral and religious beliefs. Is the force violent or non-violent? Active or passive? With intent to harm, or intent to help? Collective, or individual? Within, or without a social compact? (It is said by some, "we agree to the police." ) Creative or destructive? Restraining or vengeful? In line with Biblical teachings? Dangerous to bystanders?

**VIOLENT VS. NON-VIOLENT FORCE**

Probably the most significant distinction for the greatest number of pacifists is that between violent and non-violent force, but many thoughtful objectors would draw the line at some other point. At any rate, the confusion of meanings is much less if we distinguish carefully between force that is violent and force that is non-violent.

For many years, the peace movement (speaking broadly) has been divided over the morality of force in international organization; and the Korean struggle (war? police action?) has sharpened the point. Do we believe that international cooperation is the way to world peace? If so, isn't police action necessary? The crystal is not clear to all of us; but Tolstoy gives an answer that might have come from one of today's objectors:
“In order that people who do not want war should not fight, it is not necessary to have either international law, arbitration, international Tribunals, or solutions of problems; but it is necessary merely that those who are subjected to the deceit should awake and free themselves from the spell of enchantment under which they find themselves. The way to do away with war is for those who do not want war, who regard participation in it as sin, to refrain from fighting.”*

**Police Force—** Throughout these questions, the concept of "police force" creeps in. Whether or not we would dispense with our domestic police force, probably we would agree that the analogy is not so perfect as the questions imply. Aldous Huxley suggests some differences:

“The force which [armies] are empowered to use is not limited. Their function is not to restrain the guilty; it is to destroy all things and people within their range. When the police wish to arrest a criminal, they do not burn up a town in which he is living and kill or torture all its inhabitants. But this precisely is what an army does, particularly an army using modern weapons.

"States arrogate to themselves the right not only to judge other states, but also, by means of their armies, to punish them. The principle is wholly repugnant to law; moreover the process of punishing a guilty nation entails the destruction of countless innocent individuals. An army with atomic and hydrogen bombs is not and cannot be a police force. Nor can its essentially evil and destructive functions be moralized by calling it a U.N. army, an instrument of collective security, etc. Police operate with the consent of the community which employs them. Armies operate by the order of one among the nations or the few nations which are allied together."

**Individual Use of Force—** The draft board likely will draw a picture of the objector’s grandmother attacked by a ravening enemy soldier. What shall we do, theoretically, about grandmother? What about ourselves, set upon by thieves? What about the innocent victim of bullies? The little girl molested?

Questions about the individual use of force are, perhaps, the hardest questions to answer honestly. Often the head leads one way and the emotions another. In the excitement of the event, the commitment may go unhonored. The advocate of violent defense may, at the moment of crisis, be betrayed by our human cowardice; and the pacifist may find that he is not emancipated from our common culture of violence and vengeance.

*This quotation, and those that follow, are borrowed from a War Resisters League leaflet, The Use of Force and the Conscientious Objector.*
Not all war objectors are opposed to violence at the individual level. It is not necessary to be a passive resister to know and reject the folly and immorality of war. To many, however, all violent force is wrong, and to some, impractical. We all are aware of (and there are books filled with) striking cases where non-violence has won “practical” victories.

William Penn, the pacifist ruler of a province, said, “Force may subdue but love gains, and he who forgives first wins the laurel.”

Gandhi put this practical aspect more strongly: “Non-violence is not passivity in any shape or form. It is the most active force in the world. It is the weapon, not of the weak (as passive resistance may be), but of the strongest and bravest... No power on earth can stand before the march of a peaceful, determined, and God-fearing people.”

The following may not be honest questions, but they are good ones. Tell me, friend, why do you take your daily place in a society organized by force, and then refuse to fight that society’s wars? Why do you pay those taxes into the war chest? Why do you make your living at a task which ultimately helps fight the war? If you can work in a war-making society, keeping your own hands clean and ignoring the eventual implications of what you do, then why can’t you go into the Army in a noncombatant role and rationalize that in the same way? Every thoughtful objector must rub up against such rough questions, and there is very little comfort in them.

SUMMARY

One temptation that should be resisted is that of buttressing unduly our views on the use of force—regarding the draft board as the antagonist, and trying to win in the way a debater wins. If the objector can clarify his reasons for rejecting violence, and present them clearly, his sincerity will carry him where argument would fail. It is not necessary to reject violence for every possible reason, but it is highly desirable to know what you reject, and why.

Rejection of violence, out of love, lies at the heart of so many religious systems, and is implied in so many secular idealisms, that it cannot be shrugged off as an aberration. When Jesus spoke of love’s way, some who heard him knew at once what he meant, and Christendom has not been able to forget it. Kropotkin said it differently, and Gandhi, too; but they and their messages are comprehensible anywhere on earth. This marked ability to make contact at the common point of compassion is a measure of prophets and messiahs; all people know and respect love. Love is a hard word to say in the smoking-room atmosphere of the draft board, and the board members may be embarrassed and a
little peevish to hear it mentioned. It is fitting, however, that the objec-
tor be bold in the knowledge that he (however unworthy) is with the
prophets, and that his inquisitors (however worthy) are speaking for
the dead past out of which man is creeping. It is not right that the
advocates of love should apologize or flinch.

Ask yourself the questions you will be asked, and try to decide
(1) what forms of force you are willing to use, and in what circum-
stances; (2) how far it is required that you separate yourself from such
force as you are not willing to use personally; (3) why you make these
distinctions; and (4) what, if any, counter proposals you wish to make
in rejecting violence. Face your draft board honestly, realizing that
they are performing a duty, and that the first task is to state your beliefs
as clearly as possible. Remember, your position needs no apology.
Sincerity counts more than pat answers.

V. Questions Asked C.O.'s

The conscientious objector who asks for a hearing before his local
board or appeals his case and appears before a Hearing Officer must
expect many questions. Often his questioners will be antagonistic, and
the questions will be difficult and confusing.

The following questions are listed to help C.O.'s to think out
their answers in advance of formal hearings. No attempt is made to
answer the questions, since they can only be answered by each indi-
vidual according to his conscience. However, group discussion on these
questions, as well as time spent with a C.O. counselor, can be helpful.

No C.O. will be asked all of these questions, and questions will be
asked which are not listed here. The type of questions a C.O. is asked
is influenced by his answers, his background, and the classification he
is seeking.

A C.O. should remember that the manner in which he responds
to questions is often as important as his answers. There is no obliga-
tion to have detailed logical answers to all questions, especially those
involving complex, theoretical problems of conduct. The important
thing is to emphasize the complete rejection of participation in war by
reason of religious training and belief.

OTHER GENERAL QUESTIONS

What process of reasoning led you to the view you hold?
How long have you held these views?
In what way and to whom have you expressed your views?
What sacrifices have you made for your conscience?
What books have you read on the subject?
What is your present occupation? Isn't it assisting the war to some extent? If so, why do you refuse to fight?
What happens to people like you in Russia or China?
Should we let the Communists oppress the Cuban people?
Why is it wrong to prevent evil from happening to others?
Are you against all war?
Why do you object to killing?
What method would you use to resist evil?
What would happen to your pacifist organization if we were conquered by Communists?
Why is it wrong to defend your country?
Why accept the benefits of a country you won't protect?
If a nation suffers unprovoked attack, should it not defend itself?
Do not the facts show that Communists want to rule the world?
How can you restrain a powerful army except by a more powerful army?
Why did you register for a law passed to raise an army?
Do you have any duty at all to the community?
What would be the consequences of converting this country to pacifism? Communists could then invade us unopposed.
Have you realized that by refraining from helping our army you are in effect helping our enemies?
Would you just let a tyrannical aggressor walk all over us?
Are not our armed forces a deterrent, and thus preventing war?

QUESTIONS ON RELIGIOUS BELIEF

Are you a member of a church? How long have you been a member? If not a member, why not? How often do you attend?
What does your church say about war?
Doesn't government have divine sanction?
If you are not in a position to overcome evil with good, would it not be better to destroy a greater evil with a lesser evil rather than not at all?
Why do most of the members of your church support war?
What parts of the Bible support your position?
Where in Christ's teachings do you find anything which forbids you to serve in the Army, or to help defend your country?
If war is evil, why did not Christ condemn it? Did he not even say, "He that hath no sword, let him buy one," "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's . . ." and "I came not to send peace, but a sword."

How do you explain the text in Revelation "and there was war in heaven," and also "and in righteousness he doth judge and make war?"

Are you sure you are not just selecting texts from the Bible to suit yourself?

How do you know the direction to take this stand comes from the Supreme Being?

Does God tell you to live at the expense of other people who are risking their lives fighting for you?

If God told you to defend your country, what would you do?

Would Christ object to a war for freedom and to stamp out evil?

Would you fight to bring Christ's kingdom on earth?

How about the Christian doctrine of approval for just wars?

How do you explain all of the wars in the Old Testament?

How is it any practical help to pray for oppressed people while they are being massacred?

**WHY NOT TAKE I-A-O?**

Don't you realize that soldiers classified I-A-O do not kill?

Would Christ help civilians and refuse to help soldiers?

Could you not spread the gospel in the armed forces?

Why would you help the wounded and sick individually but object to being organized to help them?

How can doing the same thing, such as ambulance or relief work, be right under civilian control and wrong under military control?

Would you take part in civilian defense? Why, or why not?
The literature of conscientious objection to war is voluminous. Space limitation has compelled the omission of many interesting titles, many of which, however, are difficult to find in libraries. Preference has been shown the more readily available material. Included in the limited selection are titles on the history of conscientious objection, pacifism, nonviolence, and the experiences of individual conscientious objectors in the military, in C.O. camps, and in prison.

**BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS**


A novel of life in a C.P.S. "smoke jumper" camp during World War II, well-written, especially appealing to people nearing draft age.


A comprehensive treatment of the history of American pacifism, organized according to current problems.


One of the earliest expositions of radical Christian pacifism by perhaps the best-known 19th-Century pacifist. Includes many examples of the power of non-violence over evil which are not found elsewhere.


English conscientious objection during World War I is the theme of this novel. (Originally published in London by Headley Brothers as *Mr. Sterling Sticks It Out.*)
The story of four pacifists who sailed a thirty-foot ketch into the Pacific in a non-violent protest against nuclear bomb tests, in a serious effort to "speak to people" and to urge governments to disarm before nuclear war destroys civilization.

*Blessed Are the Peacemakers*. The Catholic Pacifists' Association of Canada, 1944. 128 pp. (Available from The Catholic Worker, Box 252, New York 2, N. Y.)
Describes the activity of Catholic pacifism during World War II. Shows how pacifism has been taught in different forms throughout the history of the Roman Catholic Church.

The outstanding study of Brethren pacifism and conscientious objection.

Examines the teachings of Jesus, the writings of Church fathers and Christian practice up to the time of Constantine, and brings out the changes in attitudes toward participation in war, showing how Christians gradually came to terms with the State.

An anthology of personal accounts of experiences of C.O.'s in prison during World War II, with drawings by Lowell Naeve.

An unusually able study of conscientious objection to war and to other situations of injustice, in many times and lands.

The most controversial opposition to World War I was that of political objectors—Socialists and "Wobblies"—Industrial Workers of the World. This book tells the story of the latter.

Authoritative statements on the legal treatment of objectors in the United States during World War II up to 1944.

The heritage of Jewish pacifism, documented by one of its modern leaders.
A thoughtful and well-written history of the American peace movement.

A number of American C.O.'s worked with this famed British unit. An official history covering the World War II FAU.

Story of the pacifist Catholic Worker movement.

Deb's own account of his imprisonment during World War I.

Study of Gandhian non-violent direct action.

Two C.O.'s are among those portrayed in this trilogy, and much of the story is concerned with those social movements which furnished the political objectors of World War I.

A history of conscientious objection, written in popular style.

Gandhi's story is largely the story of the birth and development of Satyagraha, the conscientious objection which turned a colony into a nation.

The official history of Mennonite Civilian Public Service in World War II, including a brief account of Mennonite objectors in Canada. Carefully done.

This novel is a sensitive portrayal of the inner struggles of a British World War II C.O.

The personal story of an American objector in World War I.


An official history, covering Canada, as well as the United States.


The story of conscientious objectors in Britain in World War II. A readable, fully documented account with excellent statistical section.


A study of Christianity, the State and war, considered both from the historical and the philosophical angles.


The life story of a non-registrant objector in both World Wats who is a tax-refuser, itinerant farm worker, and a former editor of *The Catholic Worker*.


A forthright challenge of war and a defense of conscientious objection, published in wartime. This is the most influential of Holmes' pacifist writings.


Brief history of an Anabaptist body (within the Mennonite circle) which has maintained a consistent pacifist position and a religious commune for more than 400 years.

Discusses the fundamentals of true world peace from a Roman Catholic viewpoint. Holds that modern war cannot be justified by the doctrine of a just war.


True stories of eight contemporary men and women who pitted non-violent methods and a living faith in the gospel of love against the two great evils of our time—war and totalitarianism.


Pacifism's most lucid writer deals with almost every side of conscientious objection; illustrates his thesis that the ends sought by social change are inescapably conditioned by the means used to bring them about; hence, violent or immoral means can never produce a peaceful society.

James, William. "The Moral Equivalent to War." (Widely available in editions of his works and in anthologies.)

This tremendously influential essay includes a brilliant analysis of the gulf between the adherents of war and peace, and the need for a more positive emphasis by the latter. But two World Wars and the sobering experiment of Civilian Public Service have cast serious doubts on the specific "moral equivalent" proposed—a state-glorying civil conscription for the "war against nature."


Leading religious pacifists contribute to this symposium.


Debs was the most famous American political prisoner of World War I; receiving nearly a million votes for president in 1920, while in Atlanta penitentiary. His courtroom statements ("...while there is a soul in prison, I am not free...") are included.


Pacifism attacked on religious grounds.


A Marxian criticism ably handled.
A modern classic of pacifist theory, first published in several European languages.

*The New Testament Basis of Pacifism,* first published in 1936, has long been considered the standard work in its field. This is the complete revised edition as published in England. A pacifist interpretation of the New Testament, including discussion of controversial texts, the ethic of Jesus related to war, the pacifist history of the early Church. Includes an appendix of relevant passages from the Gospels and the letters of the Apostles, and a complete index of all scriptural passages that occur in the book. *The Relevance of an Impossible Ideal,* first published in 1941 and long out of print, is a reply to Reinhold Niebuhr's critique of pacifism.

A World War I political objector recounts the life of army camp and prison.

America's leading contemporary pacifist presents his case. The chapters on "Pacifism as Revolutionary Strategy" in the former book are particularly outstanding; *Not By Might* relates pacifism to the major problem areas of present society.

A thought provoking argument for rejection of alternative service under conscription. (Pendle Hill pamphlet No. 64.)

Personal account of the imprisonment of a libertarian, absolutist objector in World War II.

A Professor of Philosophy in the Catholic University of America re­views the morality of war, compares the necessary conditions of a "just war" with the conditions of modern war, concludes that the perfect Christian is a conscientious objector.

The autobiography of a pacifist. Recounts three years of prison as a conscientious objector during World War II.
Diary of a Civil War C.O. who suffered much punishment and privation until Lincoln ordered his release from the army.

The case for pacifism, from the standpoint of liberal Christianity.

Survey of Biblical foundations of pacifism, written in context of the thinking of contemporary Christian theologians.

The non-violent techniques and militant "satyagraha" evolved by Gandhi, and their practical effectiveness compared with war, vividly described by a participant. (An abridgement in pamphlet form is published by Fellowship Publications, Nyack, New York.)

The only comprehensive study of American C.O.'s in World War II. It is judicious, reliable, and crammed with information. It received the Franklin D. Roosevelt Foundation award for the best 1952 book in the field of government and human welfare.

Stories, sketches about men in Civilian Public Service camps.

*Statements of Religious Bodies on the Conscientious Objector.*
A compilation of official attitudes, revised from the 1951 edition.

A sociological analysis.

A non-religious C.O. in the army is the central figure of this novel, written by a veteran of World War II.


Thoreau, Henry David. *Civil Disobedience*. (Widely available; often printed separately; included in the Modern Library volume on Thoreau.)

Inspired by the Mexican War and the Fugitive Slave Law, the classic exposition of the individual's duty to refuse cooperation with evil.

Tolstoy, Leo. *My Confession; The Kingdom of God Is Within You; Christianity and Patriotism*. (Available in many editions and languages.)

These are only a sampling of the body of pacifist writings of the great Russian novelist.


Jehovah's witnesses do not call themselves pacifists, but they have opposed every war in every country since their beginning in the last century. Of American C.O.'s imprisoned during World War II, 75% were Jehovah's witnesses. The above is a representative exposition of the J.W. viewpoint. Their periodicals, *Watchtower* and *Consolation*, are pertinent.


While it includes a history of American war objection, this is principally our government's record of its dealings with objectors to World War II. It is remarkably complete, particularly statistically. Volume II is a documentary appendix. (Selective Service System Special Monograph No. 11.)


Since a considerable proportion of Selective Service violators were C.O.'s, there is much pertinent information here, dealing with their prosecution and imprisonment. (Selective Service System Special Monograph No. 14.)


A novel of Quaker pacifist experiences in exile during the American Revolution. Based on actual historical events.


The only non-sectarian study of Civil War C.O.'s, well documented and with a bibliography.
PERIODICALS

The Catholic Worker (New York City 2, Box 252) v. 1-to date; 1933-to date; (monthly; bi-monthly).
Organ of The Catholic Worker movement; best source of information and news about Catholic C.O.'s.

The organ of the American Fellowship of Reconciliation, covering pacifism generally with both articles and news.

Liberation. (New York, Rm. 1025, 5 Beekman St.) v. 1-to date; 1956-to date (monthly).
Features articles on radical pacifism, non-violence, and conscientious objection.

News Notes. (Philadelphia, Central Committee for Conscientious Objectors, 2006 Walnut St.) v. 1-to date; 1949-to date (bi-monthly).
Good coverage of legal difficulties of American objectors since World War II; reports changes in draft law and regulations; current information on C.O.'s in prison.

Excellent world-wide coverage of pacifist news; especially good source of news on peace activities in Britain.

Peacemaker. (Cincinnati, Peacemaker movement, 10208 Sylvan Avenue, Cincinnati 41, Ohio, v. 1-to date; 1949-to date (monthly, bi-weekly, tri-weekly).
Organ of the Peacemakers; but carries news and opinions of pacifism generally.

The Reporter, for Conscience' Sake. (Washington, National Service Board for Religious Objectors, Washington Bldg., Room 604, 15th and New York Avenue N.W.) v. 1-to date; 1942-to date (bi-weekly; monthly).
General coverage of C.O. news, but particularly good for information about I-Ws and their assignments.

WRL News (War Resisters League, Room 1025, 5 Beekman St., New York, 38, N.Y.) Bi-monthly.
Reports on CO and anti-war activities.
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by registrant 8
procedural 8, 29, 39ff
Extended liability 17

Federal Bureau of Investigation
interview 50
investigation 16, 23, 24
promises of 50
report 23, 24

Federal Prisons 63ff
Federal Rules of Criminal
Procedure 56

Fellowship of Reconciliation 16
Felony 10

Fines 10, 51
Forms—see SSS Form
Force, use of 15, 90ff
Fort Sam Houston 76ff

Garver, Newton 56
Good time release 72, 73
Grand jury 52
Guilty 54, 55

Habeas corpus 36, 39

Hearing
Department of Justice 23, 24ff
failure to grant 29
local board 19ff, 95
preliminary 52
probation 57, 58
U.S. Commissioner 50, 52
witnesses 20, 21, 24, 25

Hearing officer
and C.O. appeal 23, 24, 25,
90, 95
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hearing officer—Continued</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>recommendation of 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>submitting material to 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hershey, Lewis B. 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horst, Peter 86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indictment 52ff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Induction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oath of 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>postponement of 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>process 34, 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>refusal to submit 34, 35, 50, 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transfer of 34, 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information, U.S. Attorney's 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jail—see county jail, prison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jehovah's witnesses 22, 36, 37, 39, 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial review 36ff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mandatory work order 31, 32</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medical corpsman 79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical specialist 79, 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical interview 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Training Center 76, 77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mute 54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Selective Service Appeal Board 26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Service Board for Religious Objectors 6, 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No basis in fact 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nolo contendere 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncombatant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assignments 76ff, 78ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>basic training 76ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>classification for 5, 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>defined 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Induction 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obtaining status 74, 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-cooperators 43ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-registration 43ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-religious objector 89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not guilty 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notice of Classification 18, 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21, 22, 26, 28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order to Report for Civilian Work 18, 31</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Order to Report for Induction appeal and 22, 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cancellation 22, 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.O.'s facing 34ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>postponement of 28, 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reopening classification and 13, 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pardon 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parole 57, 71, 72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical examination 18, 19, 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>delinquents 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>failure to report for 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transfer of 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plea 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary hearing 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidential appeal 24, 26ff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>censorship 64, 66, 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chaplains 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>correspondence 64, 66, 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>daily routine 65, 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discipline 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>housing 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>job assignment 63, 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>life in 60ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>medical service 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opportunities for service in 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>protest within 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quarantine 63, 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>release from 72, 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>segregation, administrative 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>segregation, racial 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strip cells 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>visits 58, 66, 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work 67, 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation 57, 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural errors 29, 39, 40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prosecution 49ff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>World War I 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World War II 41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Quarantine 63, 64                         |
| Questionnaire 11, 12                     |
| Questions                                 |
| asked all registrants 11, 12              |
| asked C.O.'s 14ff, 92ff, 95ff            |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>References 16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Registration 10, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aliens 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>card 10, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>continuing duty 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in foreign countries 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>involuntary 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>questions 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>refusal 11, 43ff, 49ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transfer of 11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Release</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>from armed forces 82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from civilian service 17, 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from prison 72, 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious training and belief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9, 12, 14, 15, 15, 83ff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reopening classification 13, 18, 21, 29

Selective Service
Act of 1940, 36, 41, 87
Act of 1948, 9, 36, 41
National Appeal Board 26
National Director of appeal to President 26ff
approval of employers 30
determines prosecution 33, 49
may release C.O. 33
reconsideration of appeal 26, 29
treating classification and 29
supervises foreign work 32
State Director of appeal to President 27ff
approval of employers 30
reconsideration of appeal 26, 29
treating classification and 29
supervises civilian work 32
work assignment and 31

Sentence
average 55
determination of 53
maximum 9
pre-investigation 56
reduction of 58
suspended 57
Special form for C.O.'s 5, 12, 13ff

SSS Form
(100) 11, 18
(110) 18, 19, 33.
(130) 17
(150) 12, 13, 14, 18, 83ff
(151) 32
(152) 31
(153) 18, 31, 33
(154) 33
(252) 18
(DD 390) 12

Statement of acceptability 31
Strip cell 65
Student classifications 16, 17
Subpoena 14
Supreme Being clause 8, 9, 14, 487ff

Test cases 58
Tietz, J. B. 20, 21
Transfer
Transfer—Continued
of court case 35, 49
of Department of Justice
Hearing 25
for induction 35
of medical interview 19
to noncombatant status 75
of physical examination 11, 19
of registration 11
Trial 53ff
True bill 52

Uniform Code of Military Justice 74
United States
Attorney 35, 43, 45, 49, 50
53, 56, 59
Attorney General 43, 49, 61
Bureau of Prisons 54, 55,
62, 66, 67
Circuit Court of Appeals 43, 58
Commissioner 51ff
Department of Justice
and C.O. appeal 24ff
and C.O. prosecution 44, 46, 47
institution assigned by 63
District Court 9, 32, 41, 42,
47, 53ff
District Judge 53ff
Grand Jury 44, 52
Marshall 50, 52, 63
Parole Board 72
Supreme Court 36ff, 87
Universal Military Training and Service Act 9, 10, 43, 49
Use of force 15, 90ff
Vacation mail 7
Volunteer for civilian work 32

War Resisters League 16, 83, 92
Witnesses
at hearing officer interview 25
in court 55
local board hearing 19, 20
The CCCO Program

Purpose

- to maintain freedom of conscience;
- to interpret the moral and legal basis of conscientious refusal to participate in war;
- to counsel and assist conscientious objectors to conscription, civil defense, and the payment of taxes for military purposes;
- to seek an end to conscription

Services Offered

- counsel and assist all conscientious objectors who seek its aid, directly and in cooperation with local agencies;
- provide legal advice and arrange for legal counsel for C.O.'s facing criminal prosecution;
- arrange means of providing bail for arrested conscientious objectors awaiting trial;
- try to secure the release of men who become C.O.'s after entering the armed forces;
- work to secure for imprisoned objectors as many human rights as possible while confined;
- publish information useful to counseling agencies, lawyers and objectors;

The Committee's work depends entirely on voluntary contributions. Your support is invited.

Central Committee for Conscientious Objectors
2006 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103
West Coast: 514 Mission Street, San Francisco, California 94105

A. J. MUSTE, J. BARTON HARRISON, Co-Chairmen
KATHARINE ARNETT, Treasurer
ARLO TATUM, Executive Secretary