

more by compassion than by the rhetoric of liberation. People are understandably suspicious of those who proffer a revolutionary formula for justice in a new world order. Agencies such as Church World Service have a precarious relationship to the millions of church-going Americans whom they presumably represent. That relationship will be broken altogether if the tension between relief and liberation is pressed too hard.

Does this mean the Church should stick to humanitarian relief and neglect the political dimensions entirely? Of course not. As church relief agencies—which are too often mere brokers of governmental monies and supplies—begin more effectively to build a constituency of concern and compassion in the churches, more and more Christians will begin to understand the issues of justice and political change. Until that happens, those who beat the drums of liberation will be viewed as suspect by most American Christians. As that happens, the relief agencies must exercise restraint, sticking to their last and letting others assume direction of the more explicitly political facets of the Church's ministry.

Some commentators on the recent Church World Service controversy have remarked that the Church's ministry encompasses more than the delivery of food, supplies, and services. They are quite right. Their mistake is in confusing Church World Service, or any other such agency, with the Church. Every organization that evokes deep commitment has a tendency to turn itself into a church. Organizations are most effective when they are instrumental; or, as the social theorists say, when they are functionally specific. The Church is a community, necessarily using many organizations for many distinct, although interrelated, tasks. When any one organization forgets its instrumental character and tries to take on tasks for which it has neither ability nor mandate, "more" is almost inevitably less.

The Church has a powerful responsibility to support the victims of political oppression and to witness to the changes justice demands. The exercise of this responsibility is best led by those most directly involved in the injustice protested, by the Church in the place. Today we have exciting examples of such leadership. One thinks of the courageous Christian protest against the racist regime of Ian Smith in Rhodesia, against the unspeakable terrorism of President Park Chung Hee in South Korea, against the brutal torturers who govern Brazil, and, less publicized, against the denial of human freedom in the Soviet satellite countries. To be sure, there are not enough such examples of courage. Equally certain, the American churches are shamefully weak in their support for these Christians who are

literally risking their lives for the sake of the Gospel.

Perhaps we are lacking the agencies needed to exercise the Church's concern for political justice. More likely we are lacking the concern. In any case, the political dimension will not be enhanced by depreciating the humanitarian. We may move through compassion to justice, through relief to liberation, but we dare not move away from compassion or away from relief. The Church protests injustice, the sorrow of which is all too evident; the Church invokes justice, the shape of which remains ever elusive; but the Church lives by love, the deeds of which are ever waiting to be done.

RJN

Wars That Are Not Wars

Used to be we were inundated with news from Indochina. Now many Americans find their memory of continuing wars jolted only when they run across a small item squeezed onto page 36 of the daily newspaper. For those who want to know more, we warmly recommend *Indochina Today*, issued monthly by the Indochina Resource Center. It is a fair and thorough compilation of news items, articles, and documents keeping the reader abreast of changes that have enormous impact upon millions whom we once again find too easy to forget. For information: Indochina Resource Center, 1322 18th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

EXCURSUS II

Leaders of the Western World

The hunger for leadership in the world at large is an expectable response to the flabbergasting complexity of contemporary life, national and international. Ever responsive in mood, *Time* magazine has set out on a search for chieftains, preferably under forty. It is noteworthy from their selection that they seem more interested in brains than charisma, in the omniscient person who may have some plausible ideas about getting through the maze rather than sure cures. Ideologues are out, having lost their credibility to a more skeptical audience.

For the present we have older men in power, and for some time they have been disparaged as pale creatures in the shadow of the heroic

tradition of Roosevelt, Churchill, De Gaulle, and Adenauer, or of John Kennedy, who was believed to have set a new pattern of leadership all the more glittering because unfulfilled. In the past year of threatening catastrophe there has been a disposition to find some reassertion of the leadership principle in Western countries, in France and Canada particularly, and perhaps also in Germany. There are inadequate grounds to announce a pattern, but enough to encourage speculation.

In the first place, it should be borne in mind that none of these leaders has been exactly swept to power. Giscard became President of France by the barest majority. Pierre Trudeau was re-elected Prime Minister of Canada by a swing of a few crucial seats and a moderate increase in popular vote. Helmut Schmidt became Chancellor of Germany by default, default of the one man in Europe regarded as having some old-fashioned charisma, Willy Brandt. Britain swung from one tired leader to another, although the significant factor here may have been the thrust of a much increased minority to find a sensible new leader in Jeremy Thorpe.

The crisis over leadership in the United States is of a different order but of such consequence that it has affected attitudes to leadership in other countries. Suffice to say in this context that the wide support for Henry Kissinger and his Gordian knot-cutting is more significant than the selection of a brawny substitute captain, Gerald Ford. Friends abroad can only hope that in the next year or so the party strategists will seek out candidates for a new generation rather than tarnished survivors from the age of charisma.

If there is significance in the choice of Giscard and Trudeau, is it in the rejection of charisma as an ideal? Half the French opted for supreme competence, the man most likely to use intelligence and a controlled imagination to deal with the tangible problems of the electorate. The other half voted for Mitterand, who represented that kind of virtue within the Left spectrum. The defeated Conservative leader in Canada, Robert Stanfield, ran as the capable and thoughtful pragmatist he is, and he was rejected only because he was unable to promise a team of national managers that looked as reliable as the more experienced and broadly based liberal leadership. Everybody likes him.

The Pierre Trudeau elected in 1974 is like a new leader in that he was supported for qualities quite different from those which swept him to office in 1968. Flair and style, as well as an iconoclastic intelligence, appealed to Canadians when charisma was still the thing, when the great stv'-

ists were still being lamented, and every electorate wanted its very own Kennedy. It was called Trudeaumania in 1968, but that appeal faded and proved counterproductive in the election of 1972 when the Liberals hung on by two seats. What had seemed like charisma was being called arrogance. It didn't appear serious enough to voters sobered by the prevalence of fearsome contradictions in the state. Then the Prime Minister and his Cabinet had their own sobering experience in a minority government, and the electors seem to have decided that they came out of it more sensitive and more conscientious. The pitch to the electors was much less abstract.

In the Canadian elections of July, 1974, there was no great difference in the programs of the major parties. The politically viable options for Canada don't allow much choice, since, in spite of inflation, the country is too prosperous to feel drastic. The public wasn't interested in miracle cures or miracle workers. The election was about leadership, but what they wanted was a capable team able to hold something approaching a national consensus. They chose a party which seemed most likely to govern and a leader whose disposition to be strong in critical situations and talk bluntly were valued above his exciting personality. Opinion polls revealed that more people than voted Liberal had a regard for Trudeau as a leader. He is still applauded as the man who gave Canada a more sparkling image in international circles, but in 1974 he would not have been elected for that reason alone. In spite of their relative good fortune, Canadians know they cannot afford the luxury of a government which, however appealing emotionally, has neither the strength nor the integrity to face real issues.

An important test of leadership for any Western government is its capacity to maintain a rational relationship with the United States. American weakness has revealed to all the importance of American strength. The anti-American ritual has become awfully boring—and much of it anachronistic in the age of SALT. People are impatient with the cold warriors of the Left as well as the Right. Giscard and Schmidt are expected to work toward a healthier relationship between the West Europeans and the United States by abjuring abstractions about domination and subservience and burden-sharing. They differ, however, from the postwar generation of leaders who felt constrained by circumstances to place alliance loyalty above other considerations. They believe in a more distant but easier relationship.

So does Pierre Trudeau. Because he came to office at about the time Americans were becoming aware of a new infection they identified as

Canadian nationalism, they have wrongly assumed that he fostered it. He is, in fact, ideologically antipathetic to nationalism of any kind. He has a healthy view of the United States as a friendly foreign power with which Canada has common and also competing interests. He rebukes the anti-Americans for their obsessions, and he seeks to control rather than encourage the strong popular demand for protection of the Canadian patrimony. It is unfortunate that the incompatibility of style and personality between Ottawa and Washington at the moment obscures this reality. It should be noted that although in the election both Trudeau and his Conservative opponent stressed the need of a government strong enough to negotiate confidently with American institutions, of which the U.S. Government is only one, they have not stooped to raise the American bogey to hold together a fissiparous confederation. Wrapping oneself in the flag is perhaps an escape mechanism not acceptable from the new kind of leader.

May Western electorates be looking for self-reliance rather than demonology? They don't want great single-minded leaders because there are no single-minded answers. The British badly need leadership, but the last type they need is another Churchill, with his anachronistic visions and bad economics. De Gaulle was wiser in that he engineered the triumph of France over the French Empire, but his kind of fantasies are just what France and Europe do not need now. Even John Kennedy, for all his virtue, affirmed an historic mission for his country which led to disastrous miscalculation.

We cannot afford any more miscalculations. In the cybernetic age we can't fly by the seat of our pants, but we have seen enough of the computer to know that we need very human beings in control of them. We need governments which are not aloof from popular needs, but we are, it is to be hoped, passing beyond simplistic views about good government as the simple triumph of a wise people over arrogant and power-hungry governments. Pierre Trudeau led us in Canada in and out of that heresy. We want people who look as if they can cope. The language of the times is apocalyptic, and one would expect the response to be messianic in nature. Perhaps the crisis of leadership in the great pioneer democracy has strengthened doubts that any mortal could be a messiah. Even in the Communist countries the trend seems to be away from the personality cult. We have worried lest the discrediting of leaders would lead to cynicism and an open path for demagogues or submission to soulless managers, the nightmare of Dmitri Karamazov. Perhaps instead of cynicism we have skepticism

enough to make these bad times for demagogues, and the insistence on cost-accounting discourages the compulsive managers. One thing is certain: the formula for new leadership is terribly demanding.

John W. Holmes

Director General, Canadian Institute of International Affairs, Toronto.

EXCURSUS III

Spain

Dying. For weeks in midsummer, Generalissimo Francisco Franco (who began dying eighty-one years ago) lay abed in a hospital. Daily medical bulletins reported his inevitable progress, while the seriousness of his condition led him to invoke a constitutional provision turning the Prince of Spain, Juan Carlos de Borbón, into Acting Chief of State. Dying. In Pedraza (Toledo Province) the walls of the city have swung open. The citizens within wear medals around their necks; the invaders wear cameras. Dying. At the Cathedral of Seville, a priest faithfully stands at the door keeping the indecently dressed away from the House of God. Dying. The National Council of the Falange, Spain's official political movement, approved a proposal for an opening of the political system and the acceleration of Spain's "political development." Dying.

The local press in Córdoba notes how law and order are preserved in Spain while the rest of the West verges on collapse. A companion article, an interview, notes an explosion of juvenile delinquency throughout southern Spain and a discriminatory pattern in the allocation of central government funds to deal with the problem. Dying. Juan Carlos, the Acting Chief of State, awarded prizes to enterprises and workers for their devotion to work and productivity, and for harmonious labor-management relations. Meanwhile, strikes dot Barcelona, where some workers are acting only in solidarity with others and not for their direct self-interest. Dying. The United States and Spain concluded a new agreement to supplement NATO's new Declaration on Atlantic Relations. While the NATO statement reaffirmed the virtually automatic commitment of the United States to the defense of the Alliance, the U.S.-Spanish document triggers off consultations. The comparison of the texts reinforces the marginality of Spain as far as the rest of Europe is concerned. Dying.