

politician. But a person who has won office through popular elections is forced to recognize the needs of his constituents and to resolve, if possible, conflicting interests and loyalties. That is a politically essential part of a President's task.

We have been told for some years that the White House was not appropriate lodging for a saint, that we needed there a pragmatist not a moralist, that we would do better with an intelligent knave than an honest dolt. Given the events of the last several years, it is probably not necessary to underline the witless bias of those assertions.

We have been told that we should be aware of ambitious men who lust for power, i.e., the Presidency of the United States. Put in those terms, little argument. But the office of President is demanding as well as elevated, and the person who is not willing to struggle hard for the office probably does not deserve it.

We have been told that style may disguise the lack of substance and we should beware that cosmetic virtue. Almost pure nonsense. Recent arguments on the topic usually start with John Kennedy—and they fail to recognize that style can become a real political strength, as it was for FDR, Churchill, and De Gaulle. Even Harry Truman developed a Presidential style once he accepted himself as President.

On one other point all will agree. The candidate must be believable; he or she must be able to be elected. Well, that's the ideal candidate. The task for the major parties now is to find the reality, the actual person, most nearly congruent with it.

JF

EXCURSUS II

Catholics, Jews, and American Community

Unanimously agreed, it was an extraordinary meeting. And there unanimity stopped.

Archbishop Jean Jadot is the Apostolic Delegate, the Pope's official representative, in the United States. On October 17 he met with a small and very distinguished company of "Leaders of the Jewish Community in New York City." The meeting was sponsored by the American Jewish Committee and brought together by the ecumenically indefatigable Rabbi Marc Tanenbaum.

In his first fifteen months in the United States Archbishop Jadot has impressed Roman Catholics and others as something more than a run-of-

the-curia nuncio. Belgian by birth, African and Asian by priestly and curial experience, deceptively mild of manner, he appears to listen carefully and care deeply.

Meeting in the same room where the late Cardinal Bea once talked with Jewish leaders about his and their hopes for Vatican II, the gathering had the tone of what is called historic. A likelier nuncio might have said some approving things about Jewish-Christian dialogue, run through the prescribed confession of Christian culpability for unspeakable crimes against the Jews, expressed hope for bigger and better brotherhood in the future, and let it go at that, no doubt being awarded with polite applause. Jadot is turning out to be an unlikely nuncio. (Technically, he is not a nuncio at all, since the U.S. does not have diplomatic relations with the Vatican, but that is a nice distinction to be pondered by the White House and whomever it has hanging around St. Peter's these days.)

The Archbishop allowed that his comments "may lead us into areas of discussion which are not all sweetness and light, but that are certainly necessary for the advancement of our ongoing relationship." The beginning of the dialogue, he suggested, is when you focus almost exclusively on similarities. The development of dialogue is when you deal honestly with differences. The principle stated, Jadot became quite specific.

"To put the matter quite bluntly, some Catholics feel that on the issues of Israel and Soviet Jewry Jews have been successful and we have helped them; whereas, in regard to abortion and state aid to private schools, we have not been successful and Jews have opposed us."

The Archbishop hastened to add that he did not buy the generalization in its entirety. Not all Jews oppose Catholics on "their" issues nor do all Catholics support Jews on "theirs." Jadot's point was that they are all *our* issues; issues facing the whole American community and touching upon how our common life is to be ordered in the world. As Catholics must not view Israel and Soviet oppression as "Jewish" issues, so Jews must not view the protection of unborn life and educational diversity as "Catholic" issues.

Father Andrew Greeley recently made a similar point in his predictably less elevated style: "Many [Americans] suggest that the Catholic effort to modify the abortion ruling is some sort of secret, evil campaign. Mind you, their efforts to get the ruling were just part of the normal democratic processes. But our response has to be a dirty Catholic plot." It is a fair indictment of a widespread attitude, beginning with the editorial page of the *New York Times*. But then Father Greeley's saying it is not quite the same thing.

Unless Pat Moynihan becomes the next pope, Greeley will never be a papal nuncio.

Archbishop Jadot made it clear he was not proposing a deal. "The basis of our dialogue must be our shared spiritual patrimony. It cannot rely on a policy of reciprocity that would demand a pairing off of issues which are to be traded on a one-to-one basis. Dialogue is open-ended, not programmed for results. The starting point is respect and the end product is mutual respect."

In urging that we face these issues as common issues Jadot speaks in a tradition of distinguished foreigners such as Alexis de Tocqueville and Gunnar Myrdal, who from time to time illuminate for us both the genius and the requirements of our American experiment in democratic pluralism. It was an extraordinary meeting because Jadot chose not simply to endorse Jewish-Christian dialogue but to advance it.

RJN

EXCURSUS III

Neither Guerrillas Nor Patsies

Jaime L. Sin is the new Archbishop of Manila, the Philippines, and he seems to have President Ferdinand Marcos worried. The previous archbishop was Rufino Cardinal Santos, whose surname means "saint." Whatever may be in a name, Sin seems to be generating some sanctified power among the people of the Philippines.

In our September issue Raul S. Manglapus, former Foreign Secretary of the Philippines, described the brutal suppression of Filipino democracy under President Marcos ("The Philippine Archipelago"). It is just possible that some few signs of relaxation now reflect Marcos's sensitivity to the bad press he has been receiving. Perhaps there have even been some political pressures from the U.S. State Department. Certainly a more independent U.S. Congress is less ready to bankroll murder in defense of democracy in the Pacific. Thieu in South Vietnam, Park in South Korea, and Marcos in the Philippines are all nervous, and with good reason.

While these dictators fret about the erosion of their Washington lobbies, the more immediate and in some respects more interesting pressures are coming from the Christian Church in each country. In Saigon the myth that the late Cardinal Spellman built ("millions who voted for freedom with their feet") is being dealt a devastating blow as thousands upon thousands of Roman Catho-

lics from the North take to the streets to protest the tyranny of President Thieu. In South Korea, while Mr. Moon entertains at Madison Square Garden, Protestants and Roman Catholics have led the resistance to General Park's despotic denial of human freedom (see "Heroism in Korea," *Worldview*, October).

And now the Philippines. It may seem like a small thing that in their last meeting the bishops refused to be photographed with Mr. Marcos. Nor would a gathering of five thousand for a "vigil for justice, peace, and freedom" at the Manila Cathedral seem an earthshaking event. Unless, of course, in a country that is 80 per cent Roman Catholic you had imposed strict martial law in furtherance of your role as savior of the nation. The social scientists call it delegitimation.

Archbishop Sin and his episcopal colleagues are, to be sure, no revolutionary cadre. "I for one don't like to be a martyr," the Archbishop says. "I would like to be a confessor." Be that as it may, it has often happened that a bold confession of simple truths can lead to both martyrdom and revolutionary change. Detractors might see the Archbishop's stand as self-serving. After all, the initial friction surfaced following a military raid on a Jesuit novitiate which the regime suspected of harboring its political opponents. Even if one reduces it to a conflict over territorial imperatives, however, the impact of the conflict is not diminished.

The Church has frequently pursued a course of accommodation with repressive regimes. This is the case, for example, with Lutheranism in East Germany, is still largely true of Roman Catholicism in Franco's Spain, and was clearly the case in the Portugal of yesterday. Thus the Church lends religious legitimation to the existing order, protesting only, if at all, when its most clear and immediate interests are trampled upon. But even this minimalist approach to social justice can form powerful resistance to tyranny. One thinks, for example, of the churches in Rhodesia that successfully refused to tolerate apartheid-style restrictions on multiracial ministry and education. Less happily, one reflects on the Dutch Reformed Church in South Africa that has so basely accommodated Christian teaching and practice to racist fear.

Something new is now happening. It is not happening fast enough or surely enough, but it is happening. In Korea, the Philippines, Vietnam, Latin America, and several African countries the churches are rethinking what is essential to the integrity of Christian ministry. The bishops are not donning guerrilla outfits, as some people thought a few years ago. But neither are they content with a definition of ministry that restricts