

in the magazines

In "Man, the Earth and the Universe" (*Christianity and Crisis*, June 25) Paul Tillich looks anew at the story of Noah and the Flood, finding in it a parallel to our present problems of survival. In Genesis, the Lord visits destruction upon man and the living things of the earth because "I am sorry that I have made them." Today it is man who holds the power of destruction or survival. "What," asks Dr. Tillich, "has the Christian message to say about our predicament? What has it to say about the significance of the earth, the scene of human history, within the vastness of the universe? What about the small span of time given to this planet and to the life upon it, in view of the unimaginable length of the rhythms of the universe?"

"Such questions have rarely been asked in Christian teaching and preaching," Dr. Tillich continues. "Its center has been, quite naturally, the drama of the creation and fall, of salvation and fulfillment. Sometimes, however, a question suddenly moves from the periphery of thought into its center—not for theoretical reasons, but because it has become for many a matter of life and death. This has happened again and again in human history as well as in the history of Christianity. And whenever it has happened it has changed man's view of himself in all respects, as it changed the understanding of the Christian tradition in all its parts. It may well be that we are living in such a moment and that the relation of man to earth and to the universe will, for a long time, become the point on which the primary concern of sensitive and thinking people is focused."

•

In the June issue of *The Christian Century*, Donald W. Shriver, Jr. defines "one of the critical challenges of the '60s to American Protestantism: the challenge of seeking a relationship and a distinction between the faith of the church and the ideologies of churchmen."

"Of late two delusions have plagued American Protestantism with particular intensity," writes Mr. Shriver. "The first is that, as men of faith, we either do not have or do not need an ideology of Christian conviction. . . . One might assume that when American Protestants think ideologically, they do so on the basis of their Christian faith. But in actuality their frame of reference is in many respects secular as well—a fact which makes for conflict, or at best uneasy alliances, in the thought of individuals.

"Hence the second delusion: that an easy transition from Christian faith to ideology is possible. Has the first delusion nourished the second, and has the church contributed to both? If, so, we churchmen cannot wag a righteous finger at those 'good Protestants' who belong to the John Birch Society and

the Christian Anti-Communist Crusade. Whatever their underlying motives, are these Protestants not rushing to fill a spiritual vacuum where they sense some articulate ideology should be? And must not the church bear partial responsibility for this ideological void's being filled by ideological fanaticism?"

•

In an article on "Unconventional Warfare" (*The American Scholar*, Summer) J. K. Zawodny notes that the use of guerrilla tactics to achieve political power in technologically backward areas is increasing because such techniques are "cheap and effective." What U.S. leadership must decide, he writes, is whether to use unconventional warfare as an instrument of foreign policy to exert power and pressure, or merely as an infantry combat technique appropriate to wartime. "If the latter is what we have in mind, then we are really using 'unconventional warfare' in the most 'conventional' fashion. On the other hand, if we intend to enter the game of systematically initiating, manipulating and fostering political mass movements in order to help peoples realize their political objectives through violence, then we must understand and clearly distinguish between the prerequisites, the techniques and the objectives of unconventional warfare."

•

"Unconventional warfare" is also the subject of an article by Raymond L. Garthoff in the July *Foreign Affairs*. Mr. Garthoff is concerned to show how the communist application of guerrilla methods, infiltration and subversion has responded to historical change and local conditions. In this evolution lie "significant differences" between the Russian and Chinese approaches to revolutionary war, with the Chinese insistence on strategic independence from Moscow setting the example for communist revolutionaries the world over, who find Bolshevik directives inapplicable to local situations.

This leads to Mr. Garthoff's final conclusion: "The future role of revolutionary guerrilla war in communist strategy is probably more dependent on local opportunity than on anything else. The politico-military premise of communist—chiefly Chinese—thought on revolutionary warfare is basically sound, as is their tactical doctrine for such operations. The most vulnerable point, then, is the local societies and polities which may be threatened. This is not a novel idea, but if our analysis of communist thought and action brings us back to this point, we have at least discovered that there are no short cuts for either side—no basic flaws in the communist approach, but also no secret weapons in their arsenal."

PAMPHILUS