

far offered by the United States with suspicion, distrust and contempt. When the simple, clean solutions are not very effective and the effective

solutions are complex and muddy the choice is difficult. But even those alternatives seem not to be present in Vietnam.

## **in the magazines**

"Three elements of the Christian message should continually illumine the mind of Christians as they deal with the problems of world politics," John C. Bennett has written in the August 5 issue of *Christianity and Crisis*. He states these to be, first, that "each nation is under the judgment, providence and mercy of God," second, "the commandment of love for the neighbor, for all neighbors," and third, "the understanding of man's creation in the image of God and the depth and universality of sin."

While the thorny issues of international affairs do not admit of any "uniquely Christian guidance," Dr. Bennett says, the church has great responsibility in emphasizing the elements of Christian teaching pertinent to these situations. It cannot play this role if it is an apologizer for state policy, or if it advocates "over-all idealistic solutions" to cold war problems. Its role should be that of "helping the American people to think with greater freedom about the world in which they live," challenging "many of the prevailing assumptions about the cold war and nuclear armaments," and inspiring "the debate on public questions about which most people prefer to be silent."

Only in this way, he concludes, can our churches be, "more clearly than they are at present, part of the world-wide Christian community that never allows us to forget the humanity of those beyond barriers that limit our understanding."

Outside of the "revolutionary changes in the international environment" which the goal of a disarmed world under international law would appear to demand, what purposeful steps can be taken in this direction which are consistent with present realities? George E. Pugh has approached this problem in the summer issue of *Orbis*, and contends that measures can be taken for arms control, measures which are "soundly based on military and political realities and well integrated with other aspects of national strategy."

He calls attention to the role which restraint has played in international affairs, even in times of war, and inquires into the motives which underlie a nation's observance of such restraints. These principles

are then related by the author to present-day problems of disarmament and the strategy of deterrence.

Pugh finds that "a measure of arms control automatically inheres in a defense policy which offers a wide range of choices below the level of general nuclear war," and thus the first steps towards "a feasible arms control policy" is the "careful assessment of the range of military options available."

In his discussion of the Second Vatican Council which appears in the July issue of *The Ecumenical Review*, Karl Barth expresses his misgivings at the emphasis the World Council of Churches has placed upon the opportunities the proceedings in Rome afford for dialogue between Catholics and other Christians. To Barth, the interest maintained in this area has eclipsed the importance which should be lent by non-Catholics to the central purpose of the concave: "the renovation" of Rome's "own house," and what would "appear as a movement of renewal within the Roman Church." The main line of inquiry which the Vatican Council should serve to advance in the rest of the Christian world, the theologian asserts, is whether "something has been set in motion—or not set in motion!—on our side, in the rooms of our church."

Indeed, Dr. Barth asks, "of what use would any conversation with those others be to us, and how could they be conducted with a view to a this-worldly or at least other-worldly unity of the Church, if the presupposition on our side were something else than the altogether concrete entreaty for the Holy Spirit within our troubled church?" Is there not a like need for change and flexibility in other Christian groups? "Are there not also non-Roman, even 'Protestant' Ottavianis . . . who everywhere to some extent determine the appearance of the non-Roman churches?"

Both Christian groups "live to the extent that they are living communities of the living Jesus Christ," and "the question that confronts them . . . each in its own way and both in their coexistence, is not the cooperation of their different doctrines and institutions" but "the dynamics of the evangelical Word and Spirit. . ."

PAMPHILUS