

forces? Because, according to President Johnson, these forces had been "placed into the hands of Communist conspirators." Pressed to support this analysis of the situation, Administration officials raised the number of conspirators from seven or eight to 55 or 58 and released a list of Communist agents. Unfortunately press correspondents in the Dominican Republic were unimpressed and *Newsweek* reported that "the embassy failed generally to convince the 156 foreign correspondents in Santo Domingo that 'the 58' were a menace."

It can and has been argued by Washington officials that numbers are irrelevant here, that even seven or eight dedicated Communists who know exactly what they wish to accomplish represent a threat. Such reasoning does little to inspire confidence, for in Latin America it would be difficult *not* to find at least seven or eight Communists in almost any uprising. It does Communists more than credit to suggest that they are so capable that, in such limited numbers, they will automatically wrest control in a conflict of opposing forces. The evaluations of a number of respected reporters lend support to the despairing judgment of Juan Bosch: "This was a democratic revolution smashed by the leading democracy of the world."

The harshest judgment on President Johnson's decision is that it was ill-advised and hasty. But even a sympathetic judgment—that speed was essential and the action appropriate—would have to cope with the serious lapse in communicating reasons for such a decision to a citizenry that is asked to support them.

•

We find ourselves in a situation which invites not cooperation between the government and the press, nor a proper and expected tension, but estrangement. It is impossible, given these conditions, for much of the country *not* to feel confused about matters they have every reason to think they can and should understand. This is not a situation that can be cured by an exhortation from the President or any number of teachers. President Johnson still has widespread support for his policies and decisive acts in foreign affairs, but one can legitimately question whether, given the nature of that support among the informed citizenry, it is firm enough and stable enough to long maintain a policy that demands patience, perseverance, and increasing commitments. If present U.S. policies are not to change, the manner in which they are related to the public certainly should.

J. F.

## ***in the magazines***

*Challenge*, "an independent review edited by Catholic laymen" in Johannesburg, South Africa, has reprinted in its April issue a speech delivered by Archbishop Denis Hurley before the South African Institute of Race Relations, and in an editorial in the same issue it discusses the Archbishop's remarks about the racial problem in South Africa and raises a number of questions about the role of the Church in matters of public policy.

Archbishop Hurley notes a number of "favorable forces" in the private sector which might contribute to better race relations. But he feels that "politically there is nothing that can be done within South Africa to alter the present course of events. Power lies with the white electorate. The white electorate, by a majority of nine to one, or more, is violently opposed to participation of all races in a single society, and its opposition grows with every report of an anti-white speech by a foreign African politician and every atrocity committed in the Congo."

Hurley characterizes South Africa's problem as "a

crisis of love" and states that "a political change can come in South Africa only if there is a moral change first, a change of moral outlook and attitude." He does suggest one course of action: collaboration with the government in its "urging its white citizens to develop greater respect for non-whites." Although the government's aim here "is to make Separate Development work . . . there is nothing wrong in taking up the government's challenge and participating vigorously in a crusade of moral re-education of the white population," the Archbishop states. "We may reserve our right to comment and protest when the occasion seems to demand it, but our chief concern could be with the kind of missionary crusade that is necessary if we are to create the moral atmosphere for political change."

The editors of *Challenge* wonder aloud "how the policy of creative acceptance works in practice. . . ." For example, "how do Africans accept it and remain free from bitterness: for that matter how do we ourselves apply the policy and avoid the temptation

of bitterness?" And what of the Church's role in all this? "Is it the function of the Church to preserve Western civilization in South Africa or is it the function of the Church to dissociate itself from our political assumptions and yet associate itself completely with the sufferings and aspirations of all our people?" Further, "is it conceivable that the Church may, unwittingly, reinforce by its moral leadership the malformation of conscience which state propaganda and economic determinism themselves achieve? Is it legitimate, on the other hand, to challenge people to heroic sacrifice? Is the basic concern of apostolic Christians to strengthen themselves and the few who may still be won over in the certainty that the moment for decisive Christian leadership will come and that all the rest is ultimately irrelevant?"

•

Although the world public may be repelled by the notion that gas is being used in the conduct of war in Vietnam, Julian Pleasants writes in the May 7 *Commonweal*, "the development of chemical and biological methods of warfare might conceivably represent a *necessary response* to the moral requirement for minimum force. They might even offer a way out of the atomic impasse."

Mr. Pleasants, who is described as a research associate at Lobund Laboratories at Notre Dame and a frequent contributor of articles on science and religion to the journal, says that certainly "the atomic bomb has made minimum force a mockery. It is a weapon so inefficient that it must destroy practically everything in order to achieve anything." But, he contends, "it is not necessarily so that war gets more and more horrible. A new mode of warfare could conceivably be more effective than atomic warfare while being radically more humane." He suggests "the likelihood that chemical warfare could meet the demands of minimum force" if there were developed "chemicals which cannot kill" but which "can produce incapacitating effects if they can be effectively delivered."

But "if we are to be prevented from doing what is more humane because the action has the connotation of being less humane," Pleasants concludes, "then humanity has been defeated by words. There is no doubt that world opinion is a force to be reckoned with," and he admits that he "doesn't know how that situation is to be met. But it is a gruesome thought that we must gun down and burn people because it is cruel to nauseate them."

•

Is there a "truly Christian" interpretation of the term "revolution"? Hildegard Goss-Mayr, traveling secretary of the International Fellowship of Reconciliation, says there is one and she discusses the strategy of its use in *Reconciliation Quarterly* (No. 128).

The truly Christian revolution, Mrs. Goss-Mayr writes, can only take a non-violent form. It is a "divine revolution" of which the Sermon on the Mount is the "manifesto"; it is "the realization, by committed and active Christians, of the divine strategy with the weapons of Love, Truth and Justice; it is the strategy of sacrifice, of the cross; it is the incarnation of the power of God—the greatest power of all existence—in men's struggle against injustice."

"The aim of non-violent action is to overcome the evil in ourselves and in our adversary and to re-establish liberty and justice for those who suffer the evil or the injustice." But "there is . . . a basic condition which must be observed in this struggle," Mrs. Goss-Mayr cautions, "the (good) end desired cannot be achieved except by means which are themselves morally good. If, in the course of the action, we deviate from the means of non-violence, we cannot obtain the good end desired; we compromise our whole action; it loses its credibility and our struggle loses its interior force. If we allow ourselves to be drawn by the adversary on to the level of violence, we can no longer obtain his conversion, because the injustice will not be transformed from within. In addition, by adopting the same means of violence, lies, etc., which are used by our opponent, we thereby confirm in his conscience his faith that these weapons are justified and good in this struggle. Because the oppressor is usually physically the better armed, it is probable that, because of our compromise, we shall lose the struggle." But to have used "evil means," we would have been "abandoning the principle of the absolute respect of human life and become yet another link in the chain of reciprocal hatred and animosity which stretches out across the centuries."

This ban is absolute. It includes even "limited violence" which, the author notes, some call "a paradoxical form of love" and condone for use under certain circumstances. Even in a limited form such action is a "compromise with violence" that "abandons the basic principle of all human community life—the absolute respect of the human person."

•

In other magazines:

"Who Is a Jew?" by J. L. Talmon, *Encounter*, May. In a "Letter from Israel" the author, professor of history at Hebrew University in Jerusalem, asks "What are the legitimate limits which the heritage of all the ages may set upon the sovereign right of the generation here and now to fashion its life?"

"Catholics and Nuclear Pacifism II," *Continuum*, Winter 1965. Editor Justus George Lawler takes a look at the "strategic theosophy" of two "religiously tinctured apologues for massive nuclear deterrence."

PAMPHILUS