"The two decades of the postwar period have witnessed a strong effort on the part of international relations scholars to relate their specialty to Christian ethics. A solution to the problem of the relationship between the two has been achieved by the self-entitled political realists," Ronald H. Stone writes in the Autumn issue of *Religion in Life*. But how successful have they been? For an answer Stone turns to the writings of Hans Morgenthau, who "has established the general outlines of the political realist solution." He offers his comments "from a position of sympathy for Morgenthau's position," but states that he regards them as "necessary qualifications for a Christian's ethical thinking about international politics." The main points of his criticism follow:

"1. Morgenthau's critics have been overly harsh in attacking his emphasis on the national interest. It cannot fairly be stated that he is only interested in a narrowly defined, relentlessly pursued national interest. However, his strongest statements urging the pursuit of the national interest must be qualified. . . .

The pursuit of national interest tends to ignore the broad possibilities of countries having mutual interests. Certainly in relationships of trade the mutual interests have to be considered as seriously as the national interests. . . . The Christian tradition which recognizes that all property is held in trust from the Creator cannot justify a blind pursuit of national interest which totally neglects the needs of other peoples. The temptation for man to idolize his own ambitions is ever present. Labeling the pursuit of national interest a duty reinforces much of man's ever-present national egoism.

"The Christian ethic must allow for the possibility of a nation taking generous steps which may not affirmatively affect its national interest. The Christian can respect India's decision to accept the Tibetan refugees even though India's national interest was not served thereby. The Christian should support the best multilateral aid programs regardless of their failure to further in an important way the United States' national interest. Because of his faith the Christian is willing to act (within economically prudent limits) to help his human brothers in need. . . .

"2. Also for Christians, there is a real international community of the church. A conflict between the interests of the universal church and the national interest cannot be glibly resolved in favor of the national interest. . . .

"3. The Christian understands man as totally corrupt in the sense that every aspect of man has been corrupted. The symbolism of fallen man is very apparent in Morgenthau, but there is no recognition of redemption. . . . Sin and grace are both present in human experience. . . . Politics requires a profound sense of man's inadequacy and his inescapable sin, but to emphasize only man's sin may lead to a view of man which makes the destruction of human values and life of little consequence. Even as sin may permeate man's most creative enterprises, so grace may permeate man's most alienated moments and grant man courage to persevere and even to repent.

"4. In his desire to discriminate between the requirements of a pure ethic and political success, Morgenthau has often stated the Christian ethic in extreme terms. For example, at the Reinhold Niebuhr colloquium Professor Morgenthau argued, 'It is impossible, if I may put it in somewhat extreme and striking terms, to be a successful politician and a good Christian.' This dichotomy does exist between the Sermon on the Mount and political action, but Christian teaching contains many more resources which reduce the impossibility to a tension-filled possibility. . . .

"5. A further inadequacy of his thought is his unwillingness to consider positively the role of ethics in guiding men to shape the political structures of the world in order to realize more justice and order. The Christian, confronted in the community by the imperative of love, is driven not only to confess his guilt but to seek ways to realize love in the midst of broken, chaotic, outdated political structures. Between the launching of a self-righteous crusade and the complacent acceptance, the status quo, there is a vast realm where men can labor responsibly and realistically to renew the orders of society. The delineation of the politically possible reforms is as central to Christian thought about international politics as the criticism of utopian illusions. . . ."

•

"The world today is pulsating with revolutionary forces. Widespread changes are underway affecting basic social attitudes, ideas, institutions and people. . . . But the contemporary revolution does not seem to have extended to the field of international relations," remarks Harold A. Bosley, pastor of New York's Christ Church, Methodist, in an article which appears in *World Outlook* (October) and the *United Church Herald* (October 5). "In the area where it counts most—in some questions of life and death—modern society is not revolutionary," he says. "In this area of life men live in a profoundly stagnant age. From this point of view, it even appears questionable to say that we live in a revolutionary world. Instead, our world needs a revolution."

Dr. Bosley looks "at some of the general understandings of man which influence and shape policies

today"—the scientific approach, the religious, Christian, Marxist, rationalist and existentialist views. These, he finds, are necessary to our understanding because "historically, the question 'What is man?' is a prelude to revolution." He stresses, though, that while "all of these views have brought valuable but limited understanding of the nature of life and society," to emphasize them is merely to underscore "the diversity of thought in the world"; "that which divides men."

Instead, Bosley suggests, we should "stress the reality of living on this earth." And "this reality is not pluralistic but is one and the same for all men and women on earth." At the same time we must "consider man's relations and characteristics so as to arrive at a view of man which will give direction to the changes we seek."

The "composite view of life" which derives from Dr. Bosley's inquiry, has a number of implications "for life in a revolutionary world": (1) "If we are to have peace, justice and freedom in the days ahead, men must be placed above things and institutions. . . ." (2) "Our approach gives us a basis for support of human rights. . . ." (3) "Our view of man points to a conception of right and wrong. . . ." (4) "Our approach gives a basis for building a world community in the face of an arms race which threatens the whole of mankind with disaster. . . ."

•

A research psychiatrist offers some insights into the nature of moral choice in situations of stress in a comment upon the *American Scholar's* symposium "On Morality" which appeared in the previous issue (Autumn). Dr. Robert Coles of Harvard assigns the "chief troubles we have these days" to the fact that "the sources of dignity and ethical responsibility in particular lives are not really known, despite all our interest in the mind. Bruno Bettelheim and Victor Frankl," Dr. Coles notes, "did not just discover, but experienced, the awful disparity between what they believed to be a coherent *view* of man, his nature and his inner struggles, and what in fact could be relied upon to *give* coherence—hence dignity—to inmates of the concentration camps. The appearance and strength of morality can even defy the willful categories of those who today make it their business to evaluate human personality. By no means were the 'mature' and 'non-neurotic' the best able to resist bestiality and brutality. By no means did troubled and vexed minds, given to 'unrealistic' fantasies or 'sick,' obsessional musings, fail to justify their humanity and dignity. It is a bold man indeed, in the face of what we have witnessed this century, who relies too confidently or devotedly on any particular bit of knowledge as a foundation for his ideas about man's mind, let alone his moral nature."

Commenting upon his interviews with young people in the Southern sit-in movement during the last five years, Dr. Coles states that "repeatedly I have heard these youths emphasize that moral decisions do not simply follow from moral truths adopted and even held close to the heart. Moral decisions are made in a moment that enables them, that 'brings' them into being—whether they be the awful moments of the Nazi camps and the Soviet camps, those of the American White House in the midst of the responsibilities for waging and ending a terrible Asian war, or those of the American South coming to terms finally with its proud and dismal exile."

And even "a morality that is once set in motion, once attached to the inclinations in people that make for deeds," he remarks, "is not without its own tests or crises. Under such circumstances I have seen the ideas of moral philosophers accepted or rejected. . . . In the field of battle, morality both lives powerfully and risks instant death before such enemies as practicality, power, brutality—and most assuredly before the greed and spoils that come with victory."

•

"No area of the world has been more neglected by both the serious and the popular press in Britain" than Latin America, states the forward to the September issue of *Encounter.* "Where else, for example, would leading newspapers think it sufficient to file their Latin American news from a desk in New York?" A wide-ranging, eminently readable series of articles about the history, economics, politics, arts and literature of the countries of Latin America is provided by this special number as a contribution to the "intellectual rediscovery of Latin America."

•

"Rosy, But Not Red," the title of his article in the August-September *Africa Today,* aptly sums up George W. Shepherd, Jr.'s description of the current political climate of Tanzania—"the only East African country where you do not get that 'morning after uhuru' feeling."

Mr. Shepherd, writing from the University of Khartoum in the Sudan, sees room for greater American participation in the problems of the area. He states that "since the capacity to carry out a development program is greatly dependent upon the assistance of the outside world, it is to be hoped that Western countries, particularly, the U.S., will determine their policies from the real facts and prospects. The international press has given the impression that Tanzania is China's foothold in Africa. In actual fact, Chinese technicians and influence are outnumbered ten to one by Western technicians and influence. And I did not find a single informed individual in Tanzania who believed that Chinese or Russian influence on the mainland exceeded the legitimate limits of non-alignment." PAMPHILUS