

tors in human affairs and are not to be overcome. Perhaps there will always be an irreconcilable difference between those who emphasize the unique, irreplaceable value of the individual person and who spend their lives in an attempt to understand and communicate that value, and those who stress the significance of the quantifiable aspects of existence and the need to find and act upon them if society is to develop in some rational fashion. Perhaps. But it is not evident that the familiar distinctions between the "tender minded" and the "tough minded," between the visionary and the planner, the subjective insight and the objective conclusion, the artist and the scientist — it is not evident that these distinctions establish human divisions which cannot be overcome. What is evident, however, is that they do now exist and are disturbingly apparent in our present debates.

It would not change the essential terms of our present national controversy if those on each side recognized what can *not* generally be expected from those on the other side. The politician is not to be considered inhuman and unfeeling, for example, because he does not publicly express compassion for the individuals suffering under the

punishment of his nation's weapons. If he acknowledges such suffering he must, inevitably, attempt to diminish its importance relative to proclaimed national goals. And this, in fact, is what happens when the government officials respond to questions and charges about, for example, civilian deaths, torture, and especially repugnant forms of warfare. Those who support U. S. policy must see these aspects of war as part of the "lesser evil" which is enjoined if a greater evil is to be avoided. Without the political person who will bear this burden, we would not have an organized society.

The poet, on the other hand, is not to be dismissed as fatuous or foolish because he does not suggest politically viable alternatives to the actions which he criticizes. Even those who regard themselves as fair, humane people can become hardened to the sufferings of others, particularly if they are at a cultural distance. The poet acts to overcome that distance, and to stress that evil is evil even when it is lesser. At his best the poet is upholding high ideals and standards which in times of great conflict are slighted or discounted. Without the poet, and all that he represents, we would not have a society worth organizing. J.F.

in the magazines

No flags or hortatory orations marked *The Spectator's* celebration of the fortieth anniversary of the Kellogg-Briand Pact, whose signatories renounced war as a solution to international problems. For shortly thereafter, the British weekly recalls (issue of February 24), "Hitler was master of Germany, and the world had embarked on the bloodiest phase in its history." And yet today, at Geneva, "the world leaders are . . . engaged in drafting a second Kellogg — this time to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons." While "there is no reason to believe that it would be followed by the disasters that followed its predecessor, there is

equally no reason to suppose that it would be any more effective in preventing them."

For one thing there is vigorous dissent by members of the European community. Their "crucial objection" to the enterprise "is that the draft treaty that Britain, America and Russia have agreed rules out any possibility of a European nuclear force until such time as the six countries of the E.E.C. are genuinely one. That is, it rules out a European nuclear force at the intermediate stage envisaged by the Rome Treaty and almost all believers in European unity as the only possible route towards full integration: the stage at

which decisions are taken by majority vote. And by ruling out a nuclear Europe at this stage it puts a roadblock on the path to unity at any date.

"Britain's attitude towards the non-proliferation treaty was therefore seen by most Europeans as an acid test of the genuineness of Mr. Wilson's attempt to join the Common Market — had he not even declared that Britain wanted to join Euratom in order to put 'new life' into it? — and of this country's readiness to consider itself European. For all the European objections add up to one simple truth: the object of European unity is to create a new world power on a par with Russia and America; while the object of the non-proliferation treaty is virtually to prevent this.

"Had Britain, like France, declined to sign the treaty in its present form, every nation of Europe would have followed her example. Had we quietly agreed to sign and said nothing (for the real negotiations have inevitably been between the Americans and the Russians) this would have been accepted by the Europeans without in any way affecting the chances of a non-proliferation treaty ultimately being concluded. But instead, in pursuit of Mr. Wilson's eager search for a worthless 'peace' triumph he can wave at his Vietnam-angered left wing, Britain has been actively promoting and touting the non-proliferation draft treaty throughout the length and breadth of Europe. Not only that, our one and only contribution to the evolution of the treaty has actually been to persuade the Americans to eliminate the 'European clause' that was in their original draft, which would have permitted a European force controlled by majority vote. For good measure, we have privately made clear to the Europeans that this means that Britain would only agree to a European nuclear force before European unity is complete if there were to be a British veto on it.

"In fine, the Government's conduct over the non-proliferation treaty, at a time when it is ostensibly seeking membership of the Common Market — and, in particular, Italian and German help in gaining it — represents one of the most inept episodes in the annals of British diplomacy. It may well be that no treaty ultimately emerges; but the harm has been done. The French have not even needed to put up obstacles: we have created them ourselves. If, this time, the General fails to use his veto, it will be for one reason only: that the negotiations do not begin at all."

Dorian J. Fliegel remarks on the "Forgotten History of the Draft" in *The Nation* for April 10, and asserts that the present proposals for reform, "in the name of democratizing the draft," will instead lead to the "militarizing" of American "society and foreign policy." Indeed, he states, "all aspects of the draft-reform movement — its initial motivation, the rhetoric in which it is couched, the basic structural consequences

— reflect the degree to which our society is increasingly subject to military pressures and priorities."

Fliegel says, for example, that "the irony of the present movement to do away with student deferments is that no military justification whatsoever has been put forward." "Yet, unable to do away with the draft in the context of Vietnam, and impatient to deal with what appear to be glaring inequities, proponents of draft reform have turned toward greater universalization of service as the solution." And "since universalization appears to make the draft more just, it will no doubt make it more acceptable on a permanent basis. Fifteen years ago the primary concern was the justice of the system; today the primary concern is justice *within* the system."

To Mr. Fliegel this poses a certain threat: "the more society becomes committed to the maintenance of the military, the more the issues which relate to the military, especially in the realm of foreign affairs, will be removed from political debate. The more we accept and rely upon a large and explosive military establishment, the more will military needs take priority over domestic social problems. Furthermore, with a military establishment whose actions are legitimized in advance by the legitimization of the system, democratic public debate will inevitably be constricted."

Mary McGrory, reporting the "Washington Front" for *America* (April 15), notes that "Pope Paul's new encyclical initially received little public attention" in the capital city. "Congress was in its Easter recess when 'On the Development of Peoples' was published. The President held no press conference during the week. The humanist manifesto of the Holy Father was read, however, with much quiet satisfaction at the White House. Members of the Administration welcomed this new and fervent voice for social reform in the underdeveloped countries.

"Those concerned with poverty programs and foreign aid realize they have gained a valuable new witness and expect to cite the ringing phrases about the 'intolerable scandal' of the difference between the haves and have-nots of this world."

Miss McGrory also comments that "Pope Paul's visit to the United Nations — that incisive, tactful and perfectly organized 24 hours — made a deep, but not lasting impression. He is, of course, a hero to the dwindling and demoralized band of doves on Capitol Hill. His failure to be moved by the arguments of the Administration that it is 'stopping Communist aggression' has constituted something of a problem to Administration diplomats. His oft-expressed abhorrence of the war has, in the opinion of like-minded legislators, kept the country from being swept up in the 'holy war' sentiments expressed by Cardinal Spellman on his Christmas visit."

PAMPHILUS