

decisions are formed into actual policy.

It may be that this questioning of our basic political processes will emerge as the single most important domestic consequence of the war in Vietnam. For opposition and active resistance to the war will continue as long as the war continues on its present course. And as it continues, the alienation which is everywhere evident will increase, the failure of communication will be everywhere more evident. The severity of the political crisis through which we are passing is indicated by the state of our national arguments: the danger is not that the arguments presented are not accepted but that, increasingly, they are not understood. This leads to attacks, not on the opponent's arguments, but on his sincerity and integrity.

The great division is between those who believe that the democratic process is functioning adequately and those who do not. Those who believe it is point out that the present policies were developed in acceptable political fashion, that they are open to change through the same political chan-

nels, and that no media is closed off to the dissenters. They cannot understand why the dissenters feel driven to desperate strategies, which they see as a threat to law, order, justice and stability. Those who feel the system is functioning inadequately frequently feel that they have been disenfranchised; that the goals they share with many others are proper, right and unattainable by political processes they have long upheld; that the system of checks and balances has been replaced by another; and that if they are to get a fair hearing they must pursue justice through extra-legal means.

The mutual alienation between these groups will only intensify as the war continues. The relatively few persons and organizations that are concerned to limit this alienation do not have the resources equal to the task. Frequently they can do no more than warn, as did Senator Aiken of Vermont, that "the real danger to our democratic institutions lies in the U.S. and not 10,000 miles away." J.F.

in the magazines

The continued existence of the "six 'half nations'" formed by the division of Germany, Korea and Vietnam are a chronic source of power conflicts which cannot "be permitted to stand much longer in the way" of constructive solutions to world problems, Eugene Rabinowitch writes in the September issue of *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*. ". . . both sides should climb down from their high horses. They should acknowledge that one cannot insist that divided country A must be reunited, while divided country B is really two countries, whose permanent division must be recognized!"

At the 1957 Pugwash Conference, Dr. Rabinowitch "advocated 'freezing' the political map of the world, recognition of all de facto existing frontiers and regimes, and disassociation of both the West and the East from active support of 'revisionist' movements. (This is emphatically not identical with a guarantee of military support of all existing regimes against all their internal enemies!)" He argued then "that the danger of nuclear war makes all revisionism (even if it can be justified by strong historical or ethnic reasons) too dangerous for it to be used as a power-political tool." Since that time, "actual developments in the world have moved inexorably in this direction; but the reluctance of both sides to commit themselves to the 'freeze' as the only realistic policy in the nuclear

age has slowed down this process of stabilization, and has encouraged 'revisionist' violence such as has occurred in Korea, Hungary, and Vietnam," says Dr. Rabinowitch.

"What is sauce for the goose should be sauce for the gander! The situation in the three divided nations of Germany, Korea, and Vietnam is fundamentally similar and requires application of the same yardstick to each!"

He asserts that "the world has witnessed a renewed demonstration of the danger of revisionism in our time. For many years, Arab countries, led by Nasser's Egypt, refused to recognize the status quo created by the two Arab-Israel wars. They denied the legitimate existence of the state of Israel, and made no secret of their intention to wipe it off the map as soon as they became strong enough to do so. The three-day blitzkrieg, unleashed by Israel when the Arabs were obviously poised to carry out this threat, has achieved in the Middle East the same result the second world war had achieved in Europe after six years of carnage: the original revisionists have lost the war and face revisionism in reverse—the loss of some of their own territory and dismemberment. . . ."

"But the revisionism goes on. The Germans cherish the hope of reunification and return of the lost Prussian lands; the Arabs clamor for return of Israel-

occupied territories. The Arab revisionism is aided and abetted by the very nation that is implacably hostile to German revisionism in Europe. . . .

"As long as great powers support revisionism in parts of the world where the revisionists are on their side, and denounce it where they are allied to the opposite side, outbreaks of violence are bound to repeat themselves, conjuring every time the danger of an all-destroying nuclear war between the sponsors. Sooner or later, one or the other side is likely to miscalculate and engage itself beyond the point of no return."

•

Christianity Today comments (November 24): "The secular theologians of social revolution who shaped the National Council of Churches' Church and Society strategy conference in Detroit [October 22-26] sang a strange song: U.S. force in Vietnam is deplorable; ecumenical violence for socio-political goals is justifiable.

"This idea, if acted upon by neo-Protestant clerics, may bring on the biggest wave of anti-clericalism in the history of American Christianity. Separation of church and state still remains too prized an ideal for Americans to welcome the prospect of New Breed clergy's controlling—as they apparently aspire to do—the machinery of political power, by violence if by no other means.

"Distressing in every way was the attitude toward the role of violence in social change voiced by one of the work groups in Detroit. There was no disposition to accept suffering as a fundamental aspect of fallen man's lot. The work group's refusal to disown violence, and insistence instead that violence may be justifiably used to redress wrong, thereby sanctioned the condoning, encouraging, perpetrating, and perpetrating of violence as ecumenical patterns. Contemplation moved beyond 'mere marches or picketing' to massive campaigns of civil disobedience, non-cooperation with government, economic boycotts and strikes, and physical disruption. Property rights were demeaned as secondary. . . .

"The New Breed churchmen are groping for a theology of revolution; to few people's surprise, they find that the Bible offers them none (or else at this one point they might consider invoking biblical 'authority!'). Their announced objective is to change the machineries of power in the large American cities, on the assumption, apparently, that a cadre of church politicians would function as incorrupt and infallible social engineers. Some seem wholly unaware that violence is self-defeating, that violence carries no guarantee of the results its sponsors seek, that perpetrators can easily lose control of it, and that no process of violence can ever provide the new society that mankind needs. . . .

"The strategy of the New Breed is painfully obvi-

ous. Instead of challenging unregenerate man and society with the biblical demand for regeneration, it seeks rapid ways of gratifying the self-interest of the secular spirit. All who want more of what others have earned are offered ecclesiastical aid in achieving political means of self-aggrandizement. Young men seeking to avoid military service are counseled on how to dodge the draft. Perhaps next, those who wish extramarital sexual fulfillment will have the sanctuary of the temple as well. Such causes, obviously popular among the unregenerate masses, are then identified with the 'morality' of dissent from the status quo. The New Breed is transparently willing—even by violence—to conform the Church to a secular culture in the name of Christian social action."

•

Jewish Frontier, a Labor Zionist publication, asks in its November issue, "Will sentiment against the continued involvement of the United States in Vietnam be strengthened by some of the recent tactics or will popular indignation at 'unAmerican ways' create a reverse effect?" The magazine responds that "the effect on public opinion of the means can only be disregarded if the end is despaired of. When the purpose of a particular demonstration is merely disruptive on the theory that 'hell let loose' is what our society merits, then the demonstrators will presumably be indifferent to their lack of achievement and to their own fate in the face of the inevitable ensuing repression. Such appears to be the reasoned view of the more flamboyant Negro revolutionaries; hence, arguments about the danger of a white backlash will not affect them. In fact, they welcome 'concentration camps' coming in the wake of urban conflagration.

"This thinking does not hold for most of the anti-Vietnam movement," the editorial avers. "By and large, the majority of those involved in it have not despaired of America and still hope by an act of individual conscience to arouse the national conscience. Consequently, the reaction they provoke is not a matter of indifference to them. . . . The limits of civil disobedience in a democracy are set by the consensus which safeguards the rights of the minority insofar as these do not impinge on the rights of the majority. And the majority, unless stirred to revolutionary passion, wants law and order. The average American who may grudgingly applaud the 'guts' of a clergyman who speaks out against an unpopular war will be infuriated by attempts to invade Government offices and disrupt Government business, for it is his government until the next election. The extremist fringe around the peace movement is as harmful to its purpose as the Negro extremists have been to the civil rights movement. Those concerned with the achievement of an objective rather than self-expression cannot afford to disregard the safeguards and controls of the democratic process." PAMPHILUS