

in the magazines

"Demonstrate, Yes — But Not Futilely," urges Charles E. Fager, a Quaker who has just completed a term of alternative service as a conscientious objector (*The Christian Century*, February 28). "I agree with the New Left's view that what is variously called the 'establishment' or the 'power structure,' a relatively small group of extremely powerful men in government and industry, has significantly diluted the effectiveness of our democratic institutions, has wielded its power in support of the war's expansion. But I also believe that, especially in the case of a war, these decision makers depend on widespread acquiescence among the populace for the success of their policies. . . ."

"From this point of view the most realistic objective of antiwar efforts would seem to be to undermine this public acquiescence in or support of the war. The most radical strategy, the one most threatening to the power structure, is the one which can most effectively dilute this support. I reject for several reasons the alternative strategy, discussed more and more frequently in antiwar circles these days, of trying to replace the power structure without bothering to change underlying public opinion.

"In the first place, such an effort would most likely be violent, and I persist in the pacifist conviction that a violent change in the structure of power does not end evil but simply replaces one variety of evil with another. . . . My basic reason for questioning the utility of trying to stop the war by a change in elites is, however, that the new, pacifist elite would likewise need the acquiescence of the citizenry — and that citizenry stands under the spell of a generation of militarist cold-war conditioning. . . ."

Rejecting "some vague plan of inoffensive public 'education'" as an answer to current modes of demonstration, Fager calls for "larger scale," more "truly radical (i.e., effective)" forms, "designed to make visible to those who are the object of the demonstration the evil being protested against, or to exhibit to the target group values to which its members subscribe but fail to implement, values which if actually practiced would make their support of the evil intolerable and contradictory."

An example of "effective demonstration" cited by Fager was one which "took place in New York the same October weekend as the Pentagon protests. As a counter to the Washington actions, a coalition of veteran and labor groups announced a vigil in Battery Park . . . to 'support our boys in Vietnam'. . . . The vigil began Saturday October 21 and continued through the night into Sunday afternoon. Around 2 A.M., as Battery Park was wrapped in a cold, damp fog, a group of New York Quakers entered the park carrying jugs of hot coffee and cups. As they handed

out the coffee to the surprised patriots they talked quietly, unaggressively about the war and the various incidents of protest. They spoke to people whose ears still rang from the hours of speeches, few of which had failed to dwell on the war protesters' lack of cleanliness, intelligence, patriotism and morals. Imagine the vigilers' consternation at being offered welcome refreshments by just such protesters!

"Obviously no hordes were won over that night. But the potential persuasiveness of the approach was infinitely greater than would have been that of, say, a 'nonviolent' assault on the park by 3,000 chanting students. The Quakers demonstrated far better than any picket sign the pacifist affirmation of all men's worth. Had the incident been publicized, it would hardly have sustained the image of antiwar activists so widely held by the public at large."

"Youth, Change and Violence" are explored by Kenneth Keniston of Yale University Medical School's department of psychiatry, in the Spring issue of *The American Scholar*. Keniston writes of "the salience of the issue of violence for post-modern youth" ("the first generation to grow up with 'modern parents'):

" . . . The capacity for rage, spite and aggression is part of our endowment as human beings: it is a constant potential of human nature. But during the past two decades — indeed, starting before the second world war—we have witnessed violence and imagined violence on a scale more frightening than ever before. . . . It should not surprise us, then, that the issue of violence is a focal concern for those of contemporary youth with the greatest historical consciousness. The hippie slogan 'Make love, not war' expresses their sentiment, albeit in a form that the 'realist' of previous generations might deem sentimental or romantic. Although few young radicals would agree with the wording of this statement, the underlying sentiment corresponds to their basic psychological orientation. For them, as for many others of their generation, the primary task is to develop new psychological, political and international controls on violence. Indeed, many of the dilemmas of today's young radicals seem related to their extraordinarily zealous efforts to avoid any action or relationship in which inner or outer violence might be evoked. Distaste for violence animates the profound revulsion many of today's youth feel toward the war in Southeast Asia, just as it underlies a similar revulsion against the exploitation or control of man by man. The same psychological nonviolence is related to young radicals' avoidance of traditional leadership lest it lead to domination, to their emphasis on person-to-person participation and 'confrontation,'

Continued on p. 5

current reading

Force, Order, and Justice

Robert E. Osgood and Robert W. Tucker. John Hopkins. 374 pp. \$10.00

"The importance of examining the role and rationale of force today needs no explanation," notes the preface to this work by two eminent political scientists, "but the difficulty should not be underestimated." To accomplish this the authors "found it necessary and illuminating to view the current status of military power in the perspective of its status before the nuclear age." For, they say, "it is in the interplay of continuing, changing, and, in a few respects, really novel manifestations of force that one finds essential clues to understanding the present and speculating about the future."

Synod '67, A New Sound in Rome

Francis X. Murphy, C.Ss.R. and Gary MacEoin. Bruce. 236 pp. \$4.95

For thirty days in Fall 1967 nearly 200 Roman Catholic bishops met, behind closed doors, to confer on problems confronting their Church. This Episcopal Synod—a gathering of bishops as successors to the Apostles—was an outgrowth of Vatican II. Theologian Murphy and reporter MacEoin were on hand and together have chronicled the events of the sessions, reserving separate chapters for individual analyses of issues resolved and unresolved by the bishops.

The U. N. and Vietnam

Lincoln P. Bloomfield. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. 44 pp. 60¢

The author, who served the State Department as planner on U.N. affairs and is now a member of the M.I.T. political science faculty, asserts that "apart from rhetoric or propaganda, the U.N. has no operationally useful role to play in the Vietnam war until such time as both sides have a disposition to negotiate seriously." But he does suggest, in addition to factors limiting its usefulness, some "intermediate steps in which the U.N. might be helpful" and its role "once fighting has stopped."

Elder and Younger Brothers: The Encounter of Jews and Christians

A. Roy Eckardt. Scribners. 188 pp. \$4.95

Dr. Eckardt, editor of *The Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, considers this an essay in "Christian theological ethics," one with four principal emphases: "the decisiveness of the historic fact of antisemitism . . . ; the present ferment in Christian attitudes; . . . relevant theological dimensions of the subject; and the rejection of the traditional Christian missionary outlook toward Jews, yet in a manner that testifies to the uniqueness and integrity of Christian faith." Comments on the Arab-Israeli war and the response of the American Christian community to the Mideast crisis form an appendix to the volume.

in the magazines . . .

Continued from p. 2

and even to their unwillingness to 'play the media' in an attempt to gain political effectiveness. . . .

"Yet the position of psychologically nonviolent youth in a violent world is difficult and paradoxical. On the one hand, he seeks to minimize violence, but on the other, his efforts often elicit violence from others. At the same time that he attempts to work to actualize his vision of a peaceful world, he must confront more directly and continually than do his peers the fact that the world is neither peaceful nor just. The frustration and discouragement of his work repetitively reawaken his anger, which must forever be rechanneled into peaceful paths. Since he continually confronts destructiveness and exploitation in the world, his own inevitable potential for destructiveness and exploitativeness inevitably arouses in him great guilt. The young men and women who make up the New Left in America, like other post-modern youth, have far less difficulty in living with their sexual natures than did their parents; but what they continue to find difficult to live with, what they still repress, avoid and counteract is their own potential for violence. It remains to be seen whether, in the movement toward 'resistance' and disruption of today's young radicals, their psychological nonviolence will continue to be reflected in their actions."

Robert Strausz-Hupe's prognosis is "not only for the continuation but also for the intensification of the cold war." Circumstances have not altered Soviet Russia's cold-war objectives and its strategy remains one of seeking to bypass its opponent's position of strength and catch him napping — "the Strategy of the Indirect Approach" (*National Review*, Feb. 27).

Of relations between the USSR and other Communist systems, Strausz-Hupe writes: "It has been the West's successful containment of Communist expansionism which has increased the internal pressures of a Communist system both politically rotten and economically inefficient. These pressures, when they were no longer afforded sufficient outlets into external conquest, cracked the monolithic facade of the Communist bloc: insofar as the Western Alliance has denied the Soviets further gains in Europe, and the United States has barred East Asia to Red Chinese encroachment, the United States and its Western allies have been the true authors of the Sino-Soviet split. They can 'coexist' with one another only so long as they can cooperate with one another in foreign conquests — and divide up the loot. This is why the principal objective of the Soviets' Strategy of Indirect Approach has been the dissolution of the Western Alliance. This is why the faltering of the Western Alliance now opens up new avenues for Soviet political warfare. This is why growing Western disunity must lead inevitably to an intensification of the cold war." — PAMPHILUS