

nations which possesses the power for good or ill, and I may wish that only gods possessed the power of the great states, but since it falls now to mortal hands, like many cups which we would wish away, it belongs to us to act, so far as our limited capacities permit, for values which are worthy of ourselves and of men.

As Barnet makes amply clear, we must *not* intervene on the basis of a hope for or promise of "reforms" made by an inadequate regime. Intervention is a commitment more easily made than revoked, as we have learned at cost. Reforms must be a price of intervention — even more than they have been in the inadequate Alliance for Progress — and we must be prepared and willing to withdraw if the reforms are subsequently "suspended."

Intervention of that sort means that we will abandon the fiction that conditions in governments we aid can be made the responsibility of the "sovereign, recognized government" by appeal to the pale canons of traditional international law. It is, inevitably, partly our own responsibility. Oddly, perhaps, the recognition of a deep commitment may — and should — require a greater willingness to consult with those we aid, to consider their desire for dignity and their right to speak with similar tongues in our own councils.

Fundamentally, Vietnam must teach us a simple truth: that the devotion of our own citizens is not unconditional and that we must be careful of those causes in which we ask their support. For years, the

Right made this clear to Washington and the more rational, certainly more internationalist, Left kept a responsible silence. As a result, the "security-planner," like all bureaucrats eager to avoid controversy and especially so after the scarring effects of Senator Joseph McCarthy's war against State, fearfully sought to cast their policies in terms acceptable to the Right. Certainly that is the sad lesson which Barnet is concerned to tell. Vietnam has changed all that, for the moment at least. And the duty of the citizen is to make sure that the lesson is driven home. An age of peril and responsibilities cannot be left to "experts," nor can the expert forget that the patriotic devotion of citizens is something to be won, not a fact to be assumed.

Polemarchus, in *The Republic*, was refuted when he argued that justice was helping friends and hurting enemies, in part because Polemarchus lacked any basis other than birth and habit for distinguishing friends from enemies. The nations have slumbered for a long time in a similar dream, but the drowsing now may be dying. Officials will need to prove that those we aid are in some genuine sense our friends, and that those we oppose are, in equally real terms, our foes. And when they fail, they must expect resistance. That, however, is not a proof that intervention is dead, but that the old lines by which intervention could be judged, the real estate marks that set off friend from enemy, have been erased, at least for our times.

The State of Israel in the Modern World

Israel: An Echo of Eternity, by Abraham Joshua Heschel. Farrar, Straus & Giroux. 233 pp. \$5.50

by *Monika Hellwig*

The existence of the modern state of Israel appears to have become an embarrassment to most of us. It is not only the strategic delicacy of its position, the legal problematic of its territorial expansion

Dr. Hellwig is assistant professor of Theology at Georgetown University.

through warfare, and the fact that we are all so interested in Arab oil. What emerges as the main source of embarrassment is far rather that Israel chooses to mix religion with politics, which is entirely against the rules in our modern world. We demand specialization of thought and judgment, even in practical affairs, more or less along the lines of academic disciplines we have devised. Of course, the Muslim states also mix politics with religion, but we notice it less because we are used to Muslim nations doing that

through the ages, and when we do notice it it bothers us less because their brand of religion is more exotic and offers us less threat of immediate involvement.

It is quite probable that most thinking Americans, if they are not biased by commercial interests, would prefer to solve the question of Israel on a purely pragmatic basis. It is a generally accepted principle of international law (or, at the least, of equity) that all nations clearly recognizable as such are entitled to self-government and national independence,

which is not possible without territorial sovereignty. Even apart from the common acceptance of this principle, most of us would probably be prepared to admit that in face of the brutal facts of recent history something simply had to be done to give the Jews national independence. Beyond this, it might be conceded that a State of Jews might have been established anywhere, that the matter was given much thought, and that the best arrangement that the assembled nations of the world were in fact able to make was the present one situating the State of Israel in Palestine.

From this it is an obvious step in practical reasoning to conclude that once there and existing the State of Israel has the right of self-defense like other states, presumably with that amount of violence which is necessary to make the defense effective. A further common sense step might be to study a map and question whether under the type of attack and threat that has been waged since the inception of Israel, the territory as originally defined is defensible. As the former delineation quite obviously assumed a guaranteed state of peace as the condition of survival, one might then quite logically take up the chronicle of United Nations and other international activities to find out exactly how this guarantee was being supplied, more especially at moments of emergency when instantaneous action was required. Finding the guarantee conspicuously lacking, the honest seeker of pragmatic clues for right action might ask himself what options seriously lay open to Israel, at the various times of crisis or subsequently when land had been annexed in response to the immediate military need.

Rather obviously, this is not exactly how most intelligent Americans have responded, partly because they did not take Nasser's threat of extermination of the Jews any more seriously than they previously took Hitler's threat. Most

Americans, as well as those who hold power in the United Nations, apparently thought that all of us, including Israel, should first wait and see whether Nasser did actually destroy the State of Israel, and decide afterwards what to do about it. We still wanted a perfectly clear, black and white picture of who the good guys were—which is usually not available even in retrospect.

Yet neither this nor the oil interests fully account for the lack of practical common sense in the way the Israeli question has been discussed. Much of the criticism in the press and public meetings of all types hinged on the religious claim. Some maintained Israel was taking all kinds of unfair advantages under cover of religion. Some said the Arab refugee problem invalidated any claim Israel had to serious consideration or support. Many implied that American Jews, if they were loyal Americans, should not get quite so excited about a threat to the State of Israel and most certainly should not expect fellow Americans to get excited about it. Here and there one heard that as a religious state, Israel should not be fighting at all, because she has plenty of internal disorders to put right first.

Throughout it all, Jewish friends would plead that we at least try to understand why they should feel as they did. Many times since May, 1967 I have asked Jewish friends where one might find a full account of the Jewish religious orientation to the land of Israel. Such an account is offered in Abraham Joshua Heschel's book, *Israel: An Echo of Eternity*. This is a book written with passion, and ranges from poetic and mystical sketches through prophetic interpretation of history into sharp historical argumentation validating the State of Israel.

The book will, of course, be criticized for this; it offends all the canons for compartmentalized thinking. But it is all of a piece and quite explicitly states its fundamental premise: "The fatal

disease that is infecting many minds today is politics as an isolated, autonomous science following its own rules, unhampered by moral consideration or respect for truth. Politics should be part of an all-embracing effort to preserve, to enhance, to ennoble the most sacred thing on earth — human life."

The book is not a theological analysis of the situation nor yet a legal one. It develops what might be termed an historical argument within a very broad framework, linking the very existence and continuance of the Jewish people to its biblical origins by concrete points of reference in time and space. In its very existence the people is constituted by its orientation to the Land through "memory, hope and distress."

Heschel makes the interesting suggestion that if Christians of the West are unable to understand this it is because they themselves have "allegorized" Scripture. Just as they did not take Hitler or Nasser literally, so they have long since ceased to take the Bible literally, even in its most obvious references to events in history, and therefore they never through the long centuries took literally the Jewish cry "next year in Jerusalem" and the many references in Jewish liturgy to the promise of the Land as a concrete reality of the future. "The dichotomy of letter and spirit is alien to Jewish tradition. What man does in his concrete physical existence is directly relevant to the divine. . . . The Hebrew Bible is not a book about heaven—it is a book about the earth."

For the Jew, his destiny was always linked to the land, and through the long centuries, as Heschel points out, the people of Israel never abandoned their claim to what had been taken from them by violence:

The Second Commonwealth was destroyed by the Romans in the year 70, the State of Israel was born in the year 1948. In

that long interval, Palestine never became a national home for any other people, has never been regarded as a geopolitical entity, has never been an independent state . . . each conquest absorbed it as occupied territory to be ruled from without. . . . For the Jews, and for them alone, this was the one and only Homeland, the only conceivable place where they could find liberation and independence.

What most of us in the West do not appreciate in concrete experiential terms is that what is at stake for the Arabs is two per cent of their total territory, while what is at stake for Jews is their very existence. Heschel does not evade the question of the Arab refugees but gives a summary of what all who have worked in the situation

well know; Israel is fully aware of their distress and the injustice against them but is kept powerless to eliminate the scandal by maneuvers of the Arab powers to maintain Arab refugees homeless as a pawn in the game.

Yet beyond these different areas of not knowing and not realizing, is a more decisive region of Western Christian thought at which Heschel barely hints. As the Glock and Stark study (*Christian Beliefs and Anti-Semitism*) pointed out years ago, it is implicit in our most basic religious attitudes that the Jewish people was outdated by the advent of Christianity, that if they survive it should be only in exile, and that the retaking of the Land (although we were party to it) constitutes a religious problem to us. We had hoped we somehow had a gentlemen's agreement with

the State of Israel and our own Jewish friends that the whole "religious bit" would be kept out of it, and that American Jews would somehow "have the common sense" not to identify with the State of Israel.

It is our own doctrine of secularization, of separation of Church and State, and of the compartmentalization of religion that is very seriously threatened, and along with it our sense of how to live in the modern world. The State of Israel in its many-faceted paradoxical and concrete reality challenges us to rethink some fundamentals of our ideology. Not everyone will agree with Heschel's presentation, interpretation, and judgments. Many even among his fellow Jews will take issue with him. But the book is magnificently worthy of reflective reading.

Of Religious Communities and Political Action

American Catholics and Vietnam
edited by Thomas Quigley. Eerdmans. 197 pp. \$4.50

by Vaile Scott

Thomas Quigley introduces his collection of essays entitled *American Catholics and Vietnam* as "... a small voice joined with many others in protest. It is what we, and the authors gathered here, can do after all the acceptable methods of registering dissent have been used up — speaking, signing petitions, picketing and politicking." A few pages later on, in the foreword, Gordon Zahn writes, "I cannot help feeling (and this implies no criticism of the eminent contributors) that the picture which emerges is one of a change that is

Vaile Scott is director of the Woodstock (Illinois) Center, a residential conference and research facility.

both too little and too late."

These prefatory statements by Quigley and Zahn constitute a sweeping indictment of the American Catholic community and the effectiveness of its institutions; of American secular society and the political processes by which it functions. The charge is leveled against what both men apparently regard as an almost hopeless response, on the part of American Catholics especially, to the war in Vietnam and to the draft system.

The impact of this indictment tends to overshadow the contributions of the other fifteen authors whose articles make up the remainder of this volume. While it is unlikely that all of the contributors to the book are in complete and unanimous agreement with the outlook projected by Quigley and Zahn there is sufficient reason to accept the fact that most of these writers, along with a significant

number of Catholics and other Americans, are more or less in sympathy with at least certain of the implications of their indictment.

One editorial problem with the book is that in relationship to the title, the content is too diffuse. The range of topics extends well beyond Vietnam and includes an historical survey of moral and theological principles relating to war and peace in general, and articles on such issues as parish renewal, education, the draft, the peace movement and church reform. In effect, the book represents the views of a certain group of Catholics who are responding to the whole life style of the Church in America.

If I have any criticism of the articles in general, and apart from their editorial context, it is that they tend to be a bit shopworn. The contributors are for the most part prominent writers whose by-