

## in the magazines

An historical appraisal of China, the Soviet Union, and their communisms ("Sino-Soviet Tensions and American Foreign Policy," *The Catholic World*, July) leads Daniel F. Halloran to conclude that "our distorted view of current Sino-Soviet tensions is simply another example of the tunnel vision with which we now see the world." The United States, he says, has "fallen into the trap of accepting the Russian claim to a disavowal of its imperialistic history because it fits in with our own narrow world outlook. We want to interpret all events in terms of the Communist-'free world' dichotomy, and, when events don't quite fit this pattern, we distort them until they do. And yet, Communistic internationalism to the contrary notwithstanding, the plain fact is that nationalism, with its emphasis on the maintenance of national borders, is still the predominant moving force in the world today. This fact applies no less within the Communist camp than it does either outside it or in relations between Communist and non-Communist nations. The sooner the makers of our foreign policy recognize this fact and incorporate it into their thinking, the sooner they will achieve a more realistic understanding of world society upon which to base a workable foreign policy."

What not to do after the sun has set (courtesy *The Manchester Guardian Weekly*, August 28): "The imperial afterglow has already lasted too long in British foreign policy. Nostalgia is no basis for a country's diplomacy even if it is rationalized by a few economic simplifications. So Sir Alec Douglas-Home's pamphlet, 'Britain's place in the world,' published this week, strikes a depressingly out-of-touch note. The possibility that it could be the skeleton on which this country's foreign policy is based in the early 1970's is disheartening. Admittedly the pamphlet is short, but it purports to be comprehensive. Yet here there is no discussion at all of the nationalist revolution in the third world. The only mention of Africa is a plea for retaining the Simonstown Agreement with South Africa. China's existence is barely hinted at; Japan's not disclosed at all. A simple assertion is made that if Britain withdraws as planned from East of Suez by 1971, British profits would diminish.

"Even if one accepts for a moment the assumption that economic benefit is the purpose of foreign policy, the argument is less than adequate. Where British profits come from business based abroad, the possibility of nationalization is bound to increase in the future.

"British troops neither can nor would be a defense against it. The presence of foreign troops on a country's soil is more likely to encourage legitimate na-

tional feeling rather than depress it. And even in cases of nationalization, a country should think twice before mortgaging its long-term interests to the demands of expropriated business.

"Where, on the other hand, British profits come simply from trade, the struggle in the next few years in Asia, Africa, and elsewhere is likely to be a tough battle against Japanese, West German, American and other competitors. Already the long British link with Nigeria, India, or Argentina, to name but three countries, has not helped British salesmen resist the rivalry of other Western businessmen. There is no reason why the pattern in South East Asia should be any different. Indeed, if Britain has a weak economy at home it is partly because of excessive military spending abroad. She will be in a stronger position to compete overseas when this burden is lifted. Tory policy is shortsighted. Britain lost her monopoly of power abroad even before the Empire died. Sir Alec is trying to prolong the life of a corpse."

"Is it technological society, scientific civilization that calls forth this [student] revolt?" asks Raymond Aron, one contributor to the *Political Science Quarterly's* special issue on the subject of rebellion in the universities (June).

"I would be inclined to correct the wording of this question," he says, "or at least complete it to read technological society at a moment when a new generation is living in quest of its mission and of a great cause, and when secularization is gradually overtaking all institutions, including some whose centuries-old vocation seemed to protect them, the churches, particularly the Catholic Church. Today, in the aftermath of Vatican II, a number of Catholics are talking as if their fidelity did not require belief in the supernatural. Some, like the students, are investing in the revolution and in violence a faith which has become, so to speak, unemployed. The authority of bishops or of the Pope, of the hierarchy in possession of dogmatic truth, is no longer safe from criticism and even rejection. Men of the church share the fate of scholars in the university. Are scientists alone able to escape this interrogation?"

"I said at the beginning of this paper that I was simply going to raise questions, to which I would give only partial and hesitant answers. The students, a majority of them coming from the literary disciplines or the social sciences, are playing the major role in a revolt which extends beyond the university to attack the institutions of scientific society: rational organization and the obsessional concern with output, production, wealth, and consumption. Nostalgia for a

(Continued on page 13)

you that the outflow of whites to the suburbs has in the past year and for the first time almost been equalled by the outflow of blacks. Residential integration is still essentially a fleeting transitional phase as city neighborhoods move from white to black occupancy. Then you receive a letter describing a conference where leaders of twelve integrated neighborhoods across the country, serving nearly half a million people, established National Neighbors, a clearing house for integrated communities. You go to the graduation ceremonies of the local Junior High School. The integrated glee club (not as many whites as before, but still some) sings, "We Shall Overcome." It sounds as if they mean it. It is premature to write off these experiments. They are tokens of a better future; they must be kept alive.

Attitudes on both sides of the color line remain more malleable than perhaps we realize. You come across a C.B.S. public opinion poll from 1968 which found 49 per cent of its Negro respondents willing to give active support to the successor of Martin Luther King, as opposed to 1 per cent to Ron Karenga, 2 per cent to Rap Brown and 4 per cent to Stokely Carmichael. Mohammed Ali tells a television interviewer: "For black people to start shooting in their fight against American society would be as silly as for you to get up and start hitting me."

Bradley loses in Los Angeles. That is bad. But 47 per cent of the population votes for a black candidate in a city where only 18 per cent of the community is Negro. That is good. In fact it is almost unprecedented. And in the *New Yorker* you read Charles Evers' speech after being elected mayor of Fayette, Mississippi. He says simply: "All of us have won a victory in Mississippi. All the poor blacks, and all the concerned, scared whites. I'm not going to belittle the whites, because they need help, just as we need help."

So the returns are not all in, not yet. This much at least can be said. We are talking about our problems. Before returning home, I had heard there was in this country a perilous communications gap. But never before have I been exposed to such a flood-tide of communications as have swept over me since our return. It is true that much of what is said is not being heard. The decibel level is too high, or the message too strident, or we are simply not turned on. But talking we are. With extraordinary frankness. I read that Deputy Attorney General Kleindienst has even urged police to invite militants to lecture at police academies! No society exposes itself to analysis, criticism and debate with the abandon practiced here. That is why we cannot yet take seriously the glib comparison between modern America and ancient Rome by those who talk of a "decline and fall" syndrome.

---

### *in the magazines . . .*

(Continued from p. 2)

bygone culture, they are reviving old utopias, but they act according to methods incompatible with democratic rules, methods which stir sad memories in men of my generation. Must we tolerate these methods because these young people are disturbing calm certainty and intellectual complacency, because in spite of everything they are expressing not only the dissatisfactions of spoiled children but a hope for spiritual liberation beyond submission to the necessities of science as applied to production?

"Here, in a single question, is the problem that concerns me, the problem which the events raise for us all: Can a revolt of the violent in the name of a libertarian ideal in a liberal society, open the way to the future? Can it help to humanize the authoritarian organizations of a liberal society? Or will it lead, directly or indirectly, either of itself or by the reaction it will bring about, to a repetition of the tragedies of yesterday, even before they have ceased to haunt our minds? Those who want to go beyond liberalism always run the risk of returning to a previous stage.

"Men born at the beginning of the century have learned the lesson by bitter experience; will they succeed in transmitting it to a generation which is in

danger of repeating history because they do not know it?"

•  
•  
• Of special note: The May/June issue of *Intercom* (published now by the Center for War/Peace Studies, 218 East 18 Street, N.Y.C.) contains a listing of voluntary organizations active in the field of international affairs. Price of the single issue \$1.50.

•  
• From "Imperialism, Economic Development and the Christian Mission," by Alan R. Booth, Secretary of the Commission of the Churches on International Affairs of the W.C.C. (*The Ecumenical Review*, July):

"What we have to live with is, in some degree the incredible success of European ideas, and the general rejection of the European person. He is seen as a suffocating threat to selfhood elsewhere in the world, while his ideas offer an incomparable tool for the discovery of the selfsame selfhood. From the point of view of the Christian mission our job is to determine which of the European ideas is directly or even remotely connected with the gospel, and which masquerades falsely in Christian dress." — PAMPHILUS