An impressive array of articles dealing with the Chinese ethos, developments since the 1948 revolution, and the People's Republic's relations with the international community have been gathered for the October issue of World Outlook (monthly publication of the Methodist Board of Missions). Charles C. West, for instance, a former China missionary who is now professor of Christian Ethics at Princeton, looks at the role of Christianity in China and draws lessons for the churches from that example. An Australian who visited China recently takes a look at Maoism and Mao ("God of China?"). Two authors of Chinese background examine the first twenty years of the People's Republic and the Communists' attempt to build a new culture. Chinese-American and Sino-Soviet relations, and the future of Formosa are the subjects of still other articles; and a Filipino, an Indian and an Indonesian offer differing views of how China looks to Asians. As a final offering, "The Snow," a poem written by Mao Tse-tung in 1945.

Win ("Peace and Freedom Through Non-Violent Action") quotes in its October 1 issue from the "official obituary" of New York's Peace and Freedom Party: "On August 13, 1969 the Peace and Freedom Party passed a resolution disbanding the Party in New York City, ending its twenty-month existence. The Party was founded in January, 1968 as an umbrella group seeking to unite radicals and left liberals around common causes and hopefully in the process, radicalize its liberal element. Peace and Freedom also sought to use the electoral arena as a means of organizing and base building.

"The Party's fundamental flaw, and eventual demise, was the failure to realize the depth and fundamental difference between radical and liberal. No matter how far left the liberal or how drastic the reordering of priorities sought, the liberal commitment is still to the existent capitalist system. The radical commitment on the other hand is to a total replacement of that capitalist system. One organization cannot expose two diametrically opposed points of view and achieve any long-term success."

"The Party also discovered that the electoral arena was not the vehicle it had hoped. A mass base could not be built simply through an electoral campaign. Those committed to the electoral process will vote for candidates with a chance of winning (i.e., the left segment of the Democratic Party). The more radical party organizers will be concerned with developing a base for the Party rather than focusing on the election."

"The truly positive aspect of Peace and Freedom Party's existence was the development of the P.F.P.-Panther alliance. The alliance was a beginning in demonstrating the necessity for radicals, black and white, to organize their own communities, while at the same time, supporting each other."

"During the twenty months of its existence, P.F.P. faced two membership depletions, resulting from the McCarthy and the Mailer-Breslin campaigns. These were augmented by a more or less constant draining away of members from March, 1969 onwards. By summer, 1969 Party membership was down to no more than fifty people in the entire city, finances were depleted, and the Party lacked credibility within the radical movement. Considering these factors, the decision was made, consciously and deliberately, to disband the organization."

In the first article of The American Scholar's issue dedicated to "Revolution on the Campus" (Autumn), scientist J. Bronowski offers this "sobering lesson" in history: "that millions of people who dislike the contemporary forms of protest still call themselves Protestants." No matter the religious background, however, what is absent from the confrontation between generations today, he says, is respect for the sincerity of the other: "...the sons no longer believe that the standards by which their elders judge them are genuine; on the contrary, they strike them for the most part as bald hypocrisy." And "I need not trouble to spell out for you what the fathers think — and worse still, the grandfathers: they are the ones who write to the papers with such venom every day... the correspondence columns are filled with such hatred against the young, such hysterical fear of change, that one cannot imagine how the writers pictured a university. Do they expect education to run backward? Do they think that there can be progress without originality, and originality without dissent? Or would they really like to burn heretics?..."

"If those whom the young stigmatize were all reactionaries and anti-intellectuals, it would be easy to concur [with their judgment]. Unfortunately, things are not so simple. A whole generation of liberals and humanists, to which I belong, is bewildered at the discovery that the young include us in their charge of hypocrisy. We made liberalism respectable by our labors, and turned it into an intellectual faith; and now we are distressed to find that our heroic memories of the hungry thirties and the Spanish Civil War are dismissed as an out-of-date mythology."

"The fact is that we, the generation of intellectuals, have been a success, and our liberal and even radical ideas have not stood in our way on the road to affluence. And the young are suspicious of affluence: they..."
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do not believe that success comes so cheap to those who hold their principles dear. Success is a commodity sold on television in shatterproof bottles at bargain prices, and the children are no longer impressed by those trappings of authenticity. They know in their hearts that the successful man is a prisoner of the status quo, whatever high principles he may avow in the family circle or on the rostrum. . . .

“So it is not to be wondered that the young are restive when they hear us pay lip-service to intellectual truth. For in the thirty years in which we have preached that, the world has changed, and we have somehow forgotten to find new foundations for the old truths. . . . As intellectuals, we have done little to formulate afresh an ethic of liberalism on foundations that are modern and valid now. In my view, this is the central criticism that can be directed against intellectuals today, in and out of the universities. . . .”

“...The contemporary challenge to authority in the Catholic Church has received so much attention from the press that little space has been given to the reaction of authority to the challenge.” John H. Knox asserts (“The Pope as Hamlet,” National Review, October 21). “What we are witnessing in the Church today is the disintegration of the central administrative authority — and this not because of the strength of the attack but because of the weakness of the defense. Hitler’s comment on the Czech border defenses — that the strength of the concrete mattered little when the will to resist was so weak — comes to mind. We all know that though the constitutional and legal powers of the American president remain substantially the same, each presidency differs markedly from the others. This is so not only because no two presidents meet exactly the same problems but because each has his own style, personality, temperament, character, etc. The same is true of pontificates and popes.

...What distinguishes Paul VI from all his predecessors is his refusal to act against any individual, no matter how grave the provocation. He contents himself with deploring the error or misconduct, sometimes tearfully, and is always careful to attribute only high motives to all the erring, whom he never identifies. He seems to feel he has discharged his obligation to defend the truth and his own position when he has done that much. When he praises the motives of high-ranking prelates who openly attack his authority he resembles President Perkins of Cornell smiling gamely through a confrontation with S.D.S. and the black militants. . . .

And further: “There is a striking parallel between the attitude of the liberals in the American universi-

ties and the present situation in the Church. All the blame is assumed by the institution. All guilt and blame are removed from the dissidents and wreckers, there is a wallowing in self-reproach and in protestations of moral inferiority to those who reject or wish to change or wreck the status quo, and there is a general attitude of universal, indiscriminate, spineless — and often mindless — benevolence. There is above all a failure to stress and act upon the basic principles that mature human beings are accountable for their conduct and that their freedom to act or not to act brings no immunity from the consequences of their free choice. In the academic world as in the Church, weakness masquerades as compassion. Unfortunately, in the administrative order weakness often does more harm than vice does.

“In these circumstances the liberal attacks on Paul VI are ungenerous and unjust. There never was and probably never will be a pope who has tried so hard to please them and who so sincerely shares so many of their beliefs. Like so many of them he believes in law without sanctions, a policy most Catholics reserve for the Church Triumphant and the Millenarians for the reign of the saints. It is strange how few, who criticize Pius XI and Pius XII for not stopping Hitler, ask what Paul VI would have done. Fortunately we will never know. The thirtieth anniversary of Pius XI’s denunciation of Hitler, in the composition of which Pius XII played an active role, passed unnoticed by the Catholic press. No one could imagine such a document being issued now.”

In other periodicals:

“Mahatma Gandhi and the Jewish Ethos” (editorial), Reconstructionist, October 31, 1969.


“Aggression and Evil: Meditation on the Biology of the Fall of Man,” by Joachim Illies, Concurrence, Fall, 1969.
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