

in the magazines

From *Religion in Communist Dominated Areas* (October), a note on revisionist history: "The Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia meeting on September 25-26, 1969, at Prague Castle purged itself and the government of all liberals beginning with Alexander Dubcek and rewrote the history of the August, 1968 fateful days. At that time, in 1968, the Soviet-led invasion in violation of the United Nations Charter and human rights was condemned in unequivocal terms not only by the free world and the whole nation of Czechoslovakia but also by the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia and a majority of Communist Parties. Now, a year later, the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia has declared at the point of Soviet guns, on September 26, 1969, that its statement of August 21, 1968 was 'non-class, non-Marxist, and fundamentally incorrect.'

"All churches of Czechoslovakia rallied during the invasion behind Alexander Dubcek in defense of Czechoslovak independence and sovereignty because he brought back to them their freedom and a promise to all believers to be treated as first-class citizens. The question is now whether the churches will be requested to annul their statements condemning the invasion and occupation and their loyalty to Dubcek's program 'to give a human face to Socialism.'

"The declaration of the presently Soviet-controlled Communist Party of Czechoslovakia under Gustav Husák that there was no invasion and aggression on August 21, 1968, the purge of Dubcek, Smrkovsky and other liberals, strict censorship, reinstatement of secret police, complete control of all news media by pro-Moscow elements and curtailment of free travel abroad sealed almost completely a new Iron Curtain around this country. . . .

"However, they still resist. The Soviets were not about to break the unity of believers and unbelievers, intelligentsia, farmers and youth; but the people of Czechoslovakia wonder whether the world, including the churches, has learned a lesson from their tragedy. Such are the reports which we receive from that country in agony."

The statement of August 22, 1968 and excerpts from the September '69 declaration are provided by the editors.

•

"... let us confront honestly the futility of middle-class liberal American and European attempts to 'work for peace.' If the world blew up tomorrow, how would our peace-making efforts appear to us in retrospect? The excitement of the jet flights to international conferences, the drama of the peace marches, the clicking of computers and typewriters, the grants and the councils and the committees and the sym-

posia, the draft world constitution by Professor X and the article by Senator Y and the solemn commencement address by Director Z? All this would suddenly, I suspect, leap into focus and be seen for what it is: a mass of busy-work without effect or world-historical vision; so harmless that national governments let most of it continue unmolested and even unnoticed."

Such is the contention of W. Warren Wagar writing in the August/September issue of *War/Peace Report*. In summary, he does "not believe that most of the private and governmental efforts to find peace since 1945 have been fruitful or deserve continued support. We must understand that peace can be nothing more than the by-product of a serious and totalizing struggle to create a new world civilization. The task of the immediate future is to give form and substance to a movement of ideas directed toward the supersession of the nation-state system and its various socio-cultural establishments by Cosmopolis. Such a movement, as it unfolds, will necessarily also assume a political dimension. The project of a world political party committed to the integration of mankind warrants careful thought. But we must bear in mind that any such party, like the larger movement from which it grows, will have the responsibility of organizing what can only be described as a revolution.

"Do men of peace have the courage and imagination to become revolutionists? Do we honestly suppose that the greatest society and polity ever conceived by the human mind — the Cosmopolis of both ancient and modern prophetic thought — will come into being without risk, sacrifice, or suffering? It is time to set aside the parlor games of conventional pacifism and put our shoulders to the wheel of world history."

•

A Judeo-Christian tradition? "Myth," says Arthur A. Cohen (*Commentary*, November). "Jews and Christians have conspired together to promote a tradition of common experience and common belief, whereas in fact they have joined together to reinforce themselves in the face of a common disaster. Inundated institutions have made common cause before a world that regards them as hopelessly irrelevant, and meaningless. The myth, then, is a projection of the will to endure of both Jews and Christians, an identification of common enemies, an abandonment of millennial antagonisms in the face of threats which do not discriminate between Judaism and Christianity; and these threats, the whole of the Triple Revolution — automation, the population explosion, nuclear warfare — these are the threats which evoke formation of the myth. . . ."

PAMPHILUS