

In the Magazines

WHATEVER BECAME OF . . . ? (LIBERATION MOVEMENTS DIV.). Well, the Tupamaros, for example? Presenting a rare article on the fate of just one of the groups whose activities filled the front pages of daily newspapers only a year or two back. This item is the doing of *The Christian Science Monitor's* correspondent James Nelson Goodsell, a reviewer for *Worldview* last month. It appeared in the issue of January 8:

"The tide appears to have turned for Latin America's urban guerrillas. All over the hemisphere, the guerrillas are on the run—at least for the moment. . . .

"New assessments of guerrilla activity indicate that while the guerrilla movements are not finished yet, they certainly pose much less of a threat to established governments than they did a couple of years ago. . . .

"Uruguay is the clearest case in point. The tightly knit and well-organized Tupamaro guerrillas, who attracted broad public support in the late 1960's, have suffered major and serious losses in recent months. As 1972 ended, they were also showing signs of an internal split.

"Moreover the Tupamaros no longer are displaying the organizational ability that was once a hallmark of their movement. This has been particularly noticeable since last August, when Tupamaro leader Raul Sendic was captured.

"Yet Mr. Sendic had been captured before and the Tupamaros went right on with their campaign of putting Uruguay's government off base.

"Just what has caused the recent reversal in Tupamaro fortunes is not fully clear. There are probably a combination of factors.

"For one thing, Uruguay's Army took over from the police in pursuing the Tupamaros following the government's declaration last April of 'a state of internal war' against the Tupamaros. The Army has proven a tougher outfit than the police ever were. Close to 200 Tupamaros have been killed in various encounters and more than 2,500 arrested. Moreover, the Army has located 70 or more hideouts, arsenals, and other Tupamaro sites. Finally, Army units have also come across numerous lists of the names, addresses, and types of contributions of Uruguayan supporters of the urban terrorists.

"Tied in with this last factor is a change in Uruguayan opinion with regard to the Tupamaros. There was a time when the Tupamaros won much public sympathy and support, but this has clearly lessened in the past year or so."

Why? Goodsell mentions only that "the hemi-

sphere's millions are clearly tired of the constant turmoil and uncertainties brought on by the guerrillas." But he adds a cautionary note: "There is considerable feeling that if the guerrilla movements are to be kept at bay in the months ahead, some substantial progress in solving the economic and social problems of Latin America is going to have to be recorded by the governments in power."

~ ~

. . . AND PAKISTAN, in the year since its splintering? According to Javed Jabbar in the *New Statesman* (January 12), "In Pakistan one has to learn to live with the headlines and survive in spite of them. For a whole year now the national destiny has wavered between the fine print of tucked-away items to the explicit banalities of the big banners. Since the disaster of December 1971 there has been a curious fretfulness in the air. One day there is the heartening news of Simla; the next day implementation is trapped in the semantics of border delineation. In the morning one awakes to the fact that this is the first truly democratic age in Pakistan's history; by sunset one is listening with cocked ear to the familiar, haunting sounds of authoritarianism that echo like a dirge through the 24 brief years of this unique country. One moment there is the secret throb of religious nationalism and one resorts to the final frontier of intellectual retreat—Islamic ideology—and the next, the entire arrangement by which this state clings to its existence becomes completely tenuous. . . .

"With ceaseless activism and inadequate planning, a whole series of reforms have been announced in the past 12 months, well-intentioned but ill-conceived. Taken singly they indicate expediency, inefficiency and a paucity of real planning. Taken together they constitute the largest reformist vision that has so far emerged in this country. . . .

"Mr. Bhutto and Pakistan are now perched on a long, thin rope stretched taut by geopolitical and historical factors. To handle the bureaucracy which has strangled many leaders and well-intentioned reforms he has taken a step which to every bureaucrat is sacrilegious. Three months ago he advertised in the press for direct recruitment from the public for appointments at all levels of the Foreign Office and of other ministries. . . .

"In the economic field he has balanced govern-

ment management of key industries and incentives to labour by recently authorising massive credit through financial institutions to private entrepreneurs. In foreign policy the man who made criticism of the US a major plank of his election campaign has now become a close ally of the Americans even while keeping his well-known emotional sympathy for China. Often he goes out of his way to show his cordiality towards the USSR whose leaders have rarely reciprocated his sentiments. And with India blowing hot and cold, he maintains a delicate equilibrium between suspicion and sincerity.

"This has been a year of soul-searching for an identity and a survival kit."

~ ~

Does money buy happiness? Yes. And data from "nineteen developed and less developed countries" are said to prove it. There's an "however," of course, but it's not large enough to give the breadwinner pause: "In all societies, more money for the individual typically means more individual happiness. However, raising the incomes of all does not increase the happiness of all. . . . Individuals assess their material well-being, not in terms of the absolute amount of goods they have, but relative to a social norm of what goods they ought to have. At any given time, those above the norm typically feel happier than those below."

Well, then, are we "trapped in a material rat-race"? "The argument," says author Richard Easterlin, "points to this uncomfortable conclusion." There's not much more to his article than that, but you can read it for yourself and check out the qualifier in the Winter, 1973, issue of *The Public Interest*. (The survey data, alas, are not included.)

~ ~

Peter Hebblethwaite, S.J., *America's* London corresponding editor, recently sought out the Conservative M.P. for Wolverhampton West to question him about some remarks he'd made on the subject of formal public papal utterances. It appears that the interviewee, one Enoch Powell, having abandoned "for the occasion his usual theme of immigration," had discussed the Pope's linkage of religious ethics and public policy. To Powell that was alarming. To Hebblethwaite, a matter for further inquiry.

Hebblethwaite tells us that Powell had spoken "as a Christian"—the occasion being a gathering of the British Catholic journalist's group—and as "an amateur exegete." The later interview revealed that Powell "holds the following views, strongly: Christianity is an individual relationship with God. It has no social consequences: its community aspect is confined to the internal life of the Church. There is no

bridge from the Gospel to politics. The Pope, in attempting to construct one, was not only attempting the impossible but also offering a stone instead of bread. Christianity is a private affair. Its relevance is to be irrelevant. It is an illusion to suppose that there can be any connection between human progress and the fulfillment of the Kingdom."

Father Hebblethwaite adds that "as it happens we have in Britain a Tory paradigm whom Mr. Powell resembles strangely. Lord Salisbury, the 19th-century Prime Minister, was another devout Christian who believed that it was dangerous to allow moral judgments drawn from the Gospels to color political life. It offended against the national interest. So Salisbury, like Mr. Powell, chose realism. But then, when a man announces that he is a realist, as Isaiah Berlin remarked, you may be quite sure that he is on the point of doing something rather shady."

~ ~

The sort of thing to send shudders through the Member for Wolverhampton West, and directly related to interpretations of "Jewish duty" discussed by Eugene Borowitz in this issue ("Covenant Theology"), is an assessment of the current position of the American Jewish community provided by Rabbis Irwin Blank and Robert J. Marx in the November, 1972, issue of *Background* (publication of the Institute for Jewish Policy Planning and Research of the Synagogue Council of America).

To these two men, "Jews stand between the wealthy and the poor, between the powerful and the disinherited." They call this role "interstitial," and "use the term to connote more than a scapegoat (in which role we often picture ourselves) or a marginal people (in which role our enemies often picture us)."

"As Jews," they write, "we feel uncomfortable about the position we occupy in American life. We feel that changes are taking place and that the jobs we hold, the housing we enjoy, the security we desire are all being threatened." But "in seeking solutions to these problems, we must avoid compounding them. Our problem is caused by the fact that as a result of an unconscionable war in Vietnam and a static economy, opportunities are becoming ever more limited. Our response as Jews ought not to be simply to protect what is ours. The point at which we can really deal with anti-Semitism is when we can help to expand opportunities and to reduce the polarization between the rich and poor, the powerful and the powerless. We feel that this is the strategy which history demonstrates is our best option. . . . [A]n understanding of how interstitiality works can lead us to demand that all groups share equally in the sacrifices that have to be made to cause such a reduction of tension. Lest we be accused of wishful thinking, let us point out that such education can and has been done, that the Jewish community can and

has formed alliances with groups of poor people, alliances which have simultaneously removed hostility from Jews and prevented the power structure from attempting to blame Jews for the disasters of the poor. . . .

"When the prophet Nathan stood before David, he marked the beginning of a long tradition which sought to identify Judaism and the God of Israel with those who had no advocate in the courts of the powerful. This tradition is desperately needed now at a time when the disparity between rich and poor is growing greater. It is needed not only because it is the best way to avoid the tragic entrapments of our past, but also because it is right."

~ ~

"Was the meeting between Pope Paul VI and Israeli Premier Golda Meir a diplomatic achievement or a disaster? That question has arisen in the minds of millions of people, who are naturally bewildered by the confused reports that have appeared in the mass media. . . ." The American Jewish Committee has sought to clarify the situation in a memorandum prepared to accompany the full text of the joint communiqué issued following the meeting of Pope and Premier.

What has confused the reports? What actually did transpire? According to the AJC memo, "prior to the papal audience, and while it was going on, several ambassadors from Arab governments who are accredited to the Holy See registered strong formal protests against the meeting. . . ."

"Literally before the audience had ended, Dr. Frederico Alessandrini, a press secretary in the Vatican Secretariat on Communications and an editor of *L'Osservatore Romano*, hastily called a press conference at which he made a fervent verbal declaration of 'Vatican policy.' His statements, which were an obvious response to demands by the Arab ambassadors that the Pope-Premier Meir meeting be completely discounted, fundamentally misrepresented and distorted everything that had taken place during the audience, both in spirit and in substance. . . ."

States the memo: "the meeting between the Pope

and the Israeli Premier was cordial, and characterized by mutual respect and reciprocal understanding. When Mrs. Meir and her party arrived at Vatican City, they were received with the same high order of protocol and diplomatic ceremony as was accorded to President Nixon on his last meeting with the Pope. When Mrs. Meir entered the Pope's library, the Pontiff greeted her by saying that he blessed her personally, and blessed the State of Israel. . . ."

"When they started the conversation, Pope Paul spoke feelingly about the history of the Jewish people, and particularly about their sufferings and persecutions. He deplored hatred and anti-Semitism, reaffirming the Church's views as expressed in the Vatican Council Declaration on Non-Christian Religions.

"The Pope then presented the humanitarian concerns of the Holy See regarding the refugee problems affecting all peoples in the Middle East, but with specific emphasis on the need for ending the plight of the Palestinian refugees. He also indicated interest in the welfare of Christian and Muslim communities in the Holy Land. In his discussion of the importance of the holy places to Christianity, Islam, and Judaism, he expressed strong appreciation of the constructive way in which Israeli authorities have cared for the sacred sites and their assurance of free access for all visitors and pilgrims.

"The Pope then discussed the 'sacred and universal character' of the City of Jerusalem, and its religious importance to the monotheistic faiths. *But contrary to press reports, he did not mention in any way the political proposal for the internationalization of the city of Jerusalem [italics the memo writer's].*"

As the full text of the communiqué reveals, "Prime Minister Meir presented the views of the State of Israel on a variety of issues: the importance of direct negotiations between Israel and the Arab states to the achievement of lasting peace; the international problem of terrorism (which the Pope had condemned in a Sunday homily the week before); and the human rights issues raised by the situation of Jews in the Soviet Union and the Arab countries. The Pope's response on each of these questions was sympathetic. . . ."

PAMPHILUS

Correspondence

[from p. 2]

their beliefs because conservative evangelicals feel they are less than "saved" for "denying Christ." Secondly, this writer has met many a person who is not a churchgoer and finds them to be more "Christian" in their charity and their belief in

human liberation than most people who go to church regularly. Ergo, churchgoing is not *the* criterion for humanity.

As far as I am concerned, we need fewer evangelists and more prophets; for our society will always

have room for the platitudes of evangelists yet will always ignore the truths of its prophets, as it did in the days of the biblical prophets and in Jesus' own time.

Elizabeth Miller

Brooklyn, N.Y.