

must be amusing." Hearty good chumminess. Or La Mazière recalling his commanding officer: "We were in the process of becoming model Waffen SS, while he, on his side, was learning something from us." Wonderful! the free exchange of ideas between Prof and Sigma Chi. Such a poverty of those human relationships that run deep, justly inspire exaggeration, and that are akin to something else of which there is no suggestion in *The Captive Dreamer*.

Yeats looks about him in reverie (but not in literal wealth): "Beloved books that famous hands have bound./Old marble heads, old pictures everywhere;/Great rooms where traveled men and children found/Content or joy." And Reck in melancholy: "I look at the things I have brought together here, and cherish, the library...the drawings, and it seems to me often now that these things have a

strangeness about them, and I want to cry." I'm not talking about classy elegance, art as property, possession; but of culture as a way of perceiving, personal relationships profound as art, and art as natural to one as friendship. Friends and things composing a rich space, not an emptiness, in which one defines oneself; oneself in turn partial fabric of the space in which another defines himself. Personal relationships and art-and-thought in a unity of perception that *is* the possession of culture.

I do not wish to idealize. Yeats was impossible often enough. Reck is often hard to stomach. And one somehow rather likes La Mazière, the nihilistic boy scout. One wonders why, given his story. Perhaps it's because of the familiarity. Culture, as I've characterized it, was not his possession. He was so normal; the man who moves among us.

merely the rhetoric of extremists, yet this is far too simplistic. Whether the goal is a permanent settlement or a first step toward Israel's destruction is still not clear.

Hassan and Elon cover a wide variety of subjects: the history of Israel-Palestinian and Israel-Arab relations, Nasser's and Sadat's policies, Zionism's history and philosophy, their own personal experiences, and the preconditions for Middle East peace. Most of their conclusions are standard Israeli "dove" arguments. What is intriguing is the new dimension, the relatively objective picture, produced by counterposing their two points of view.

History lies heavy on both sides. The "disastrous impact upon the Arabs of their cultural and political decline in the past two or three centuries" is matched by the "traumatic impact of the Nazi Holocaust" on the Jews. The motivating force for both sides has not been arrogance, power lust, or fanaticism, but fear—the Arab fear of again being subjected to outside forces (seeing Israel as Britain or France) and Israel's fear of a new Holocaust (seeing the Arabs as Nazi Germany or Czarist Russia). Lack of contact between the Arab world and Israel has exacerbated tension and misunderstanding. "There have been people before that fought protracted wars," states Elon, "but at least they spoke to each other....We live in total ignorance of each other. We are trapped in clichés and stereotypes."

Discussing the recent past, they talk of the tragic effects of the 1967 war on both sides, the missed opportunities for peace in the following six years (although there is disagreement over where the fault lies), the opening of possibilities for peace after the 1973 war, and the desire for peace on both sides. A compromise settlement would involve, for the Arab states and PLO, recognition of Israel, establishment of demilitarized zones in border areas, and an end to anti-Israel propaganda and boycotts; for Israel, return of the occupied territories, with minor border modifications, and recognition of a West Bank-Gaza Palestinian state. The principle, says Elon, is that "When two rights clash over possession of the

## Between Enemies by Amos Elon and Sana Hassan

(Random House; 151 pp.; \$5.95)

### Barry Rubin

This little book is a political event: an open and honest discussion between an Israeli writer and an Egyptian scholar on the Arab-Israeli conflict. *Between Enemies* is the transcript of these talks, and its value is enhanced by the fact that it is not a debate in which speakers try to score points, but a true dialogue, carried out with sensitivity and a willingness to admit errors. Its constructive tone is rare, not only in Middle East politics, but in any international dispute today.

Israelis usually have been willing to criticize Israel's governments and policies and to try to understand the Arab point of view. Arabs—for reasons of culture, philosophy, and internal politics—almost never find anything their side did wrong or Israel did right. Hassan is the first Arab intellectual to have the courage to criticize Arab policies toward Israel publicly,

and she might represent the beginning of an agonizing Arab reappraisal of their premises in the quarter-century conflict.

On the other hand, it would be wrong to exaggerate Hassan's importance. While Elon echoes the positions of a very important, if minority, segment of Israeli public opinion, Hassan represents only herself. Today Arab states and Palestinian leaders have been advancing two different programs. To the outside world they express a desire only for return of the territories occupied by Israel in 1967 and for establishment of a Palestinian state in part of that land. To their own people, however, they still call for Israel's destruction. While many in Israel listen only to the "hawkish" line, many in the West hear only the "dovish" one. Hassan often writes off mainstream "hawkish" statements as

same piece of real estate, the only just and practicable solution in the long run is to partition that piece of real estate between them."

Hassan brings out the objective forces moving the Arab world toward a settlement. Arabs are discovering the impossibility of destroying Israel and the high price of the conflict. As Egypt's leading playwright, Tewfik al Hakim, puts it, "if this money had been spent on our villages," each would have enough "to build it anew, to raise its standards of living to that of a European village. But our peasants have remained with their ignorance, disease, and their poverty. All these millions, which were the product of Egyptian labor, have gone down the drain." An independent Palestinian state would "take the wind out of the extremists' sails," allow the resettlement of refugees, and provide for PLO

*de jure* recognition of Israel in the peace agreement.

The question is, Who makes the first move? Elon says: "The burden of territorial compromise lies with us. But the burden of proof that you intend to live in peace with us is on you." Hassan responds: "You cannot hang on to the territories and wait until the Arabs are ready to hand over peace in exchange, as though peace were a finished product. Peace is a process...." Kissinger shuttle diplomacy—"a little bit of territory for a little bit of peace"—is a necessary beginning, but the central deadlock must eventually be broken.

One danger is the gap between political realities understood by some Arab leaders—and this applies to Israel to a lesser extent—and the myths they continue to feed to their people. Hassan explains that "because Egypt is not a

free society, only the very top leaders know that they were in a pinch in the '73 war, and because of that they have no appetite for a renewal of the conflict. The public, on the other hand, really believes that we *won* that war, and sometimes even screams for a renewal of warfare." This opens the door to demagogues and extremists.

*Between Enemies* is sometimes excessively self-conscious and engages in a too utopian image of the future of a peaceful Middle East. This is, to some extent, understandable and provides a striking contrast to the current state of affairs. But one cannot help feel that the conflict has been plagued by too many grandiose visions already. What is now needed is a hard, realistic approach. *Between Enemies* usually reflects such an approach: In fact, it is one of the most realistic volumes to date on the Arab-Israeli conflict and is valuable for those deeply interested in the subject as well as for those trying to understand the struggle by reading a single work.

"The Appeal for Theological Affirmation . . . is one of the most interesting, remarkable and historically significant religious statements since the effulgence of popular theology that accompanied the crest of Vatican II."

—Commonweal

"Christian history is replete with bone-rattling documents of theological protests that capsuled the pressing issue of the day: Martin Luther's 95 Theses, which sparked the Reformation, Pope Pius IX's 19th century Syllabus of Errors, and the German Confessing Christian's Barmen Declaration Against Nazism. The technique has fallen into disuse, but it was dusted off by a group of 18 Christian thinkers of nine denominations . . . [who] joined in a dramatic warning that American theology has strayed dangerously far afield."

—Time

"The Hartford Appeal is a welcome and necessary word of judgment. . . . The 13 'pervasive themes' which it singles out and exposes as inconsistent with the Christian gospel are readily recognizable at many points within the Church today."

—United Methodist Reporter

## NOW AVAILABLE IN PAMPHLET FORM!

For individuals, churches, schools, study groups

### THE WORLDVIEW SYMPOSIUM ON THE HARTFORD APPEAL

The text of the Appeal, with the following responses by: Gregory Baum, John C. Bennett, Gabriel Moran, Harvey Cox, John C. Cobb, Wolthart Pannenberg, Robert Jewett, David Tracy, Peter Berger, Richard J. Mouw, George Forell, George Lillard, Richard John Neuhaus.

To: WORLDVIEW, 170 E. 64 St., New York, N.Y. 10021

Please send me \_\_\_\_\_ copies the THE WORLDVIEW SYMPOSIUM ON THE HARTFORD APPEAL @ \_\_\_\_\_

My check in the amount of \$ \_\_\_\_\_ enclosed.

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

City \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_ Zip \_\_\_\_\_

## CONTRIBUTORS

PAUL SEABURY is Professor of Political Science at the University of California, Berkeley.

SAMUEL HUX teaches English at York University (CUNY). He has been a contributor to *Commentary* and the *New Republic* and a frequent contributor to *Change*.

BARRY RUBIN is a freelance journalist with a strong interest in the Middle East.

## Briefly Noted

### Religion and Political Society by Jürgen Moltmann et al. (Harper & Row; 208 pp.; \$3.95)

In "The Cross and Civil Religion" Moltmann ties into the theme of his most recent book, *The Crucified God*, and posits it against a rather uncritical reading of Robert Bellah's 1967 description of civil religion. The result is less than satisfying. More Marxist-oriented "liberation theologians" criticize Moltmann's failure to endorse a truly "partisan church," and their criticism would seem to have some merit in that his presuppositions appear to lead to the "liberationist" position he finally rejects. Of greater value is Herbert Richardson's "What Makes a Society Political?" in which he criticizes both liberalism (notably American) and Marxism for replacing politics with bureaucratic management. A similar point is made in Willi Oelmüller's more difficult essay on "critical rationality" (Karl Popper), "critical theory" (Habermas et al.), and systems analysis (Noam Chomsky et al.). Some kind of major reappropriation of religious traditions is required, writes Oelmüller, if practical philosophy is to be saved. In "Prophetic Authority" Johann Baptist Metz offers a useful antidote to prevailing moods of anti-institutionalism, and in "America as God's Kingdom" Darrol Bryant assails sundry millennialisms. Altogether a useful contribution to understanding the relation between religion, politics, and historical change.

### The Church in Today's Catacombs edited by Sergiu Grossu (Arlington House; 225 pp.; \$8.95)

There is today a growing readiness among liberals in the American religious community to be more candid about the religious persecution experi-

enced by millions under the Russian and other empires. This was evident, for example, in the widespread challenges to the delegation of Russian churchmen visiting the U.S. in the winter of 1975. The discussion of the dilemmas of the World Council of Churches and other bodies in maintaining moral integrity while at the same time continuing to include Soviet representatives is now becoming more frequent. All this is no doubt related to a certain disenchantment with U.S.-USSR détente, as was manifested in the broad support for the "Jackson amendment" in 1974. *The Church in Today's Catacombs* therefore appears at the right moment. A few years ago it might have found readers only among avowed right-wingers, but one hopes that today there is a wider audience for this important material. For the most part it is a collection of appeals, poems, and personal testimonies from Christians behind the "iron and bamboo curtains." They are, of course, of mixed quality, but at their best they are compelling and must assert a strong claim on the American religious conscience. At a time when it is popular to espouse a stronger "global consciousness," these documents stand as a warning against being ideologically selective in choosing "the victims of oppression" with whom we will "identify," as it is said.

### Poverty in American Democracy: A Study of Social Power by Frederick J. Perella (The United States Catholic Conference; 173 pp.; n.p.)

Much that is right and much that is wrong about the churches' engagement in social change is evidenced in this slim volume of bicentennial challenge to American Catholics. The concern for the truly poor, the moral outrage at our twisted national priorities, the confidence that change is possible—these themes are forcefully, if not imaginatively, asserted, and they cannot be asserted too often. The appeal is hand-

icapped, however, by its not very oblique assault upon private property, its preoccupation with "redistribution" of wealth, and its emphasis upon communal values at the expense of personal liberty. We expect the run-of-the-pew Roman Catholic will dismiss it as another leftist tract issued by priests who would do better to stick to the proper business of religion. The more sophisticated will recognize it as a highly selective reading of American society, past and present, and of church pronouncements on social justice. The sad consequence is that it will probably do very little to mobilize American Catholicism for building a better society, either in 1976 or any time soon.

### Search for the Beloved Community by Kenneth L. Smith and Ira G. Zepp (Judson Press; 160 pp.; \$6.95)

The influence of Gandhi is frequently emphasized by those who write about the thought of Martin Luther King, Jr. After King's death a number of studies appeared, arguing his later dependence upon Marxist thought. Secularists have a hard time coming to terms with what were undoubtedly the primary and always dominant Christian influences on King's thinking. While not neglecting Gandhi, Marx, and others, Smith and Zepp focus on Walter Rauschenbusch, evangelical liberalism, and Reinhold Niebuhr. Smith taught King at Crozer Theological Seminary, and the authors also make good use of their conversations with King's teachers and friends at Boston University, where he did his doctoral work, and in subsequent years. The book is a careful treatment of an important topic. One hopes it will not be ignored by those who write about King in the future. His persistent religious references were not added in deference to religious audiences, as some writers suggest. They reflect rather the emphatically theological rationale by which he understood himself, the world, and the nature of social change.

## The Political Criminal: The Problem of Morality and Crime by Stephen Schafer

(Free Press; 179 pp.; \$7.50)

A splendid little book better described by its subtitle than by its title. The author ranges widely over the centuries and over the current scene and is clearly influenced by his Eastern European experience of the tyrannical definitions of "political crime." He contends strongly for the unity of morality and crime, the pluralism of moralities, and the need to resist the trivialization of moral protest by contemporary sociology and psychology. Schafer's appreciation of the social importance of the "convictional" political criminal leads him to a vigorous critique of "pseudoconvictional" criminals who bring moral challenge to prevailing social mores into disrepute. Especially helpful is his critique of the idea that the difference between the "powerful" and the "powerless" should be the primary criterion in distinguishing types of political crime.

## Before the Fall by William Safire

(Doubleday; 705 pp.; \$12.50)

Anyone trying to get in a good word for Richard Nixon these days must take pains, to say the least, to convince others of his own credibility. Because Safire succeeds in doing so, he has written what is undoubtedly one of the most honest books by an insider on the American Presidency in recent decades. Although Safire and Leonard Garment functioned as sort of the house liberals in a decidedly illiberal White House staff, Safire's own ideology is here very muted. One wishes he had developed his critique of Patrick Buchanan's argument that Nixon's more applauded actions (such as the Family Assistance Program) were purchased at the price of "buying into the liberal agenda." But the book is nonetheless informative and highly readable. Safire is straightforward about Nixon's obsessive hatred of the

press and his almost poignant desire to emulate Theodore Roosevelt, Wilson, and JFK. It is to Safire's credit that he helps us understand how these yearnings seemed less ludicrous at the time than they do through the dark glass of Watergate.

## Prisoners of War by A.J. Barker

(Universe; 249 pp.; \$8.95)

Focusing on the wars of this century, including the U.S. war in Indochina, the British author comes to rather gloomy conclusions. Although some fine language has been put on the paper of international agreements, he believes the evidence shows an increase in barbarity, although in some cases very sophisticated barbarity, in the treatment of prisoners of war. In some areas, such as the discussion of religion and the role of patriotism, Barker's judgments seem superficial, yet the book is of value in bringing together such a wide diversity of firsthand testimony. Barker probably cannot be blamed for coming up with no bright proposals to ameliorate the plight of prisoners in wars of the future. The book is both discouraging and important.

## Democracy and Poetry by Robert Penn Warren

(Harvard; 102 pp.; \$5.95)

A moving and, although the author might not like the word, inspiring testament to the self that is the creation served and voiced by art. This self, says Warren, is now imperiled, and thus democracy is imperiled, by a loss of community that makes possible the individual's action "deserving of praise or blame."

## Conversations With Kennedy by Benjamin C. Bradlee

(Norton; 244 pp.; \$7.95)

It is not surprising that the more devout followers of the Kennedy cult have not welcomed this informal memoir of

# This year ignorance could kill you.

Ignorance about colon or rectum cancer. Because there's an exam called a procto which can detect these cancers early, while they're most curable. If you're over 40, make sure your doctor gives you a procto as part of your health checkup.

↓

**AMERICAN CANCER SOCIETY**  
THIS SPACE CONTRIBUTED BY THE PUBLISHER

informal moments with JFK. Even those opposed to the cult, however, will be moved to speculate about Bradlee's intent. Bradlee, then Washington chief for *Newsweek*, and his wife Tony were for several years the Kennedys' "best friends" (Jackie). Bradlee professes great admiration for the man, but what comes across is a JFK who was vain, sometimes vindictive, boyishly intrigued by the fact and trappings of power, and marvelously flexible about the ethics of exercising the same. He was, it would appear, not too far from the superficial and spoiled son of old Joe Kennedy that many of his critics claimed he was. On the one hand, it should be kept in mind that Bradlee's JFK is remembered in these pages from atypical moments when he was indulging himself away from the office, so to speak. If that is forgotten, the reader would have the impression from this book that Kennedy did very little work at all. On the other hand, it is precisely

in such relaxed and self-indulgent moments that one looks for signs of the more reflective and introspective person. If he did not think deep thoughts aloud with Bradlee, one wonders with whom he did his more serious reflection. By all accounts it was not with the "Irish Mafia," which was the other main leisure-time circle. Surely he could not have done all his more serious ruminating in the company of Arthur Schlesinger. One is compelled to suspect that Kennedy was not a very serious man, at least not in the sense of being inclined to, or capable of, critical analysis on the nature and uses of power. Perhaps that is just as well, but it will come as a disappointment to many. Bradlee's book has about it the feel of honesty. The price of writing such a book is to be accused of aiding the enemies of one's friends. The satisfaction is that history may catch more fully the falling star that was the moment and is the memory of Camelot.

## CHANGING YOUR ADDRESS?

Please notify the  
*Worldview*  
subscription department  
six weeks in advance  
of your move to  
insure uninterrupted  
delivery of the journal.

## Correspondence

[from p. 2]

totally omitted from any similar policy statement.

V. Trade preferences for the poorest countries.

Although I acknowledge the need for a general program for trade preferences for the poorer countries, I find it difficult to resolve such a gesture toward a military dictatorship such as Bolivia. The favorable trade status would just increase the gap between the rich and poor of that country, not lighten the poor's burden any....

If one were to lower trade barriers, the commodity imported to the U.S. would be competing with the domestic union-made articles. As a result, as happened with the importation of Japanese steel, big labor as well as big business lobby Congress for protective tariffs. Thus, the original intent is self-defeating....

VIII. Efforts to deal with the population growth rate.

The development of family planning for the Third World must precede health programs aimed at reducing infant mortality and increasing life expectancy. Populations must be reduced to manageable levels to insure a better world for the children just being born into it. Efforts should be directed toward supplementing children's lives and not wasted on those generations who are set in their ways and are soon to depart from existence altogether. All assistance to deal with the growth rate demands a reduction in population. Perhaps the cheapest way is already at their doorsteps: warfare.

Moralists may cry out, "You are advocating murder!" Yes, I am. But I ask those moralists who would let children and pregnant mothers die of starvation if they are not murdering millions. We cannot help the fact that people are born, but we can help the condition of the world that they are born into. A fighting chance is better—and more Christian—than none whatsoever....

Trey Foerster

*Graduate Student, Department  
of Theology  
Marquette University  
Milwaukee, Wis.*

Arthur Simon Responds:

As I read Mr. Foerster's long letter, the image of a cynical army colonel surfaced in my mind. What a jolt to discover on the final page that he is a graduate student in a department of theology! Let me cite just one serious example of the abundant misconceptions that permeate his letter.

Foerster argues: "The development of family planning for the Third World must precede health programs aimed at reducing infant mortality and increasing life expectancy." There is no way that family planning can effectively precede improved health services. The rule is: Where you have poor health services, poor nutrition, and high infant mortality, you also have large families. Poverty-stricken parents who depend on surviving sons for social security will not voluntarily plan to have fewer children under those circumstances. Such parents would violate their own self-interest to do so. Even Paul Ehrlich, who did so much to foster the illusion that family planning must come first, now ridicules it as a "condoms from helicopters delusion"—a psychological condition that is rampant among well-meaning upper-middle and upper-class Americans. Only where the benefits of such things as good nutrition and basic health services are spread to the masses of poor people do they choose to have smaller families and sharply reduce alarming growth rates. I am not aware of any exceptions to this rule.

As this point illustrates, Foerster's underlying disagreement with Bread for the World's statement of policy is theological. He says that to call human nature sinful "is just ass-backwards....Man is not sinful, he's just some poor son-of-a-bitch trying his damnest [sic] to survive the easiest way he knows how." Using this Darwinian premise, he not surprisingly advocates murder-by-warfare as the easiest way to deal with population growth. Starting with a theology that is so fundamentally at odds with Christian faith, Foerster moves to conclusions that defy empirical evidence. No one should mistake this for realism, just because it sounds hard-nosed.

I can understand a retired colonel feeling this way—but what is he doing in theology?