

Correspondence

Two Nationalisms

To the Editors: True, "true peace is conceivable only through the definition of the Palestinian entity..." as Messrs. Kook and Merlin correctly point out at the start of their article "Israel at Peace With Its Neighbors" (*Worldview*, November, 1975).

Leaving the Palestinians out of Middle East peace hopes is like leaving the pianist out of a recital of the *Emperor Concerto*. However, there is a serious lack of clarity with regard to how this new client Palestinian State of Kook and Merlin in the West Bank will function. Indeed, it is doubtful whether such a contrived state could fulfill the aspirations of the Palestinians.

But my main truck with Kook and Merlin is not just that they are unwilling to go far enough on the Palestinian issue but that they are too willing to jettison Zionism. They choose to solve the Middle East question by changing the nature of Israel and its relationship with the Jewish people, removing that age-old natural connection. Israel is entitled to its national definition described by its historical existential dimension without modification, as the Palestinians are entitled to theirs. The problem is one of practicality: How do two nationalisms, both genuine, find a viable solution in one homeland? Serious consideration must be given to the roots of Arab Palestinian hopes, aspirations, and their political future. This cannot be done by watering down the traditional relationship between Judaism, the Jewish people, and Israel. Neither the Palestinians nor the Jewish-Israel relationship can be treated as a myth.

Israel Singer

Brooklyn College
Brooklyn, N.Y.

World Democratic Federation

To the Editors: Donald Brandon's "Toward a Genuine 'Structure of Peace'" (*Worldview*, October, 1975)

presented a convincing analysis of the weaknesses of the Kissinger foreign policy. In my judgment, however, its proposal of a "union of the existing democratic nations of the world that could serve as a stepping stone to an ultimate world democratic federation" leaves much to be desired.

In the first place, what is a "democracy"? Is the Republic of South Africa? Is India? Is the United States?

In the second place, no democratic union could possibly bring peace with such a large number of the nations of the earth excluded.

In the third place, excluding them from the new federation of democracies would only offend the undemocratic countries and make war more likely.

Let me make it clear: I believe in "government of the people, by the people, and for the people." But I believe in the United Nations too. I thank God it has nearly all of the nations of the world in it. Obviously, it needs strengthening. Strengthening the U.N. is our challenge. With God's help we can do it.

Palmer Van Gundy
Los Angeles, Calif.

Donald Brandon Responds:
In reply to Mr. Van Gundy:

1. A clear distinction among democratic, authoritarian, and totalitarian political systems is made on the basis of such things as existence or absence of competing parties and pressure groups, freedom of educational system and mass media, etc. Today there are about two dozen democracies, 115 authoritarian countries, and one dozen totalitarian Communist countries.

2. I didn't argue for abolition of the U.N. balance of power, etc., pending the establishment of a union of the democracies. Rereading of my essay should make it clear that union of the democracies requires the extension of democracy to many more countries before it could become a viable "structure of peace."

3. Excluding undemocratic countries from this "structure of peace" would no more make war likely than does the present exclusion of undemocratic countries from such organizations as OECD, or the exclusion of democratic countries from the Soviet bloc.

(Continued on p. 54)

WORLDVIEW

Statement of Purpose

The unique purpose of *Worldview* is to place public policies, particularly in international affairs, under close ethical scrutiny. The Council on Religion and International Affairs, which sponsors the journal, was founded in 1914 by religious and civic leaders brought together by Andrew Carnegie. It was mandated to work toward ending the barbarity of war, to encourage international cooperation, and to promote justice within all societies. The Council is independent and nonsectarian. *Worldview* is an important part of the Council's wide-ranging program in pursuit of these above goals.

Worldview is open to diverse viewpoints and encourages dialogue and debate on issues of public significance. It is edited in the belief that large political questions cannot be considered adequately apart from ethical reflection. The opinions expressed in *Worldview* do not necessarily reflect the positions of the Council. Through *Worldview* the Council aims to advance the national and international exchange without which our understanding will be dangerously limited.

Philip A. Johnson, *Publisher*

Editorial Board:

Hans Morgenthau, *Chairman*,
William J. Barnds,
Eugene B. Borowitz,
Noel J. Brown,
Jorge Dominguez,
J. Bryan Hehir,
Donald F. McHenry,
Paul Ramsey,
Seymour Siegel,
Paul Sigmund,
Kenneth W. Thompson,
Howard Wriggins



greater proliferation is obviously precluded for me by my own commitment to nonproliferation. However, there is no evidence that China has ever taken any material action to promote proliferation.

The suggestion that nonnuclear states should divert their pressure from the U.S. to the USSR ignores one of the biggest facts of life in contemporary world politics: On defense and disarmament issues, most nonnuclear states tend to view the Superpowers as mirror images of each other and to subject them to equal criticism. There was no peculiarly anti-American animus at Geneva last May. In fact, the strains between Soviet and nonnuclear delegations were notably acute.

What is more amiss with Weber's "Goldwaterism" (his word!) is his claim that the Soviet Union has been

more provocative recently than the U.S. and that Schlesinger's dismissal is a "good clue to where the action is." I have no interest in trying to prove the innocence of the Soviet Union's weapons policies and force deployments; that cannot be done. But those policies and deployments need to be seen in parallel with U.S. MIRV expansion, the confused dogmas and threats of "counterforce" and possible "first use," R & D on cruise missiles and MARVs, a \$92 billion B-1 bomber force, Trident submarines at \$2 billion each, and reneging on the Vladivostok understanding that Soviet *Backfire* (medium) bombers were not to be included in the Ford-Brezhnev ceiling of 2,400 strategic delivery vehicles. On the public record it is readily arguable that the U.S. is at least as responsible for the SALT impasse as the USSR is.

Finally, I really didn't mean to seem

very theological in my use of the word "covenant" to refer to the NPT. Of course, the "working ethic" of the U.S. and USSR in drafting their original versions of the NPT was anything but covenantal. The "good faith" obligations of Article VI, along with provision for a review conference, were clearly imposed upon the Superpowers as the political price of subscription by nonnuclear powers. Recalling those very political circumstances hardly diminishes the covenantal character of the treaty, however: It reminds us that this was indeed the crucial, central, solemn bargain without which the Superpowers would never have gotten their treaty at all. Which is why so many nonnuclear states are so thoroughly disillusioned over the Non-Proliferation Treaty—and why political realism, at least sometimes, coincides with ethical integrity.

Correspondence

(from p. 2)

Finally, strengthening the U.N. is impossible so long as it reflects the present diversity of purposes and systems in the world. Thirty years ago it was understandable that many viewed the U.N. as the "last, best hope for peace." But we have seen, unhappily, that a generation of experience renders that outlook naive.

Social Power

To the Editors: Allow me a brief response to your "Briefly Noted" review of our publication, *Poverty in American Democracy: A Study of Social Power* (Worldview, October, 1975). It is true that we call for a serious examination of the allocation of resources and economic decision-making through the institution of private property and free enterprise. This is due to our fear that decisions for public goods, infrastructural development and human resources development are being made in ways which benefit some regions and economic

groupings in our country unjustly at the expense of others. Certainly we did not call for abolition of the institution of private ownership, but do suggest that it would be more equitable, and that it was intended to be more equitable by many leaders at the founding of our country....

I think it is an overstatement to suggest we are "preoccupied" with redistribution of wealth, although we do mention the idea after examining how lopsided productive wealth ownership is in our country. Your reviewer makes no mention of whether our "preoccupations" are true or not....

About the only statement in your review which seems possibly fair is his/her critique of our style in the suggestion that "run-of-the-pew Catholics" could be offended by the material, and that it will fail to mobilize Catholics to build a better society. That is, of course, possible. It is too early to say. In any case, we do not think of our people as "run-of-the-pew," and trust in what judgment they would make after reading the book for themselves....

Frederick J. Perella
Assistant Education Coordinator
Campaign for Human Development
U.S. Catholic Conference
Washington, D.C.

CHANGING YOUR ADDRESS?

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