

(and never lost innocence, since he never had any), but enjoyed vast success with his theatrical heroics and rhetorical exhortations to fellow countrymen on behalf of boldness, conquest, and the national ideal. Hundreds of thousands of young Germans came out of the gruesome trench experience with a strong desire to perpetuate such camaraderie for its own sake, and flocked to the Freikorps and later the incipient Nazi Party. For people like Hitler and Mussolini the Great War involved a diametrically opposite process to that experienced by Fussell's young English literateurs. They entered the war confused, purposeless, and in Hitler's case almost nihilistic, and came out of it with a renewed sense of purpose and mission, with tenacious new ideals. The greater tragedy of the war was that on the part of many of its veterans it failed completely to evoke general loathing or true war-weariness.

The shock of the Great War to cultural

consciousness may indeed have been greater in Britain than elsewhere because of the absence of institutionalized militarism there compared with the major Continental powers, and perhaps also because of the greater scope of the concepts of autonomy and civilized orderliness in British culture. However that may have been, the First World War did not really produce as much basic change and sense of exhaustion of values as did the Second, as far as the broader institutions and strata of society were concerned. Yet it did produce a greater impact on the literary élite, and that in large measure because of the novelty of the trauma of mass war to the literary mind.

In a general sense Fussell's book does not tell us very much about this that is new, but the reader of war literature and student of British letters will find here a skilled account of some of the major symbols and themes in British literature arising from World War I.

distinction. There will no doubt be other books on Kennedy, and one hopes they will recognize, as this one does not, that while Kennedy is a progressive man and a humane one, he also understands power and knows it is occasionally necessary to use it in ways that could scarcely be termed genteel. Campaign biographers, even those who have lost their candidates, are handicapped in trying to deal with the whole subject.

RANDALL G. STOKES is Professor of Sociology at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

WILLIAM V. O'BRIEN is Professor of Government at Georgetown University and Chairman of the department.

STANLEY G. PAYNE is Professor of History at the University of Wisconsin, Madison.

JEFFREY L. LANT holds a doctorate in history from Harvard University, where he is an Affiliate of Dudley House.

Senator Ted Kennedy: The Career Behind the Image by Theo Lippman, Jr.

(Norton; 296 pp.; \$9.95)

Jeffrey L. Lant

When Theo Lippman, Jr., first considered writing about the career of Senator Edward M. Kennedy, Kennedy was front runner for the 1976 Democratic Presidential nomination. Lippman might have made a tidy profit from those eager to learn about the candidate's senatorial career. When Kennedy took himself out of the running, Lippman found himself in a dilemma. Though he was without a candidate, and though the profits no longer looked so tidy, he had already done too much research to abandon the project. Too bad.

Lippman, an editorial writer for the *Baltimore Sun*, came up with what he thought was a convincing reason for going ahead. Kennedy's career in the Senate, he determined, has been "full enough to be worthy of study whether he is a presidential candidate or not...." True. Unfortunately, it is either far too

early to produce the complete study of the Senator's career Lippman set out to do, or Lippman has been nowhere near thorough enough in his research—or, as I suspect, both.

What Lippman has in fact produced is not a detailed look at Kennedy's senatorial career, certainly not a complete explanation and analysis of it. It is a pretty standard campaign biography, dealing with Kennedy's many accomplishments: his stand on the Vietnam war, his drive for improved medical care, civil rights legislation, the vote for eighteen-year-olds, campaign finance reform, and the complex of issues subsumed under "Watergate."

To be sure, it is a superior campaign biography and doubtless ranks above most examples of this genre. But it is a superior campaign biography nonetheless, a comfortable narrative in flat prose, anodyne, without flare or much

Briefly Noted

Hostage to the Devil by Malachi Martin

(Reader's Digest Press; 477 pp.; \$9.95)

An intriguing narrative by the celebrated author of a number of books dealing with the Church and its relation to modern culture. Using tape recordings of actual exorcisms, interviews with persons involved, and his own experiences, Martin tells the story of five living Americans who were liberated from demonic possession through the formal rite of exorcism. For those whose minds are not closed to the spiritual possibilities suggested, the book is an informative introduction to the very up-to-date world of good and evil spirits. The author declares himself sensitive to the dangers of sensationalism and clearly intends his account to be submitted to critical judgment, although it is written in a popular style. Included are brief historical and theological reflections on exorcism, as well as the relevant rites of the Roman Catholic Church.

Today and Tomorrow in America by Martin Mayer

(Harper & Row; 218 pp.; \$8.95)

The title would seem pretentious were it not so well supported by the vision, passion, and sheer common sense that mark almost every page. Mayer, well known for his popular illuminations, *The Schools*, *The Lawyers*, and *The Bankers*, here brings together much of the wisdom affirmed by those now called "neoconservatives," but without bitterness and with high hope. The mis-carriages of environmentalism, the dangers of focusing on distribution without reference to production, the absurdities of a tax system for which the poor finally end up paying most, the excesses of ethnic enthusiasms that restrict opportunity, and a host of other topics are addressed with persuasive urgency. It is as good a handbook as one is likely to find to provoke a serious rethinking of the kind of society we would like our children to inherit.

Medical Nemesis by Ivan Illich

(Pantheon; 183 pp.; \$8.95)

We use the word prophetic with great care. This book is at least potentially prophetic. In part Illich sets forth the arguments advanced by Victor Fuchs of Berkeley and others, namely, that modern medical progress is inversely related to the health of the people. But Illich goes farther, noting the ways in which individual autonomy is being destroyed by the "religion" of medicine, and the capacity to suffer and die humanly is increasingly reduced. His argument deserves careful reading by those who advocate some kind of national health program that would likely only expand the already bloated and oppressive medical establishments. In medicine's ability to assign "sick roles" without any political accountability, Illich joins Thomas Szasz in perceiving intimations of totalitarianism. Illich warns that the physician should not be scapegoated in efforts to revolutionize medicine. He learned from his earlier proposals for "deschooling society" that scapegoating the professionals can turn out to be counter-productive in the extreme. Rather he proposes a withdrawal of belief from the

medical religion, a widespread exposure of its myths and pretensions, and a positive commitment to the proposition that "healthy people are those who live in healthy homes on a healthy diet in an environment equally fit for birth, growth, work, healing, and dying." We will be surprised and disappointed if this book does not generate a lively and much needed debate about the meaning of modern medicine in the years ahead.

Correspondence

[from p. 2]

and recognized state: "whether the land tradition in Judaism necessarily demands perpetual Jewish sovereignty over a piece of real estate in the Middle East." Could this preposterous question be posed to, say, the British or the Americans or the Brazilians? Is statehood on a nation's native and historically established soil simply a "land tradition"? And one that, even theoretically, can be speculated about?

But the Vatican papers give the real answer to the background of the article. For already in 1943 the Papal Nuncio in Turkey (later to become Pope John XXIII!) wrote that support by the Church of the reestablishment of a Jewish state would be in "bad taste." The papers also state that the emergence of a Jewish state would be a "poor response to the Holy See's charitable care [*sic!*] for non-Aryan peoples."

As a member of a Catholic order Dr. Pawlikowski must obviously follow his Church's line, but it is incumbent on enlightened readers to spot this bias and dismiss his conclusions accordingly.

His desperate digs at the "Jewish scholars committed to modern methods of biblical exegesis" and the "otherwise liberal Jews" for supporting Israel are also ill-chosen. For nothing is better proven by modern methods of biblical research, following two generations of scholars reared by U.S. archaeologist William Foxwell Albright, than the historic person of Moses and the settlement of the land of Israel by Jews from the thirteenth century B.C. onward.

Manfred R. Lehmann

Nairobi, Kenya

John T. Pawlikowski Responds:
Mr. Lehmann's letter represents a serious misreading of my article rooted in the outdated assumption that all

RHODESIA: The Fight for Freedom by Leonard Kapungu

"A moving account of black Rhodesia's struggle for racial equality. It is a grim story, told by one who has lived it, with an equally grim conclusion. For Kapungu is convinced that the only corrective to endemic injustice in Rhodesia lies in revolution on the part of a black majority that outnumbers the ruling white minority by 20 to 1. A must book for anyone anxious to learn why Southern Africa is restless today." *America*

Cloth \$5.95

At your bookstore-or write:

.....

8-S



ORBIS BOOKS
Maryknoll, NY 10545

Send _____ copies of RHODESIA

Name _____

Address _____

Catholics still toe the party line. In no way do my questions to Jews about the theology of the land stem from the Old Catholic theological objections to a Jewish homeland. I have publicly repudiated this theology on numerous occasions. All nation-states, including the United States, have to face the question of possible sovereignty restrictions in the future. Israel will be no exception, and Jews will have to clarify whether the theology of the land in any way prohibits such restrictions. As for some of my other questions, they were primarily methodological ones, the point of which entirely eludes Mr. Lehmann's perception. What validity does the settlement of the land by Moses in the thirteenth century B.C. have for deciding territorial disputes today?

Mr. Lehmann's letter, exhibiting the kind of unthinking reaction to any questions non-Jews pose about Israel, ultimately does a disservice to the Israeli cause. If anything will turn non-Jews against Israel it will be the tone that permeates his letter. Fortunately there are significant Jewish leaders who are asking the very same questions put forward in my article.