

Correspondence

The "Peace Movement"

To the Editors: Permit a brief comment on James Finn's Excursus III ("Peace Against the U.S.," *Worldview*, May), which I have just had the chance to read and am in basic agreement with, but...

Whatever is meant by "peace movement"... "protest movement"... and "pacifist groups," which Finn varyingly uses in his notes, there is no doubt that the myriad of "peace-oriented" organizations have had difficulties in discerning a common standard of justice for our own country, the Soviet Union, the Third World, etc.

This difficulty has been far less a dilemma within the pacifist community—say, the AFSC, the Fellowship of Reconciliation, the War Resisters League—than Finn notes. I raise this concern only because others have recently found it convenient to criticize the nonviolent movement for an illusory inconsistency.

That the Angola demonstration recently held should meander down to the Soviet Mission to the U.N. is less a surprise than a part of movement tedium. Merely to give a few examples:

—At the Montreal World's Fair a mass international march converged on both the USSR and U.S. pavillions to call for disarmament...

—In December, 1969, the WRL sponsored the first demonstration to use civil disobedience at the USSR Mission as part of a protest on behalf of dissenters within the Soviet Union (three of us went to jail for this, the case that established the right to protest *in front* of the Mission).

And, to skip to the present:

—In October, 1973, various pacifist groups called upon the parties to the Middle East conflict to cease all fighting and arms shipments. This included a visit to the USSR Mission...

—There have been three demonstrations since then that I know of including the Angola one; in fact, some of us have become "friendly" with both American and Soviet diplomats as a consequence of these contacts.

The inevitable irony is that there is little media reportage of such events as

these because they do not conform to preconceived stereotypes of what pacifists do. But we will try harder.

Allan Solomonow

Fellowship of Reconciliation
Nyack, N. Y.

Dependent Israel

To the Editors: In the excellent article "Dependent Israel: The Two Options" in the April issue of *Worldview* the authors [Mark Bruzonsky and Israel Singer] refer to Zionism as a political idea. I wish they would have developed the thought that the religious groups are promoting a military right-wing outlook. For it would seem to me that the answer to many of the problems is to recognize Zionism as a political entity and disestablish the Jewish religion.

Last November in a lecture in Jerusalem I heard Abba Eban refer to Hebrew and the requirement of an Ulpan as the basis of identity for the State of Israel. The language of the Old Testament or Bible has become a living language to welcome the Jew home to his native land. Thus the question I would raise is whether the lack of independence is due to the lack of a personal religious faith, which the Jews of America display but which is not evident in Israel. Were not the revivals and the testing of faith of the Great Awakening of the 1740's a necessary precondition to the American Revolution?

As a Christian, I would hope that the Old City of Jerusalem, as well as the Mount of Olives and Mount Scopus, would be part of a unified City of Jerusalem. The authors object to the ghetto mentality of Israel, yet use their boundary for Jerusalem as the Old City, which would return Mount Scopus to the boundaries of the Palestinian state.

Christopher Niebuhr

Albany, N.Y.

Mark Bruzonsky Responds:

That Jerusalem should be unified in the sense of being a single and open city is not at issue, we think. Various plans are being debated, including one by Lord Caradon, author of Security Council Resolution 242, who foresees two sister cities—one Jewish and one Arab—under a single municipal administration.

(Continued on p. 58)

WORLDVIEW

Statement of Purpose

The 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. The Council is independent and nonsectarian. *Worldview* is an important part of the Council's wide-ranging program in pursuit of these 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 and religious 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

James Finn

J. Bryan Hehir

Donald F. McHenry

Paul Ramsey

Seymour Siegel

Paul Sigmund

Kenneth W. Thompson

Howard Wriggins



**The Black American
Reference Book**
ed. by Mabel M. Smythe
(Prentice-Hall; 1026 pp.; \$29.95)

In 1966 *The American Negro Reference Book* was published and proved an invaluable source of information. Much has changed in the past ten years, and the different title for this second edition reflects many of those changes. Thirty chapters comprise essays (sometimes two or three to a chapter) by a wide variety of authors on every major aspect of the black American experience. Of course the quality is uneven, the biases of some authors might have been more carefully checked editorially, others leave out relevant information readily available from, for example, the U.S. Census Bureau. Nonetheless, for "getting it all together" under one cover the editor, and the Phelps-Stokes Fund which sponsored the project, are to be thanked. It should serve well in the decade until, one hopes, the third edition appears.

Correspondence (from p. 2)

We spoke in our article of "special provisions for the Old City of Jerusalem" precisely because some condominium arrangement with a Palestinian entity or state will be necessary. But we did not intend in our article to discuss in any detail the possible alternatives. Our point is simply that compromise over Jerusalem must be a part of any overall peace initiative. Such a compromise would allow for minor border adjustments, special provisions for holy sites, and flexible political arrangements.

After we wrote our article the Israel Council for Israeli-Palestine Peace issued a twelve-point Manifesto, and we are inclined to agree with point six regarding Jerusalem: "We affirm that Jerusalem is the eternal capital of Israel. Being sacred to three religions and inhabited by the two peoples [the people of Israel and the Palestinian Arab peo-

ple], it deserves a special status. It will remain united under a common municipal roof-organization and will be accessible to people of all nations and faiths. Jerusalem will continue to be the capital of the State of Israel, and the Arab part could become after the establishment of peace, the capital of the Palestinian Arab state. The Holy Places of all three religions will be administered autonomously by their respective institutions."

Mr. Niebuhr's two other points are more amorphous. While Zionism as a political movement does require a secular separation from the Jewish religion qua religion (as Herzl once said, "We shall prevent any theocratic tendencies from coming to the fore on the part of our priesthood. We shall keep our priests within the confines of their temples in the same way as we shall keep our professional army within the confines of their barracks....[Both] must not interfere in the administration of the State...."), there is no getting away from Israel as a "Jewish state." History and contemporary allegiances dictate this reality even for many atheistic Jews. The separation of religion and the political state is not as easily accomplished as Mr. Niebuhr seems to imply. A paragraph from the *Encyclopedia of Zionism and Israel* makes the point rather well: "To the extent that the Jewish State is the outgrowth of Jewish (religious) history, the separation of these concepts is highly problematical. The 'State' is designed as a solution to a Jewish dilemma and justifies its existence on the basis of a religious historic tradition, no matter how it is reinterpreted....Modern Israeli attitudes toward religion cannot be divorced from attitudes toward the State of Israel."

As for speaking Hebrew and going to an Ulpan as sufficient basis for identification with the state, this is true today precisely because only Jews do so, with rare exceptions. And whether Jews of America have more or less personal religious faith than Jews in Israel is highly debatable. Anyway, the connection between political independence and personal religious faith largely escapes us.

As for Mr. Niebuhr's wish that we would have discussed in more detail how religious elements in Israel have become the exponents of a right-wing militarism, we will accede to his request in a future, shorter article.

Israel Singer Responds:

No! Jerusalem must remain a united city. The specific arrangement is left to negotiations as to how municipalities with multiple ethnic communities should be governed. There is an arrangement under the enlightened attempts of Teddy Kollek that seems to be working out fairly well now, but may indeed be in need of revision. If so, so be it. But all of the Arabs and Jews that I've met in the years I've lived and taught in Israel have felt that they were citizens of Jerusalem. This lends to Jerusalem not only its historical character of indivisibility but also one that exists in the popular will of its people. Generations of my grandparents, making great sacrifices to come and live in that city, were loyal to an indivisible Jerusalem before there was a State of Israel. I know that there are tens of thousands of Arab inhabitants of that same city who have continued to live in it because their loyalty is to Jerusalem, as it was before either the Palestinian movement or Zionism changed modern politics. Jerusalem therefore is a special subject and must be treated in a manner somewhat different from the usual geopolitical considerations.

**CHANGING
YOUR ADDRESS?**

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

What About the U.N.?

To the Editors: *Worldview* is the most interesting, provocative, and thoroughly rewarding magazine that comes to my study. I like the fact that it deals realistically with the problems of the world from a spiritual perspective.

In the April issue I was especially moved by three articles. Rosemary Radford Ruether and Richard A. Falk made real contributions in their comments on "That Person Should Be the Next President Who..."; and Marjorie Hope and James Young performed a real service in reminding us of the greatness of the practical idealist who governs Zambia, Kenneth Kaunda.

The following words of this true statesman have profound meaning not only for Africa but even more for the whole Human Family: "...the goal should be to remove the *breeding grounds* of violence. To work for the simple Christian idea, 'Do unto others as you would have them do unto you.' You see, I believe it's a mistake to separate politics from spiritual development... Nonviolence should not be confined to a single situation... In its deeper meaning it is love for humanity—the implementation of Humanism. The program of Humanism sees man's development in terms of an all-round development—body, mind, and soul."

Kenneth Kaunda, except for his pressing responsibilities in Africa, might well qualify to become the next secretary-general of the United Nations.

Now, one negative note: Why did Rosemary Ruether and Richard Falk, in their otherwise brilliant and prescient articles on the qualifications which should be required in the Presidency, say nothing about the United Nations?

Ms. Ruether said: "The United States and the world face in the next decade what may well be apocalyptic prospects for human survival—in the areas of nuclear war, world famine, energy, rising expectations of minorities and of former colonized nations in the face of dwindling resources, at least as those resources are used and distributed by present international capitalism. The ecological costs of mismanagement of the globe for the benefit of the rich mount daily until they threaten the organic structure of life itself."

This is very well put. Her article should be reprinted and distributed to

every member of Congress, to the President, and many others. Nevertheless, my question remains: Why does she not give credit to the U.N. and its agencies, which recognize these problems and are trying to do something about them?

With Falk's article it's the same thing: a brilliant article calling for the one-world consciousness and one-world action to cope with one-world problems, but not the slightest reference to the U.N. Why?

If the answer is that the United Nations is so deficient that it can't handle the problems that Ms. Ruether listed—and others—let's say so, and get on with the task of making it more efficient and effective. Is the answer world government? If so, let's get on with the job of building the world government on the U.N. foundation.

If, on the other hand, it is, as I believe, a matter of supporting the United Nations and slowly erecting a superstructure of law and justice for all the Human Family, let us rise to the challenge.

Palmer VanGundy
Los Angeles, Calif.

Richard A. Falk Responds:

Mr. Van Gundy's response to my prescriptions for the Presidency is so positive that I am naturally disposed to be receptive to his criticisms. And so I would agree that it was a mistake not to mention the role of the United Nations in facilitating the transition from geopolitical to planetary preoccupations over the course of the next decade or so. I regard the United Nations in a generally positive light, providing the world with a primary forum for discussion that can help shape and reflect a new consensus on what is needed normatively and functionally, namely, equity for the poor, human rights for all peoples, and central guidance mechanisms for planning and coordinating policy on a planetary scale.

To translate this consensus into behavioral patterns and institutional forms will require some prior fundamental reorientations of outlook by ruling groups and their publics in domestic societies. It is an educational and political challenge that confronts many obstacles. Thus, in the period ahead the critical arena for global reform is domestic society. In American terms this emphasis could be expressed through a credible effort to link our

behavior toward others with the ideals we proclaim for ourselves. Interdependence also has a normative dimension; Vietnam implies Watergate. For better or worse there will be continuity between our foreign policy and the governance of domestic society. The United Nations is only marginally connected, in my view, with this central struggle to forge a new positive vision of America's role in the world.

One final comment. Often implicit in enthusiasm for the United Nations is an uncritical acceptance of centralized patterns of global governance as a desirable sequel to the state system. Such a prospect deserves the closest scrutiny. My own positive vision heavily emphasizes the decentralization of power and the deconcentration of wealth *within* advanced industrial states. In such a setting, the image of "central guidance" is meant to imply a minimalist notion of control and bureaucracy. Shifts in values, especially a "cultural revolution," are the essential precondition for a just and peaceful world system. Institutional innovations, within or without the United Nations, can do little without such a cultural revolution and will be almost automatically forthcoming with it.

The Sixties Without End

To the Editors: [Re James Finn's Excurus, "Looking Back, Hoping Forward," *Worldview*, January/February.] The sixties were proclaimed "ended"—and then in 1971 the two biggest demos happened: Mayday in D.C. and San Francisco. In 1975 (January) the biggest antiwar lobby did its thing and sorely distressed Ambassador Martin. CIA exposed all over.

In early '76 Congress votes to end CIA aid to certain Angolan forces.

Most of all, 54 per cent of eligible voters don't register in California, few people vote everywhere.

Anti-imperialistic sentiments are strong among many sectors of American people.

"Traditional issues of jobs, savings, profits, inflation" are now being analyzed in terms of neocolonialism and imperialism. *Marxism* is being studied everywhere—*Leninism—Maoism—newism*. Great!

William Hogan

St. Brendan Church
Chicago, Ill.