

I am not privy to any "private conversations" with people in the Movement, but the consequences of a credibility gap among dissenters seem of far less consequence than a lack of candor among public officials, especially those with access to intelligence reports and the legendary "captured documents" which so conveniently appear when there is a point to be made.

The model of rationality and honor advanced by Mr. Lefever on behalf of the government and his paradigm of shrill irrationality applied to dissenters is without empirical foundation. It was, I recall, an official of the Johnson Administration who advocated the government's right to lie on behalf of its policies.

It may be unpleasant or jarring to admit that the war may have brought out the worst in America, but can it be reasonably alleged that it has elicited our most noble sentiments or that its distorting economic, social, and psychological effects are phenomena on which honest men can disagree?

How ennobling are the consequences of a war that causes over one half of our soldiers in the combat zone to seek relief from tension with the needle and the joint? How lofty is a conflict which, according to recent testimony, induces such violent reaction in Marines that they cannot be safely re-integrated into civilian life without extensive psychotherapy? Perhaps this data comports with what Peking or Hanoi want to hear. Possibly it is merely the cant and deception of demonic left-wing psychiatrists. I suspect, however, that we have not seen the final pathological manifestations of this conflict. To attribute these assessments to willful and malicious malcontents is to indulge in dangerous self-deception.

Ross K. Baker

Princeton, N.J.

Dear Sir: In the past I have found myself generally in agreement with the views and opinions of Ernest Lefever and have come to regard him as one of the most responsible and authoritative spokesmen for that particular part of the political spectrum we apparently inhabit. I am therefore deeply dismayed and bewildered by both the tone and the tactics of his article in the November issue.

Certainly there has been an excess of rhetoric on the part of many of those who have criticized U.S. foreign policy in recent years, especially among those opposed to the Vietnam war, and certainly the quality of dialogue and debate on public issues has deteriorated as a result. However, I can neither condone the ethics nor comprehend the practicality of combatting this "rhetorical overkill" by perpetuating its usage. Such phrasology as "no seasoned Communist propagandist would have dared"; "presented in the garb of self-righteousness"; "orgy of black terror"; etc.—this simply will not serve to advance that "quality of dissent and support equal to the seriousness of the problems we confront" which Dr. Lefever so rightly demands.

Since newspapers, books and magazines abound with

foolish and extravagant statements by those who should know and do better, I am particularly bewildered as to why Dr. Lefever chooses to weaken his own case by focusing on a speech of the late Martin Luther King, Jr.—especially a speech Lefever himself admits is "strange" and "uncharacteristic." By attacking someone no longer able to defend himself, I am afraid Lefever indulges in the very same tactics he deprecates in others.

I can understand Dr. Lefever's feelings only too well. I, too, am tired of abuse and passion masquerading as fact and logic. But this is no time for us to lose our heads. There is every evidence that the nation is fast becoming weary of the Left's rhetorical excesses and that such tactics are becoming counter-productive, as sooner or later they always do. Whether the protesters like it or not, the war is winding down; the rallies and demonstrations are fading away; the inflated language is cooling off. In the exhausted silence that follows such outbursts, new realities will have to be confronted and new decisions made. The advocates of reason and moderation can then prevail—but only if they have preserved authority by remaining true to these principles. It is a great temptation to whack one's opponent with his own stick, but the just and rational man will choose a more worthy weapon.

Guy Davis

... AND "THE NEW STYLE IN AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY"

Nyack, N.Y.

Dear Sir: You have a most interesting tension in your November issue of *worldview*—in the contrast between old and new views of foreign policy in the lead article and the one by Ernest Lefever. I'm sure you will get an equally interesting division in correspondence on the two widely divergent angles these authors take.

May I come down heavily in favor of the "new style" approach (in "The New Style in American Foreign Policy," by Cynthia Enloe and Mostafa Rejai), which is, by inference at least, a rejection of the Lefever approach. Acheson's and, to a lesser extent, McGeorge Bundy's "principled" and "moral" approach to statecraft, which in the end comes off as a glossy veneer applied to the apparatus of pure power, are now seen as not even self-serving from the standpoint of the national interest. Authors Enloe and Rejai rightly see as a healthy development the more candid and hence more flexible new approach in the U.S. which no longer needs to be perceived as moralistic.

But Mr. Lefever is still caught back in yesterday. And his concept of loyalty to the institution of our State Department, right or wrong, is so constricting and myopic as to permit him to slander in quite cruel fashion the late Martin Luther King for attempting to apply the Christian imperative to America's Vietnam war policy. In fact, I feel so strongly about the matter as to ask why, in this instance, are we to prefer Mr. Lefever's views to those of J. Edgar Hoover in the realm of morality and the state?

James S. Best

January 1971 19

in the magazines . . .

(Continued from p. 2)

the effort to achieve solidarity. But there is absolutely no political or military reality there, for such a reality presupposes some definition of nationality. We have no definition of the nationality of Europe; we do not even have a definition of Europe.

"That is not to say that we should deny the existence of a higher European interest. On the

contrary, we can go further and state that such a European interest exists. . . . One should always perceive or conceive some higher interest than one's own. But let us be on our guard! In twenty years, I have never on any single occasion known our English, German or Italian neighbors to give up the least of their own interests for the sake of Europe! Abdicating on principle from being oneself leads nowhere, except to an advance agreement to take orders from other people."

PAMPHILUS

The World of Dom Helder

Dom Helder Camara: The Violence of a Peacemaker, by José De Broucker. Orbis. 154 pp. \$4.95.

by Susan Woolfson

Someone ought to become Dom Helder's Boswell, someone ought to examine at length his views of underdevelopment and suggestions for action, to study the many projects begun or led by him. Journalist José De Broucker has attempted a bit of all three, leaving more questions about the "Red Archbishop" of Recife, Brazil, than he attempts to answer in this brief book.

Dom Helder Camara has been praised widely, both in Brazil and abroad, for his efforts on behalf of the lower classes of his country, but rightists and leftists alike have maligned him; by the Archbishop's own writ (in a biographical epilogue) he is "rather timid," yet he has been an innovator and organizer on a scale that is only hinted at by mention of CELAM, the National Conference of Brazilian Bishops, Action, Justice and Peace, Operation Hope, the Bank of Providence. His vision extends to "a radical structural change in economics, and politics, the social and cultural strata," yet he does not reject "paternalism" as a means

Susan Woolfson is a member of the *worldview* staff.

for "the improvement of the human condition and for justice"; he has "always" felt "the need to be convinced in my own mind that I am in line with the pope," yet his ministry seems more in the spirit of Pope John's Vatican Council than of Pope Paul VI's recent Asian tour with its consolations to the squatters of Manila in their poverty.

Perhaps some of the contradictions, conflicts and controversies which cluster about the Archbishop can be summed up with the statement that "Dom Helder now represents the passage of the polemical Church to the missionary Church." But the reader will find no clue here to some very central questions: For example, what form will the "moral force" take which Dom Helder feels the Church in Latin America must exercise? And one looks in vain, in a book called *The Violence of a Peacemaker*, for an extended discussion of the subject's own view of violence.

There is fascinating stuff here: Conversations with successive leaders of Brazil, like this one:

. . . I had some contacts with Marshal Castelo Branco. . . . He would telephone and say, "Let us have a talk together like simple natives in Ceará."

The first time he did this, after April, 1964, I remember very well. When we were alone, I said, "President Branco! Today I woke

up rather anxious. Because I discovered that I have a left hand, a left leg, a left half of my body. I am anxious, because I see that today it is very dangerous to be on the left! And now I discover that you, too, President Branco, have a left side. Now really, this is ridiculous!"

Or this reflection on the possibility of Latin American integration:

. . . there is . . . a certain kind of integration that would play into the hands of the mini-imperialisms of the continent. Unfortunately, egotism is a terrible force. Even an underdeveloped country such as Brazil, which has begun a small development, is already behaving in a mini-imperialistic way toward weaker countries such as Paraguay and Bolivia. We have crushed the Paraguayan textile industry. We must therefore be very careful: Latin American integration, yes; but without mini-imperialism, whether Brazilian or Argentinian or Chilean.

Reflections like these abound, for the book is the result of interviews which De Broucker has held with Dom Helder and which he has pieced together with some narrative and interpretive glue. Of course, such a work can only be a *vorspeise* of studies to come. But as the first book-length piece on the Archbishop, it will serve a useful purpose in introducing to many the world of Dom Helder.