

Correspondence

Portugal

To the Editors: Re "Spiritual Politics" by Lawrence Nevins (*Worldview*, January/February, 1976): [When he states] "Obscurantism is a term educated Portuguese seldom fail to use in denouncing Salazarism." Mr. Nevins is implying that

A. All educated Portuguese denounce Salazarism. I am an educated Portuguese and I do not denounce(!) Salazarism, nor do many of my educated Portuguese friends. I am critical of certain aspects of Salazar's administration, admiring of others.

B. All educated Portuguese generally use the term obscurantism in denouncing Salazarism. This is purple prose and doesn't belong in *Worldview*.

Then: "To the modern Catholic [the cult of Fatima] is an embarrassment, and to the nonbeliever an affront to his intelligence and a blot on the nation's escutcheon."

More purple prose. How is it a "blot on the nation's escutcheon"? What is a "blot on the nation's escutcheon"? Are all Catholics to whom it is not an embarrassment not modern? I am a militant Protestant—a nonbeliever—and I do not consider the cult of Fatima an affront to my intelligence.

Next: "What follows, translated from the *Portuguese Times*, is a standard account of the event and the author's analysis of its meaning for today.

...continue to pray many rosaries for the conversion of the sinners, for peace, and the conversion of Russia as well as all other countries that oppress the rights of citizens or the Divine Being."

I doubt if Solzhenitsyn or Sakharov would object to that. Why does Mr. Lawrence Nevins?

If Mr. Nevins is a specialist in Portuguese history and a frequent contributor to *Worldview*, it seems to me that he might better busy himself with writing an article of praise for the way the Portuguese are carrying on a *revolution* with an astounding lack of bloodshed and cruelty. What seems most noteworthy to me about the Portuguese is that all of them—

Communists, Maoists, Socialists, "fascists"—fight tenaciously for their political ideals without losing their reverence for human beings. They are gentle people. They are still gentle people. Every day our newspapers bring us another account of careless bloodshed and brutality in pursuit of some political ideal. The Portuguese are showing us that we can be political activists without killing each other.

Joyce H. Mann

New York, N.Y.

Lawrence Nevins Responds:

Doctors Salazar, Caetano, and the Cardinal Patriarch of Lisbon were educated men and did not denounce Salazarism. I am astonished to learn that my purple prose might lead a reasonable person to imagine I believe, or wish others to believe, all educated Portuguese agree on anything.

That only a handful of people in Portugal died of politically connected violence since April, 1974, may not entirely be due to national character. The Portuguese are as fine a people as any in this world, but, in some circumstances, they are no more gentle than any other. One need only think of the bloodshed in the 1974 riots in Luanda and Lourenço Marques and the 1961 riots in Luanda.

Anti-Zionism and the Church

To the Editors: The article by Catholic professor John T. Pawlikowski entitled "Anti-Zionism=Anti-Semitism: Fact or Fable?" (*Worldview*, January/February) is certainly a masterpiece of cunning writing, where the true aims easily escape the inattentive reader.

After correctly establishing on historical grounds that Arabs have throughout history practiced cruel anti-Semitism and that the tale of harmonious coexistence of Moslems and Jews in Arab countries is a myth, Dr. Pawlikowski plunges into an attack on the very foundation of Israel that is strictly dictated by "old theology" tenets of the Catholic Church. Without the recent revelation of wartime Vatican papers it would be impossible to fathom how in this day and age and as part of a "factual" analysis of present-day political problems a writer would pose the following question about an independent
(Continued on p. 59)

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. Barnads
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

