

within a few months by cutting off power and coal. This would be a hurting blow against Britain's economy.

The rest of the African nations would not be standing by. The power of nationalism is nowhere stronger than where it has an outside cause, and Rhodesia offers a cause par excellence. And so does South Africa.

Mr. Wilson will be hard pressed to avoid immoderation, on the one hand, and a disastrous compromise settlement on the other. A recent article in these pages by Peter Rutner discussed the unsatisfactory alternatives of the South African question, especially that of military

intervention. No doubt Rhodesia will prove just as sticky

First chance at the unlucky task goes, of course, to Britain, to whom we should give our strongest support. However, if she fails, as it seems probable she will, the United States should be quick at the U.N. Security Council table to insure that the situation does not degenerate into the political nightmare of the Congo. Things are too undeveloped yet to say what course the U.S. should follow. One can only pray that lessons have been learned from previous experience.



PLEA FOR PEACE

THE POPE IN NEW YORK

When Pope and President appeared together briefly outside the Waldorf, the crowd cheered the Pope. This is one measure of the legacy of John XXIII: the Pope of Rome is now the only man alive capable of upstaging Lyndon Johnson.

What this and the rest of the visit indicated in a change of attitudes toward the papacy was altogether too obvious to engage the attention of those sifting the day's events for "significance." But the evidence was all there. eager reception by the nation's major religious leaders, crowds that totalled more than four million, 15 hours of non-stop Catholicism on TV networks, whose devotion to religion is customarily expressed only on Sunday morning between 8 and 9 o'clock. The *Herald Tribune*, the only respectable New York paper then publishing and the one which a century ago gleefully predicted the collapse of the papacy any year now, found itself unable to restrain enthusiasm, papal symbols sprouted on virtually every page. Several commentators cautiously suggested that a decade ago no Pope could have even set foot in America; one added. "at least not without an army at his back."

If the cheering was unanimous—only one Lutheran editor and one Hungarian newspaper were quoted in opposition—it was not clear as to exactly what was being cheered. In the recent Democratic mayoral primary in New York, after Mayor Wagner's chosen successor Paul Screvane was badly beaten, Screvane turned to Wagner and asked, "Who lost this, you or me?" Many thought that Pope Paul might mentally ask his predecessor, "Who won this, you or me?"

The question is not an idle one, and yet Pope Paul put his personal stamp on this visit as he has on few other events of his reign. Paul's attention to detail and

use of the symbolic is surely superior to John's. What John did spontaneously Paul does carefully, and in this case the minutest gestures and details were subordinated to Paul's chosen message of humility and service.

The inevitable call from the Curia and the New York chancery for trappings that would underline the Pope's importance was overridden. A Negro American bishop was announced on the eve of the trip. After the arrival at Kennedy airport, instead of waiting ten decorous minutes before holding court onboard for U Thant, the Pope immediately appeared in the doorway and strode down to pump Thant's hand vigorously. Despite some ecclesiastical and civic flutterings, the Pope insisted on visiting Harlem. In his meeting with the President, he made a particular point of thanking Johnson for his accomplishments in civil rights. At the U.N., he unostentatiously presented a \$150,000 jeweled crucifix and ring for the poor, bypassing Cardinal Spellman this time and presenting it directly to U Thant for the U.N. Freedom from Hunger fund. At the U.N. reception, he seemed notably warm and animated, especially with the representatives of African nations. Throughout the day he did his best to discourage ring-kissing, though most people, particularly the women, were not to be deterred. The Pope's decision not to stay overnight, which had the incidental effect of enormously amplifying TV coverage, was a way of saying he was visiting the U.N. and not the U.S. This gesture creaked under the weight of hoopla heaped on by the New York chancery but the Pope neatly tied in his brief remarks at each stop with the U.N. visit and neutralized some of the excess. The U.N., however, was unofficially peeved at what appeared to be a chancery takeover of a U.N. visit.

The motorcade, by New York standards, was brisk indeed. A tight schedule and the nervousness of security officers sent it through the city at blurring speed. In Harlem, where the crowd was thinnest, but still six or seven people deep, the police stepped it up to 40 miles per hour, thus expressing more of what New York's finest thinks of Harlem than what the Pope cared to express. One inadvertent papal gift here was the clean streets, it is always an event when the City Sanitation Department decides to service Harlem, and from now on, a papal motorcade will be welcome there *anytime*.

At St. Patrick's Cathedral, the Pope was solemn and direct, expressing the need to work for peace, as he did in the eight other talks he gave during the day. The cathedral rocked with applause—for the first time in its history—and with an occasional "Viva il Papa" by seminarians demonstrating they had studied in Rome. Rockefeller, Wagner and half of the Kennedys were on hand, as they were all day. Bobby and Teddy drew squeals from the crowd outside and worked their way through briefly in the Richard Nixon manner, shaking one man's hand while smiling at the next.

Outside the U.N. were five pickets from C.U.R.E. in Los Angeles, demanding the ouster of Cardinal McIntyre. Also a few pro-McIntyre pickets and some Zionists who considered Paul partly responsible for the death of six million Jews. None were allowed within four blocks of the Pope.

The speech at the U.N. was enthusiastically received. It stressed—with some rhetorical force—the Johannine themes of humility, service to the world and man's ability to get out of the mess he got himself into. The Church, the Pope said in effect, is neither in politics nor judging them from above, but is in the service of those whose properly secular job it is to gain the peace. All this went down very well with the delegates, less well perhaps than it did with some in the papal entourage. There was also the Pope's "solemn moral ratification of this lofty institution"—the strongest and most explicit papal statement in support of the U.N., pending, of course, analysis by *National Review*.

A few demurrers, not serious, were heard on the Pope's careful distinction between offensive and defensive weapons, since no nation thinks it has any of the former anyway. Also the Pope's insistence that world order must be founded on a belief in God is a step away from his mentor, Maritain, as well as from Pope John. But the one remark which jolted the audience, was, of course, the reference to artificial birth control as irrational. The question most often raised was why the Pope chose to discuss an issue still up for study in the Church, and some concluded that the Pope was taking

the opportunity to close the debate. Because of the nature of the occasion, no howl went up from the press or civil leaders. United Press labored to explain it away by telling readers the Pope was talking about *artificial* birth control, while the possibility still existed that the pill will be recognized as *natural*.

Gromyko, after a brief pause, applauded the speech loudly and was cordially received by the Pope afterwards. Tass and Pravda were enthusiastic about the speech, instead of diatribes from China, there was merely silence. The Chinese, who have not yet informed readers of the death of Pius XII, may be studying the possibilities here. One line in the papal speech called, in a circumspect way, for the eventual admission of Red China to the U.N. In an interview with Barrett McGurn, the Pope was asked if he would go to China if invited, and the reply was yes.

The Mass at Yankee stadium, which gave many Catholics in the New York area their first look at the modernized liturgy, was fascinating and moving, marred only by the chancery's intrusion of a cornerstone blessing for a new seminary in Yonkers. The chancery proved during the day its expertness at organizing and logistics, and also its positive gift for the jarring and the provincial.

Those Seven Points

Television coverage was massive. The public was denied no detail. CBS rushed in early with a bulletin from Irving R. Levine reporting that the Pope had breakfasted on a sweet roll and coffee, light. Similar attention was given to midday refreshment (orange juice at the chancery) and supper on the way home (veal scallopini and a banana). The high points were professionally covered by 80 TV cameras and more than a thousand reporters. Father Peter O'Donnell, the Paulist who served as house Catholic for NBC was extremely effective, over at CBS, Bishop Sheen fared less well. When asked why the Pope was flying back on TWA, he observed that the initials stood for Travelling With the Angels. Compared with the sensible, even commentary of CBS's regular team, the Bishop always seemed to be breaking into set routines. (Eric Sevareid "What did you think of the points in the Pope's speech?" Bishop Sheen "The Holy Father made seven points, like the seven notes of the octave.") One is left with the impression that while the Pope may be invited back, Bishop Sheen will not be.

One thing that caught New York by surprise was the Pope's warmth. Midway through the day he exchanged Roman *gravitas* for a broad grin and the upraised hands

of the traditional Papal greeting for lively American hand-waving. Several times he slowed down to give a child's outstretched hand an affectionate slap. At least twice he stopped to bless crippled children he spotted in the crowd. His goodbys at the Stadium were so exultant that one was left with the impression that he was enjoying himself immensely and hated to leave.

The results of the visit can not now be discerned through the euphoria. Certainly he has given the U. N. a helpful boost at a crucial time. Massive TV coverage

across the country will reduce chances of conservatives' being less papal than the Pope on liturgical changes and internationalism. As personal diplomacy it may have no more ultimate effect than the travels of President Eisenhower. But as a personal triumph, its immediate practical effect is a dramatic rise in the Pope's prestige. Richard Horchler wrote for Religious News Service "The person and authority of Paul seem now to overshadow even the Council which is now in session." For many, that will be precisely the problem. JOHN LEO



NATIONAL AFFAIRS

HOME RULE-ALMOST

The rejection of the bill providing self-government for the District of Columbia was President Johnson's first defeat of the year in Congress. But the mere fact that the bill ever reached a vote on the floor of the House is a good measure of how ambitious his reach has become.

Although the Senate has six times passed a home rule bill, the House District Committee, which is dominated by Southern Democrats, has consistently prevented any action for nearly twenty years. When the same stalling occurred this year, Mr. Johnson and his legislative aides pressured members of the House to sign a petition discharging the bill from committee. Such action requires a majority of the whole House—218 members—and it was not easy to get. Members rarely override one of their standing committees because to do so would set a precedent for taking bills away from the committee on which they serve. Only twice in history has a bill become law that reached the floor by a discharge petition. In the present instance, Mr. Johnson rounded up a half-dozen Texas members who signed the petition as a personal favor to him while reserving the right to vote against the bill on final passage.

The chief underlying reason for opposition to home rule for the city of Washington is that it is 58 percent Negro. Southerners do not want to turn over the nation's capital to Negro political control. But they are not alone in their reluctance. Most Republicans, who come from the nation's farms and small towns, are equally doubtful of the political capacity of Negroes. Indeed, one suspects that these conservatives would not grant home rule to New York, Chicago, or most other metropolitan centers if it were within their power to withhold it. The demagoguery and irresponsibility of Representative Adam Clayton Powell are particularly harmful in this con-

text because they tend to give substance to these unstated racist fears. More than one congressman has privately rationalized his opposition to home rule by asking "Would you like it if Washington elected a mayor like Adam Powell?"

In actuality, the possibility of the Capital electing this kind of mayor is slight. Washington is not Harlem or the South Side of Chicago. Although it has its share of slums and of unemployed, it is dominated by the tens of thousands of Negroes who have secure, relatively well-paid jobs with the Federal Government. These Negro civil servants are very much like their white counterparts: sober, respectable, and home-owning citizens.

Washington is presently governed, and has been for nearly a century, by a curious hodgepodge of unrepresentative bodies. Budgets, tax policies, and many municipal ordinances on the most trivial matters are determined by the District Committee and the Appropriations Subcommittees of the House and Senate. These congressmen are elected by all Americans except those who live in the District, who have no voice in Congress. The municipal bureaucracy is directed by three commissioners appointed by the President. The school board is chosen by a panel of judges. In short, the capital of the world's most powerful democracy is governed very much like a British crown colony.

As a practical matter, the most powerful influence in running the city under the present unrepresentative system is the local business community operating through the Board of Trade. Business enjoys what might be termed a comfortable relationship with the regulatory agencies and other municipal bureaucracies which operate independent of any strong political direction. Taxes on incomes and real estate are kept at approxi-