
PRESS & TELEVISION

organizations; 35 percent were opinion columns or editorials. The remainder were illustrations and feature pieces. Yet only 6 percent of all stories reviewed the history of affirmative action. A mere 4 percent described the workings and results of special admissions programs. And only 5 percent portrayed the background of plaintiff Allan Bakke. All the papers except the *World* editorialized strongly against Bakke's position, but news headlines were generally neutral. Fewer than one-third of the Bakke stories appeared on page one.

Immediately after the Court decision, the four papers ran 35 Bakke-related items. Only one headline—in the *Amsterdam News*—betrayed editorial bias: "Bakke: We Lose!!" Seventeen items appeared in the *Amsterdam News* alone. The *Defender*, the *Sentinel*, and the *World* ran just 9, 4, and 5 Bakke stories, respectively. In contrast to prehearing coverage, the papers ran only 5 hard-news stories but 18 background articles on the political and philosophical issues surrounding the case.

The black papers ran a significant amount of Bakke-related commentary, the authors note. But they suggest that the greater focus on facts and events indicates that the black press is moving away from its old "protest" role to a more "neutral, objective" stance.

RELIGION & PHILOSOPHY

John Paul II: One View

"The Political Theology of John Paul II"
by Harvey Cox, in *Michigan Quarterly Review* (Spring 1980), 3032 Rackham Bldg.,
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
48109.

A relatively young man, John Paul II (age 60) may well guide the world's 563 million Catholics into the 21st century. His travels, his "spiritual charisma," and his inclination to speak out on poverty, consumerism, and the latest SALT treaty could make him an influential global figure. But first, warns Cox, a Baptist theologian at the Harvard Divinity School, the pontiff will have to drop his insistence on conservative rules and absolute doctrinal conformity within his own church.

John Paul's political interests stem from the belief that mankind was rendered potentially divine and deserving of dignity when "the Son of God became the Son of Man." In his only encyclical to date, *Redemptor Hominis*, he held that the Church's responsibility was not to convert the rest of humanity but to fight forces that degrade the individual. He numbers among these forces not only totalitarianism but Western consumerism—"the hunger for status symbols that divide both the world and the hearts of men."

Yet, Cox contends, the pope has not been equally sensitive to indignities inflicted within the Church. Relegating women to the status of

RELIGION & PHILOSOPHY

“permanent second-class citizens” (by excluding them from the priesthood), requiring celibacy of all priests [except for married Anglican clergymen who join the Catholic Church], and his ban on contraception run counter to the contention that each individual is unique, says Cox. And, he adds, the pope seemingly contradicted his own human rights stance by refusing to allow dissident Swiss theologian Hans Küng “to select his own counsel and have full access to his dossier” if and when Küng answers the Vatican’s summons to defend his teachings.

The pontiff’s penchant for stifling Church controversy can be traced to his days as bishop of Krakow during the late 1960s, when the Polish church was calling for the end of political and cultural repression. “The last thing Wojtyla [John Paul] wanted to be then,” notes Cox, was “a general without troops.” But with Catholics firmly in line, he was able to help build a coalition with idealistic Marxists that won concessions from the government in 1968.

The battle lines are less clear-cut on the global front. To achieve his goal of a more humane world, John Paul II will need allies among the world’s diverse leaders and electorates. But until he eliminates the “archaic rules and oppressive practices” of his own Church, Cox argues, few beyond its doors will consider him serious about rooting out foes of human dignity.

Herzl’s Dream

“Theodore Herzl: A Reevaluation” by Jacques Kornberg, in *The Journal of Modern History* (June 1980), Univ. of Chicago Press, 5801 Ellis Ave., Chicago, Ill. 60637.

Theodore Herzl (1860–1904), the father of modern Zionism, dedicated his life to securing a Jewish homeland. Yet the Budapest-born journalist and political activist wanted to “make Jews over into Gentiles, to normalize what he saw as a deformed people,” says Kornberg, a University of Toronto historian.

Herzl’s writings are filled with the anti-Semitic prejudices of late 19th-century Europe. Once, after attending synagogue in Paris (Herzl lived mostly in Vienna) in 1894, he confided in his diary that he was sickened at the sight of the worshippers, with their “bold, misshapen noses; furtive and cunning eyes.” He published a handful of plays and novels—each marked by vicious, obsequious, ugly Jewish villains and virtuous, blonde, blue-eyed gentile maidens.

To Herzl, the Jews were a people shaped by oppression. They were skilled at surviving, but—perhaps as a consequence—were strangers to the “joy of sacrifice . . . for an idea.” (Like many assimilationist German and Austro-Hungarian Jews, he was ignorant of Talmudic scholarship, kabbalistic mysticism, and other vital elements of Jewish culture.) Only by creating a state of their own, he argued, could Jews regain the dignity of their Biblical forebears. Herzl envisioned a homeland empty of Jewish culture; he even opposed reviving the Hebrew language.