

warriors—Secretaries Acheson, Dulles and Rusk—was guided in relations with the Soviet Union by a number of propositions, enumerated by Dr. Guhin. One was that the Soviet challenge was neither unnatural nor demonic. Others were that the challenge could exert a salutary effect on the West (the latter would have to put its own house in order); war can be avoided without compromising basic convictions; the goal of U.S. policy is a world at peace rather than the eradication of communism; there is no panacea; and the danger of war comes from miscalculation by either side.

Dr. Guhin is at his professional best—abetted by nine-hundred citations in a fifty-page reference section, and by Dulles's own memoranda on the treaty with Japan, the Berlin blockade and the Geneva Accords on Southeast Asia—when he shows that the Eisenhower-Dulles foreign policy was part of a continuing link, preceded and followed by similar policies espoused by Truman, Acheson, Kennedy, Johnson and Rusk. Nonrecognition of mainland China, construction of bilateral and multilateral alliances, reactions and counteractions against Russia over Berlin, Greece, Cuba and atomic weaponry, and maintenance of military power: these were fundamental policies of the United States for a generation.

Dulles said: "We are not so closely wedded to doctrinaire concepts that we cannot adjust our policies to the demands of the hour. . . . We cannot deal in absolutes. This, to many Americans, is a source of worryment." This "worryment" led many Americans to criticize what they saw as "confusion" and "indecision" on the part of Dulles. But Dulles, as Secretary of State, was faced less by uncertainty and ambiguity in foreign relations as he was forced to resolve the dichotomy between what we all wanted and what it was possible for us to achieve.

Modesty was not a quality ordinarily ascribed to Dulles: His appearance, style and personal idiosyncrasies did not lend themselves to such a characterization. But for

his countrymen as well as for himself he bespoke an international modesty. We should not act and talk "as though God had appointed us to be the Committee of Admissions to the Free World and as though the

qualifications for membership were to be found by our looking into a mirror." Here we perceive the essence of Dulles: a reference to the Deity while announcing a line of diplomatic conduct.

## A Window on Russia for the Use of Foreign Readers by Edmund Wilson

(Farrar, Straus and Giroux; 280 pp.; \$7.95)

Paul A. Goble

*The relations that exist between the social and political condition of a people and the genius of its authors are always numerous; whoever knows the one is never completely ignorant of the other.*

—Alexis de Tocqueville

Russian literature has long been an object of study in the West, and its relationship with the social and political life of an often tragic people has been carefully investigated. Unfortunately this valuable and legitimate task has all too frequently been a substitute for, rather than an adjunct to, serious literary criticism. As literary concerns with language, style and the exposition of human values and actions have been eclipsed by political concerns in the criticism of Russian authors and their works, much has been lost both in our understanding of Russian literature and, as Tocqueville suggests, in our knowledge of Russian social and political life. The late Edmund Wilson is one of the notable exceptions to this practice.

Russians tend to assume, as Wilson points out, that "no foreigner can really know Russia, since one cannot imagine it correctly in any terms supplied by the West, and nobody but a Russian [they] think—not entirely without justification—can have the freedom of the Russian language." In offering to be our guide to a world partially cut off

from Western experience, Edmund Wilson first has to deal with the Russian language; for contained within it are both the terms and relationships needed to understand Russians and the reasons it is so difficult to translate.

Wilson himself came to the study of Russian at middle age "with the insight and intelligence of an adult," that is, in the same way in which he would have us approach both the language and the literature. He points to the richness and variety of the linguistic heritage and to the unfortunate fact that much of this has been squandered in the Soviet present. Thus, for example, words of the feudal past, verbs such as *pereparycat* ("to whip everybody all around") have now been supplanted by verbs like *likvidirovat* ("to liquidate"), a change in words reflecting a change in worlds.

But if the verbs have changed, the verb system has not—different verbs still have numerous and naturally irregular aspects, a feature of the language which contributes to the uniquely Russian sense of time and of movement through time. And lest we forget Turgenev's remark that "although the Russians are the most incorrigible liars in the whole world, there is nothing they respect so much as the truth," Wilson includes a special section on the various Russian words for liar and lying as well as one on the special possibilities of

the language for precision and truth.

If the language presents a barrier to our understanding of Russian literature because translations are often poorly and inexactly done or originals must be read with the constant and not always helpful aid of a dictionary, another barrier to understanding exists for Russian and non-Russian readers alike. That obstacle is formed by certain preconceptions which "partly prevent us from seeing . . . the qualities that are really there." For Russians these preconceptions are partly the product of political views and partly that of growing up with this literature and carrying the images they formed as children into adulthood. For non-Russians, Wilson suggests, these preconceptions are the result of reading too few Russian writers—frequently only Chekhov, Dostoyevsky, Tolstoy and Turgenev—and include an image of Russian writers and their works being "formless and unkempt, . . . gloomy, . . . crudely realistic, . . . morbid and hysterical, [and] mystical." Such prejudices do not square with the facts, of course, and Wilson's essays here point this out.

Being a collection of essays rather than a systematic work, this book illustrates the mature Wilson's interest in the criticism of those writers less widely read but whose style he felt worthy of study. Consequently, in this work, our attention is directed to Pushkin, Tyutchev, Sukhovo-Kobylin, Ginzburg, Chukovskaya, Alilueva and the now popular Solzhenitsyn and to fresh perspectives on Chekhov, Tolstoy and Turgenev. Dostoyevsky, the Russian writer for many Westerners, is mentioned only in passing. With this variety of styles and approaches, Wilson hopes to increase our "sensitivity to the texture and rhythm of writing, to the skill in manipulating language, for the rendering of varied effects" rather than to confirm our political prejudices or to build a system of criticism for us to accept or reject.

Wilson's own concern in this direction is reflected in his essay on "The Strange Case of Pushkin and Nabokov," the piece which initiated the controversy between these two

men on Nabokov's translation of Pushkin's *Eugene Onegin*. A wizard and trickster with language, be it Russian or English, Nabokov produced a translation of this Russian classic which Wilson felt to be lacking in common sense and sensitivity to Pushkin's intent. For Wilson Nabokov's creativity and scholarship got in the way of the task of translation; and one can feel the essential justice of Wilson's position. How-

ever, the resulting literary battle revealed certain defects in both Nabokov and Wilson as well as in the translation and the criticism of it.

Wilson's concern for literary values carries him very far in his judgments on nineteenth-century Russian writers and does not entirely desert him in his discussions of writers from the Soviet period. Unfortunately, however, his own revulsion against the Communist re-

## American Religious Groups View Foreign Policy

Trends in Rank-and-File Opinion, 1937-1969

Alfred O. Hero, Jr.

Until this study, there has been no serious research on the effects of official statements of major American religious institutions on the thinking of their members and the implications of such thinking for the foreign-policy-making process. Extensive secondary analyses of surveys conducted by Gallup, Roper, the National Opinion Research Center, and the Survey Research Center and more than 150 in-depth interviews have resulted in a major source book on the thinking and behavior of religious groups toward U.S. foreign policy.

Alfred O. Hero, Jr., who holds advanced degrees in Political Science and Psychology, is Director of the World Peace Foundation and author of numerous books and articles on the roles of public opinion in foreign policy.

Duke University Press  
6697 College Station  
Durham, North Carolina 27708

gime, a revulsion which any sensitive reader will share for at least certain periods; sometimes leads him to some very wrongheaded judgments. His discussion of Solzhenitsyn's various writings is excellent and not impeded by the common desire to sing only praises for the works of this gifted and courageous man. But in other places Wilson falls from his usual careful position, as when he suggests that Anglo-Saxons might have put up more resistance to Stalin's tyranny. Such a remark shows an abysmal ignorance of the historical circumstances involved and slanders a people who have shown great courage at many points. Wilson is also wrong when he concludes a very sympathetic review of Svetlana Allilueva's book by suggesting that her *Only One Year* "will reverberate through the whole contemporary world." Allilueva is a brave and courageous human being who deserves both our sympathy and our praise, and her book is an important one; but Wilson's extreme judgment is certainly unwarranted. Ginzburg and Chukovskaya write far more poignantly on the horrors of the Stalinist system than does Wilson when he openly condemns it.

Wilson's concern for the literary craft obviously did not preclude the larger social, political and moral issues to which Russian literature is addressed. Traditionally Russian authors have been spokesmen for a people who have had no one else; and ultimately they have been heard if not always heeded. As the Russian proverb has it: "If it is written with a pen, you can't remove it with an axe." Certainly, an understanding of the dialogue between the pen and the axe is important, as is an awareness of "the power that creates and crushes" in Russian life. Neither full awareness nor understanding can be achieved by the reading of several Russian novels in translation. One requires what Wilson has given us in this volume: an appreciation of the language and its use, knowledge of the variety of styles and concerns of Russian writers and a feeling for the commonalities of the Russian experience.

## CONTRIBUTORS

ROBERT LEKACHMAN, a member of the economics faculty of the State University of New York at Stony Brook, is author of the highly regarded book on Maynard Keynes.

MARC LANDY, a member of the Department of Political Science, Alice Lloyd College, is currently on

leave and doing research at Harvard.

WILLARD BARBER served in the Department of State and the U.S. diplomatic corps from 1938 to 1962.

PAUL GOBLE is a graduate student in political science at the University of Chicago.

## Briefly Noted

*When Can I Come Home?*  
edited by Murray Polner  
(Doubleday; 267 pp.; \$1.95 [paper])

*War Resisters Canada*  
by Kenneth Fred Emerick  
Knox, Pennsylvania Free Press; 320 pp.; \$4.95)

*The New Exiles*  
by Roger Neville Williams  
(Liveright; 401 pp.; \$2.95)

In his foreword to *The New Exiles* William Sloane Coffin, in advocating an across-the-board amnesty, asserts: "It seems only right, a very small way for a country to make amends to citizens it offered the choice only of becoming killers or criminals." One complication, documented in all three volumes, is that many of the draft resisters and deserters in Canada and elsewhere claim to be in no mood to accept amnesty. Believing they have committed no crime, they feel they do not need forgiveness. This is but one wrinkle in a complex debate that is only now getting under way about what to do with these 60-100,000 "victims" of America's Indochina debacle. (Although amnesty was a code word for permissiveness in the recent presidential campaign, the issue itself was not joined.) Of course the debate may be curtailed by a President who seems to be above the give-and-take of democratic exchange and who seems to delight in surprising his people. Perhaps by the time this is published we will have an executive order granting blanket amnesty or condemning deserters to death by firing squad. But, assuming political debate will

have something to do with public policy for a while longer, these three books should prove extremely useful.

*The New Exiles* and *War Resisters Canada* are both relentlessly antiwar and pro-resistance. The first provides the more intimate insight into the everyday life and feelings of the exiles, the second is the more serious effort to understand their backgrounds and to supply a broad-ranging social analysis of the resister phenomenon. Polner's collection is more precisely a debate about the meaning and wisdom of amnesty, involving people from several disciplines and from almost every point on the political spectrum: Willard Gaylin, Edward Koch, Martin Marty, William Rusher, Ernest van den Haag, et al. Polner's pro-amnesty sympathies are evident enough, but he does a craftsmanlike job of balancing arguments and also supplying insight into positions that do not fall into clear pro or con categories. One should begin with his *When Can I Come Home?* for an introduction to the state of the question and then move on to the other two books for a stronger feeling of the human realities at stake in the debate.

*The Art of the Possible*  
by Lord (Richard Austen)  
Butler  
(Gambit; 274 pp.; \$10.00)

Of this shamelessly overpriced book John Kenneth Galbraith writes in the introduction to the American edition: "A good many men have played an important part . . . and have managed, nonetheless, to say nothing very interesting. . . . This is where Butler is the great exception. Uniquely among autobiographers, English or American, he writes to rejoice the reader and not himself." Uniquely?

One marks off such praise to the bonds of friendship. To be sure, Butler's memoirs are readable, what he says in defense of the Munich Agreement is important, and his views on Rhodesia and South Africa are interesting (if shortsighted). He is to be further credited for not dragging out his memoirs into the multivolumed historical mists in which, for example, Harold Macmillan is currently wandering. But finally *The Art of the Possible* is a too brief, frequently smug, affirmation of one man's admittedly impressive life's work. To judge by this book Lord Butler was little troubled by larger questions about the nature of history and politics. (Detractors of Johnson and Rusk will rejoice in Butler's short account of a visit to Washington while he was Foreign Minister.)

**The Myth of the Middle Class**  
by Richard Parker  
(Liveright; 232 pp.; \$7.95)

In America today 1.5 per cent of the people own at least 30.2 per cent of all privately held wealth and receive at least 24 per cent of the yearly national income. And so it goes, throughout the carefully researched, dreary, statistic-laden indictment offered by Mr. Parker of our unequal society. His purpose is simply stated: "Many people are poor and many others are deprived, while a few have enormous wealth. This is a situation I find offensive, and one which I think needs to be made known." He does not, unfortunately, speak convincingly to those who may be offended by the poverty but not by the great wealth. Nor, and this is of course closely related, does he establish that concentrated wealth is causally related to others living in misery. He concludes with a touching mix of Rousseau and Jefferson, homilies on the relationship between equality and "the natural state of man." While the argument has more to do with *ressentiment* than with justice, the book is nonetheless useful for bringing together hard data on economic inequality that is not always readily available.

**Free the Children**  
by Allen Graubard  
(Pantheon; 306 pp.; \$7.95)

A passionate and often confusing manifesto directed chiefly against the liberal assumption that "better education" can right the wrongs of a "sick society." Dr. Graubard has as little use for Ivan Illich's proposals for "deschooling" society as he has for the liberals. A professed radical of apparent socialist bent, the author advocates intensively "politicized" education (he is therefore opposed to the voucher plan approach, since it would "privatize" education by returning it to the family and other primary communities) that will prepare radicals for the task of exposing the cruel pretenses of an inherently unjust social order. The book has received considerable play and does represent yet another vision offered in place of the liberalism that has allegedly collapsed. It is mainly material, we suspect, for the pot party debates of those who view the *New York Review of Books* as the symbol of centrist establishmentarianism.

**The Myth of Population Control**  
by Mahmood Mamdani  
(Monthly Review Press; 173 pp.; \$7.95)

In 1953 the Harvard School of Public Health, financed by the Rockefeller Foundation and the Indian government, launched the first major field study in birth control. It was called the Khanna Study and focused on seven Indian villages. In 1969 it was apparent the program was an almost total failure. Mr. Mamdani, now at Harvard, analyzes that failure and argues that the researchers' conclusion that it can be attributed to "cultural misunderstanding" is a facile evasion of reality. In fact, says the author, the Indian villagers perceived their needs, including the need for a large family, more accurately than did the outsiders. The story is told with humor and compassion and will no doubt provide comfort both to those who deny there is a population explosion *and* to those who insist the explosion is

far too serious to rely any longer on voluntary restraints. In any case, this book offers an illuminating case study that should be required reading for anyone involved in thinking through the connection between population and development.

**The Church and Revolution**  
by François Houtart  
and André Rousseau  
(Orbis; 371 pp.; \$3.95 [paper])

Houtart, a French Roman Catholic sociologist of Marxist commitment, would seem to be the chief author of this global survey of liberation movements. The focus is on the Roman Catholic Church, and the authors are highly critical of its conservative head and structure, except in Latin America where they see signs of revolutionary promise. Most of the information about struggles in the various countries is available elsewhere, and the treatment of "theologies of revolution" is largely secondhand. One gathers that the authors see the main purpose of the book as making a start on the development of a sociology of revolution with specific reference to religion. The reader's satisfaction with their effort will depend largely upon his confidence in a rather conventionally restated Marxist-Leninist understanding of the revolutionary process.

**In His Image, But . . .**  
by H. Shelton Smith  
(Duke University; 318 pp.; \$8.50)

Subtitled "Racism in Southern Religion, 1780-1910," the special merit of this volume is its focus on primary sources reflecting the ways in which the everyday influences of religion reinforced Southern racism. The story, sober and lucid in its telling, is unremittingly dismal. The few bold dissidents discovered by Smith eventually succumbed to "racial orthodoxy" in a way not too different from today's trends toward a creeping withdrawal from the quest for racial justice. Smith reminds us again of the myriad ways in which moral and religious rhetoric can be used for profoundly antihuman purposes.