

deference, and degree—the Anglo-American political world of privilege and patronage and of limited arbitrary access—he could not respond to the aroused moral passion and the optimistic and idealist impulses that gripped the minds of the Revolutionaries and that led them to condemn as corrupt and oppressive the whole system by which their world was governed. . . . There is no better testimony to the character of

the forces that were shaping the Revolutionary movement and that would determine the nature of American politics in the early national period than the failure of so prudent, experienced, and intelligent a man as Thomas Hutchinson to control them.”

Hutchinson has been freed at last from Parrington's close cell and has become again what once he had been, a figure of consequence.

## The Birth of Nations by Philip C. Jessup

(Columbia University Press; 361 pp.; \$14.95)

### Willard Barber

Starting with fifty-two charter members at the San Francisco Conference in 1945, the United Nations has now grown to a membership of over 130, and it is certain to grow still further. While diplomatic recognition of new states is not equated with admittance to membership in the U.N., the two measures often go together. *The Birth of Nations* examines the criteria for U.N. status, criteria that are not always consistently applied, subjected as they are to the countervailing influences of compromise and confrontation. Specific attention is given, sometimes in the fullest detail, to the entry into the United Nations of Korea, Indonesia, Morocco, Tunisia, Libya, Somalia and Israel. There is also an account of the illegitimate birth of a state—doomed to a very short life—Manchukuo, the offspring of Japanese aggression against China.

In his unique role as Ambassador-at-Large, and at times representing the United States in the General Assembly or the Security Council of the U.N., Philip C. Jessup played an intimate and sometimes decisive role in the international midwifery that delivered one infant state after another. Having lectured on international law and diplomacy at Columbia University and having served

after his ambassadorship as one of the judges of the World Court, he is well prepared to disentangle threads of legalisms and of power politics. The book is not, however, a legal treatise. It reads easily and cites examples to show that personal animosities and bumbling misunderstandings, and even an inefficient method of delivering messages, can often fault the performance of statesmen. Even when they occupy center stage.

The importance of nationalist sentiments, enhanced and elaborated by true believers and demagogues alike, forms a denominator common to the newly emerging states. Ho Chi Minh was a champion of nationalism who struggled against the colonial French, the conquering Japanese and, in the recent Vietnam war, against the Americans. At the time of the Versailles Peace Conference in 1919 Ho Chi Minh attempted to gain the support of Woodrow Wilson. But the American President, one of whose famed “Fourteen Points” was the self-determination of peoples, refused to receive him. After years of political and military effort Ho Chi Minh became the leader and liberator of his countrymen. An irony of history, however, has characterized him, not as a na-

tionalist, but as a Communist. (Jessup describes him as “the most dangerous and powerful agent of Soviet Communism in Southeast Asia.”)

The United States Government was not ignorant of the growing force of nationalism and the urgency of dealing with it. In 1949 the French Ambassador to Washington, M. Henri Bonnet, noted that Secretary of State Dean Acheson talked about nationalism in Southeast Asia as a counter to communism. With that he said he agreed, but the Communists were developing nationalism. All the more reason, Jessup replied, “that we should build up the non-communist nationalists.” On another occasion Jessup relates that he discussed that very matter with Jean Chauvel, the French representative to the United Nations: “I urged upon him our view that the experience of the Dutch and the British showed the folly of reluctant, slow yielding to emerging nationalism. . . .”

The United Nations influence “was direct and conclusive” in establishing statehood for Libya and Somalia. These former Italian colonies gained independence only after several years each of apprenticeship and trusteeship. Illustrative of the distinction between independence and admission to the U.N. is the case of Libya. Her independence was proclaimed in 1951, but she was held back from U.N. membership until 1955 due to a lengthy controversy over admitting other states. “Italy was caught in the same membership freeze and was admitted to UN membership at the same time as its former colony.”

Israel was recognized by President Truman in 1948 and joined the U.N. in 1949. The prenatal and birth pangs of Israel were sharp and acute, but not as long-lasting as those of others. At various intermediary steps United States delegates caucused often and lengthily with Latin American and Canadian representatives at U.N. headquarters. But the act of unilateral recognition by the White House upset not only friendly delegations that had been working on the problem with

the U.S., but caused Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, a member of the U.S. Delegation, to "be stirred to indignation" by the way recognition came about, which "has created complete consternation in the United Nations . . .," as she informed Secretary of State George Marshall.

Tidbits of gossip and sidelights of individual heroics and more frequent gaffes lighten the tone of this personal and perceptive account. The personalized records of historic moments, the author feels, should be made known. The names and deeds of scores of participants in these events are set forth. Of his own wise leadership and diplomatic skill that helped bring independence to millions of people there is a modest minimum.

## Briefly Noted

**Chronicles of Wasted Time  
Vol. 2: The Infernal Grove**  
by Malcolm Muggeridge  
(Morrow; 280 pp.; \$9.95)

It has been said that Malcolm Muggeridge is the finest living writer of English prose. You will get no argument on that from this corner. His neo-Augustinian philosophy issues in sententious pronouncements that are often indistinguishably cynical and otherworldly. But even his philosophy is not spared his wit and debunking sense of the absurdity of things. In this volume, covering the late thirties and the war years, he offers searing, sometimes kind, but always fascinating, sketches of writers, spies, politicians, and sundry odd balls he has known, including André Gide, Wodehouse, Burgess and Philby, Field Marshal Montgomery, De Gaulle, and many more. If, as Muggeridge is persuaded, civilization is rapidly collapsing, he turns the ending into a very good show indeed. It is the very fortunate reader who, after completing this issue of *Worldview*, has anything more delightful or rewarding to pick up than this second volume of a memoir that promises to become, yes, a classic.

## CONTRIBUTORS

STEPHEN ROUSSEAS, Kenan Professor of Economics and Chairman of the Department of Economics at Vassar, is author of *Death of a Democracy: Greece and the American Conscience*.

PETER L. BERGER, an Associate Editor of *Worldview* and Professor of Sociology at Rutgers, is author, most recently (with Brigitte Berger and H. Kellner), of *The Homeless Mind—Modernization and Consciousness*.

HENRY PLOTKIN teaches political theory and American politics at Livingston College, Rutgers University.

ROBERT K. LANDERS is a reporter for the Torrington, Conn., *Register*.

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

mentative force and a strong grasp of the pertinent data, Tuveson of the University of California, Berkeley, demonstrates that the various notions of America's "manifest destiny" cannot be understood apart from the pervasive religious millennialism that permeated eighteenth and nineteenth-century culture. The core assumptions of millennialism, says Tuveson, cross the line usually drawn between Puritan and Enlightenment progressivist views of the American experiment. The mystique of the frontier, the ancillary benefits of commercial imperialism, and other notions used to explain American messianism are, if Tuveson is right, themselves merely reinforcements of the confidence that America signaled the dawn of the definitive epoch in which a new cosmic order would be established. There is no better book for revealing the origins of the idea of manifest destiny, now so widely lamented and so little understood.

**The Gospel of Liberation**  
by Jürgen Moltmann  
(Word; 136 pp.; \$5.95)

The market for books of sermons was supposed to have collapsed about thirty years ago. But from time to time such a book catches on, often when written by an academic not noted for his pastoral role. Professor Moltmann of the University of Tübingen has here put together sermons and radio talks which might well show others how to articulate a "theology of hope" in a world not at all sure that it has a future.

**Religion and Violence**  
by Robert McAfee Brown  
(Westminster; 112 pp.; \$3.95 [paper])

Most of the material will be familiar to people who have stayed on top of the last decade's ample literature on violence, pacifism, just revolution, liberation ethics, and the such. But Professor Brown's is a valuable summary of a complex discussion and a moving appeal for the religious community to play a more

**Dissent in  
American Religion**  
by Edwin Scott Gaustad

(University of Chicago Press; 184 pp.; \$6.95)

From the white man's beginning in the New World dissent has challenged and thus shaped the way the American experiment was conducted. Here, a distinguished historian of American religion touches lightly on the stories and varieties of dissent, ending up with a definitely mixed review of the religious side of what used to be called the youth culture. He affirms the biblical admonition, "Test everything: hold fast what is good." He adds: "Dissent neither conducts the examination nor controls the results: it only insures throughout history that testing will take place."

**Redeemer Nation: The  
Idea of America's  
Millennial Role**

by Ernest Lee Tuveson  
(University of Chicago Press; 133 pp.; \$3.25 [paper])

Its reappearance in paperback provides excuse to call attention once more to this admirable study first published in 1968. With great argu-

vigorous role as the exponent of revolutionary nonviolent love. What may be lacking in the sharpness of Brown's critique is more than made up for by his sympathy in understanding the internal logic of opposing viewpoints.

## Christian Asceticism

by J. A. Ziesler

(Eerdmans; 118 pp.; \$2.25 [paper])

In view of the resource limitations of the planet, there has been in recent years a good deal of discussion about reviving asceticism. For those unfamiliar with the ascetical tradition in Christianity this little paperback might be a good place to begin thinking about some of the ambiguities and very practical possibilities in discovering that less can be more.

## Correspondence

(from p. 2)

position is argued from the perspective of World War I it carries little pertinence or plausibility. Read's point of view is characterized as "archaic." It should be noted, contrary to the impression left by Mr. Barber, that all but one of the six essays that comprise the text were written subsequent to the outbreak of the Second World War. However, the date of authorship is not under dispute, but rather the continuing relevancy of the substance of Read's work. The closing essay, "Chains of Freedom," perhaps the most speculative of all Sir Herbert's political writings, touches upon virtually every major theme that has been with social philosophy since Plato, and Read's social criticism is as strong here as anywhere. He foreshadows and paraphrases the contemporary criticism of Herbert Marcuse when he writes that "the most mentally enslaved people in the world today are the uniform citizens of a democratic republic like America."

3. Mr. Barber misrepresents a very key aspect of Read's anarchism in stating that Read is attracted to anarchism "precisely because he as-

sumes that men are naturally communal," and that Read "takes a view of human nature so benign and promising as to make evil and suffering seem impossible except as products of accidents or ignorance." On page 43 of *Anarchy and Order* Read explicitly states that his anarchism is not based on an assumption of the natural goodness of human nature. Read's anarchism is founded upon a certain view of the natural world and of man's relationship to the natural world—two central concerns of Read's which Barber does not discuss.

4. Mr. Barber, perhaps partly due to an ignorance of Read's total corpus, misconstrues Sir Herbert's concern with the relation of art to society. *Anarchy and Order* is said to constitute an attempt to integrate the artist and society, which, according to Mr. Barber, would result in the perversion of both. But this is not Sir Herbert's concern. His concern is to make evident the need for a social ordering which does not conflict with individual sensibilities. In his autobiographical work, *The Contrary Experience*, Read said: "Anarchism asserts—it is its only assertion—that life must be so ordered that the individual can live a natural life, 'attending to what is within' . . ." Read does not primarily seek "artistic freedom," as Mr. Barber says, but human freedom. And the role which art plays in human freedom—the theme which synthesizes Read's diverse writings—is not touched upon by Mr. Barber.

5. Finally, Mr. Barber attempts to liken Sir Herbert's anarchism to liberalism in the respect that they both equate politics with power, and power with evil. But whereas the liberal accepts the necessity of politics and tries to minimize the abuse of power, the anarchist wants to do away with politics and thereby with power. What Mr. Barber is getting at is that Read's anarchism is a stubborn liberalism carried to a point of extremity and coupled with a more optimistic view of man. This is an inaccurate assessment of Read's anarchism, as it is an inaccurate assessment of anarchism in general.

(A survey-type essay by William D. Reichert is helpful on this point. See *Ethics*, January, 1969.) The inaccuracy of Mr. Barber's account can be seen if attention is given, not to the way in which Sir Herbert's attitude toward political power is a variation of the liberal position, but to the underlying consideration which Read gives to man's relationship with nature. The problem of individual liberty, the solution to which finds liberalism ushering in one theory of government or another, is of secondary importance to Read. The more fundamental problem has to do with individual aesthetic sensibilities. It is Read's awareness of this problem that leads him, in "Poetry and Anarchism," to equate our lack of aesthetic sense with our lack of social freedom, and the cause of the arts with the cause of revolution.

While desiring to wholly renounce Mr. Barber's treatment of Sir Herbert, I would not wish to boost Read onto a pedestal of irreproachability. Sir Herbert certainly has his weak points: His reliance on organic metaphors is the most obvious, but his critique of Marxism by way of Russian communism is also very troubling. *Anarchy and Order* is an indelibly marked product of the mid-twentieth century, yet one of the critic's tasks should be to extract what is of lasting value in a work. Mr. Barber fails to do this, and, what is worse, he leads one to believe that there is little of lasting value in Read's work to be extracted.

Alan Waters

Colgate University  
Hamilton, N.Y.

Mr. Barber originally wrote: "No one ought then to be surprised to discover that Read's *Essays in Politics* (published here for the first time under the title *Anarchy and Order*, seventeen years after their original English publication and three years after the author's death). . . ." A line dropped out of the galley as we went to press. Our apologies to Mr. Barber—and to Mr. Waters, who was misled by the printer's error.

—The Editors