

opportunism and convenient appeals to popularly held sentiments such as nationalism and "soviet" power. "Communism," Ulam boldly declares, "is just an ideological veneer over Russian nationalism." As every movement, the Bolsheviks certainly had their opportunistic element, and even today Communists are eager to exploit nationalistic appeals. But one could argue as well that Leninism was a reasonably coherent and sincerely held belief system, a synthesis of old and new perspectives, which had some novel relevance to Russian society.

Finally, one expectation suggested by the book's subtitle is in fact never fully met. Ulam devotes less than a tenth of his argument to contemporary dissent. It is true, of course, that the modern dissidents' position is much weaker than that of even their predecessors, the Decembrists. Nonetheless, critics of the present regime are by no means less fervent or less articulate advocates of the libertarian spirit, however it may be understood. Especially intriguing for Ulam's purposes is the fact that these dissidents speak in radically different voices about what freedom might mean in the Soviet setting—just compare a Solzhenitsyn with a Sakharov. These contradictory impulses have yet to be explored fully, a fact that should invite Ulam to prepare a new study on the evolution of modern Soviet dissidence.

**THE AGE OF SURVEILLANCE:  
THE AIMS AND METHODS  
OF AMERICA'S POLITICAL  
INTELLIGENCE SYSTEM**

by Frank J. Donner

(Alfred A. Knopf; 554 pp., \$17.95)

John B. Keeley

On occasion one reviews a book that is disappointing because of what it might have been with better editing. *The Age of Surveillance* is just such a "might have been" book—might have been receiving better reviews, might have conveyed an important story to the public in a far more convincing manner, and, consequently, might have accomplished what the author so passionately desired. Instead we have a book that is poorly structured, badly balanced, redundant, pedantic, occasionally tendentious, and a mighty chore to read. Having said all this, I hasten to

add that I am glad to have read Mr. Donner's book, and, bad as it is, I thank him for writing it.

In a deliberate, exhaustive, almost tortuous fashion the author lays bare the political surveillance activities of private and public organizations. People, places, and events are documented with such detail as to be overwhelming at times. Over a hundred pages alone are devoted to J. Edgar Hoover who, as the book reveals, destroyed himself and betrayed not only the public's trust but that of his own organization as well. Still, for all his paranoia about communism and his manipulation of Congress and presidents alike, Hoover did create an agency that combatted interstate crime, frustrated corporate fraud, and was more effective in its counterintelligence role than is generally known. Even devils must have their due. To have given Mr. Hoover his would have added credibility to Donner's more important judgments. And do we really need to know that the director had such a phobia about germs that he ordered the installation of violet-ray toilet lamps or that he was so concerned about his safety that he forbade left turns of his limousine and propped a decoy hat in his car to confuse would-be assassins?

Hoover and the FBI are truly the devil incarnate to Donner, and he devotes the first six chapters of his volume almost exclusively to them. The reader who endures this will be rewarded in the remaining six chapters with a relatively more thoughtful and balanced consideration of the domestic surveillance activities (especially during the 1960s and '70s) of the military, the presidential office, CIA, Congress, the Internal Revenue Service, and of numerous private organizations.

The book documents wire-tapping, "dirty tricks," extensive file-keeping, break-ins, provocations, and disinformation involving thousands of United States citizens and hundreds of organizations. According to Donner, there is scarcely a scintilla of evidence to justify undertaking these activities but apparently much to show that, in fact, these activities failed to protect us from the bombings, riots, or lesser civil disturbances that actually threatened the public interest. Donner provides no analysis and little reasoned argument to support these premises. He wins his case—almost—by his massive documentation (639 citations) and by his

extraordinary devotion to a subject that has been his passion for twenty years.

I cannot imagine anyone knowing more about the history of political surveillance in the U.S. than Frank Donner. I couldn't be more impressed if he knew the batting averages of every player in the World Series since 1945. Unhappily, Mr. Donner's passion, which he states clearly in the introduction, clouds his understanding and weakens his case. Speaking of his accumulation of material on the abuse of civil liberties, he states:

"[It] served a deep personal need. The files and each item in them became for me a form of remonstrance, a private protest against betrayal by the government of its democratic premises. Beyond this lay the vague hope that someday I might wrest time from my law practice to present my final accounting in a book. My work as a civil liberties lawyer not only provided fresh material for my files but sharpened my desire to put it all down in a grand reckoning."

All of this from the man who abhors the files kept by others—granting that there are files and then there are files....

As the "tringe elements" of Right and Left again marshal their forces to destroy each other, my concern grows about the sins that Donner describes. His book has sharpened my unease considerably but deepened my understanding only slightly. Perhaps there is an inherent tendency in governments to stifle dissent, to confuse sedition with political radicalism. Beyond documenting the sins of the past, Mr. Donner could have helped us deal better with the future. **WV**

**CONQUEST OF WORLD HUNGER  
AND POVERTY**

by Douglas Ensminger  
and Paul Boman

(Iowa State University Press, 107 pp., \$7.50)

William J. Byron

This is a solid and sensible book, helpfully analytic and sufficiently prescriptive to merit the attention of agricultural policy-makers here and in the less developed countries.

Douglas Ensminger, former Ford Foundation representative for India and

Pakistan (1951-53) and for India and Nepal (1953-70), is a professor of rural sociology at the University of Missouri. Co-author Paul Bomani is Tanzania's ambassador to the United States. He served his nation as minister for agriculture and cooperatives (1960-62), for finance (1962-65), and for economic affairs and development planning (1965-70). Their book is brief and not unduly technical, its small size (like the small farm units the authors advocate for more effective food-crop production in poor countries) provides a manageable challenge. Careful cultivation of these well-organized ideas will yield both comprehension of the problem and the outline of a comprehensive solution over three generations.

"Poverty is the warehouse of hunger," writes the vice-president of Tanzania, Al-haj Aboud M. Jumbe, in his introduction to this volume. The authors agree. They know, however that the warehouse will not be dismantled without a cultural transformation and destruction of the conditions that create poverty. They also say it won't happen without the redirection of human development programs toward the reinforcement of self-respect, which, once achieved, can facilitate the integration of the rural poor into the socio-economic and as well as the political structures of the nation.

A central element in the needed cultural transformation is the substitution of an "improved quality of life" value for the development-impeding "survival" value embedded in poverty cultures. The authors keep returning to the "landless laborers," who quite literally embody the painful problem of hunger and who must be organized around a quality-of-life issue if development is to come about. "It is impossible to overstate the difference between the existing value to survive, if they can, and the value to improve the quality of life. The improved quality of life value is presently foreign to those locked in poverty."

Ensminger and Bomani are speaking here of values that are related to eating habits. Diversified food crops produced for regional markets and providing diets targeted to human energy requirements involve a shift from single food-cropping. Conditions for producing essential crops necessary to meet these requirements and better nutrition are impeded by survival values that

prompt the poor to farm as they have for generations. "Until those in poverty can feel secure, they will not risk their chances of survival." For example, to introduce home garden programs into rural economies is to run "against the cultural grain and present preferences for single cereal diets." But the task is not impossible. It must be accomplished if the quality-survival paradox is to be solved.

"Top-down" and "trickle-down" strategies must yield to new policies that help to support families. The new criterion for measuring progress should be quality of life, not gross national product. The authors are not unaware that interdisciplinary research is required to construct the new measuring rod. An essential element, however, is a nutritionally adequate diet for all.

People are not poor because they are incapable of development as human beings but because they are denied access to opportunity, to the many services and institutions that move the development process along. Financing is a problem, of course. Deeper still is the problem of land reform understood as "an intervention in the prevailing pattern of land ownership, control and usage to increase productivity and to broaden the distribution of benefits." In what only can be described as an understatement intended to suggest the enormity of the challenge, the authors write: "To accomplish this reform the individuals who benefit from the present setup will stand to lose a lot of property. It is no wonder that the elite in poor countries are opposed to its implementation."

Ensminger and Bomani are sensitive to the importance of involving the people, particularly women, in the solution of their own problems of poverty and hunger. The emphasis on small-farm agriculture, on integrated agricultural development, and on integrated rural development reflects a bias toward the people and a patience with the process of reform. They give insufficient attention, however, to the structural problems of land ownership and the distribution of returns available from export-cropping.

I would put this book in the company of *To Feed This World*, by Sterling Wortman and Ralph Cummings, Jr. (Johns Hopkins, 1978), as a useful policy guide for those in a position to influence the development process in a hungry world. 

**NESC**

**NATIONAL ECUMENICAL  
STUDENT CONFERENCE**

**August 21-25  
University of California,  
Berkeley**

*For brochures and application forms,  
please write to: John Moyer, 464 19th  
Street, Oakland, California 94612  
or call (415) 835-9631.*

## **WOMEN OF THE REPUBLIC**

**by Linda K. Kerber**

(University of North Carolina Press  
[for the Institute of Early American  
History and Culture, Williamsburg,  
Va.], 293 pp.; \$19.50/9.00)

*Jean Yarbrough*

The prevailing interpretation of the Founding is that it established a liberal representative democracy. Recently, students of the American Revolution have been challenging this interpretation, and one group of scholars has explored the Founding from the perspective of a republican tradition of concern for participation and civic virtue. Whereas many feminists tend to view the demand for women's rights as a logical extension of the liberal democratic emphasis on equality and individual rights, Kerber examines women's political participation during the Revolution and analyzes the meaning of female patriotism. Subsequent chapters consider property and divorce laws, female education and reading.

Kerber's point is that although the entire Western tradition of political philosophy excluded women from political affairs, some American women recognized the "socially radical" implications of republicanism and developed a "new female ideology" to justify women's political role in the Republic. This "ideology of Republican Motherhood," as she calls it, imbued traditional domestic responsibilities with political significance. Women could play a