to follow the course of individual fortunes and the often subliminal disputes and jockeying for power (for example, between Elmer Davis and Robert Sherwood in the Office of War Information; Cordell Hull and Henry Wallace for predominant influence on the president in foreign policy matters) and to report on their implications for British interests.

In his introduction Berlin credits his personal relationship with Washington's wartime hierarchy with opening "far wider vistas" than ordinary sources of information. "A certain reciprocity obtained in these matters," he writes.

"American officials occasionally wished the British Government to be made aware of feelings and attitudes, and even specific policies, which they did not wish to formulate officially.... The despatches of my Section could act as a channel for informal communication of this kind without committing anyone to anything, and thus occasionally proved useful in promoting understanding and clearing the air."

Departments of the British Government could not afford to ignore even the most seemingly domestic of American issues. Berlin's reports include analyses of Supreme Court decisions on the Jehovah's Witnesses' refusal to salute the flag and on the acquittal of William Schneidermann, an ex-member of the Communist party, whom Willkie defended from the government's denaturalization order in 1943.

Berlin writes that the collection of his dispatches, derived from a total of 600,000 words, recreates the view of the political scene common to servants of the British Government in Washington during the war. Their significance goes beyond that modest claim. The weekly telegrams, Professor Nicholas informs us, did not serve only the Foreign Office and related departments; they were read eagerly and influenced deeply "a small but crucially important Whitehall public, and acquired a reputation unique among the official communications of the war." They are brilliant pieces of reporting, he continues, "which deserve the attention of any student of administration for their contribution to the shaping of British official thinking in wartime." For the American reader, in addition, Berlin's dispatches let us see how our society was seen — and that view was much more complex than we are prone to recall, even though those were the heady days when we were more united in certainty of purpose than at any time since.

---

**AFROCOMMUNISM**

by David and Marina Ottaway

(Africana Publishing Co., New York; 237 pp.; $25.00/$12.50)

Aaron Segal

David Ottaway is one of America's outstanding foreign correspondents, currently covering the Middle East for the *Washington Post*. His wife, Marina, is a sociologist of merit. Together they have written excellent analyses of African societies riven by deep ethnic cleavages, anywhere in Africa that wish been father to reality. The Ottaways have steeped themselves in obscure tracts that were written in European languages while refusing to acknowledge that most of Africa's fifty-two independent states, including the three they call Afrocommunism as the successor to the failed African socialism of such otherwise different countries as Zambia, Tanzania, Algeria, and Guinea (Conakry).

As fashionable and attractive as is the thesis, so is it mistaken. One has only to draw into consideration several of the other self-styled African Marxist states—Somalia, Congo-Brazzaville, the Cape Verde Islands, the Malagasy Republic, or Guinea-Bissau, for example—to erase all sense of common denominators. What remains is the simple fact that a number of African states employ at different times different bits and pieces of Marxist rhetoric, mostly for foreign consumption. The inherent fragility, instability, and persistent ethnicity of most African states dictates a concern for internal security and confers some desperately needed legitimacy. Marxist rhetoric goes with East German security advisors and Cuban troops in Angola and Ethiopia to prop internal security. Here, as elsewhere in Africa, leaders rarely believe what they say publically. Amilcar Cabral, the assassinated leader of the Guinea-Bissau nationalist movement, was the only African neo-Marxist thinker of world note, and his work receives no mention in this book, just as it finds no readers among Africa's "Afrocommunists."

A number of African states have learned that one goes to Moscow and to Eastern Europe for weapons and security advisors and to the West, including Japan, for foreign aid, private capital, and technical assistance. Language is altered accordingly. Nationalization is a product of ideology than a means of preventing the emergence of a property-owning class that might then seek power. Agricultural collectivization has been tried and has failed in scores of African capitalist and socialist states. Where it is still espoused, it is espoused for the same nonideological reason. Even though a vanguard, doctrinaire, democratically centralist political party is a frequent wish in societies riven by deep ethnic cleavages, nowhere in Africa has that wish been father to reality. The Ottaways have steeped themselves in obscure tracts that were written in European languages while refusing to acknowledge that most of Africa's fifty-two independent states, including the three they call Afrocommunism, are still organized and divided basically on ethnic rather than class lines. African socialism as rhetoric has not been able to supplant ethnic loyalties with nationalistic ones; there is little reason to believe that Afrocommunism will do better.

Well-written and tightly argued, this book asks U.S. policy-makers to take seriously African attempts to "build a communist political and economic order" and to refrain from regarding those efforts as necessarily inimical to U.S. interests. Unfortunately, the American publisher has so overpriced the hardbound and paperback editions of the book as to make it virtually unavailable in Africa and a candidate for illegal photocopying in North America. African and American readers would have been better served by a detailed study of what life is like in Angola, Mozambique, and Ethiopia, one that tested
WILLIAM CLANCY, 1923-82

William Clancy was not much over thirty and had already served as an editor at Commonweal and as a religion editor at Newsweek when he came to the Council on Religion and International Affairs (then The Church Peace Union) to launch a unique venture in American publishing.

January, 1958, as Bill characterized it in his first Worldview editorial, was “a time of troubles.” And indeed the list of problems he recited—new weapons of destruction, Soviet challenges, dissension in the Alliance, economic dislocations—reads startlingly like a carte de jour. This new journal, he said, will be concerned with the broad area of ethics and foreign affairs. At all times, among all nations, a tension between ethics and foreign policy seems inevitable.” Worldview “will not ‘preach,’ but it will insist—sometimes explicitly, more often implicitly”—that “the West’s perennial tradition, which is deeply, essentially rooted in the values of the Judeo-Christian classical humanist view of man and society [is] relevant to, even normative for, the survival of any world worth saving.”

Bill Clancy left Worldview in the fall of 1961 to seek holy orders in Rome. He later established The Oratory in Pittsburgh and became its first Provost, ministering to students in the Pittsburgh area and devoting himself to study and thought. “A work of the intelligence,” he had called Worldview, and to the same work he dedicated himself here.

On the occasion of his leavetaking from Worldview, Bill had stressed that “ours is an attempt to understand rather than an attempt to propagandize.” In words that would seem to have been uttered just this morning he counseled patience: “At a time in history such as ours...the temptation toward the slogans of the Right—‘Get rid of the Communists’—or of the Left—‘Get rid of the bomb’—are especially strong. Too many and who have a religious commitment often think that religion somehow provides an easy answer, has a word to say that will solve all of the world’s difficulties. Even while the barbarians are beating on the gates of the city, we must cultivate patience...[T]his attempt is often difficult to explain to a public impatient for solutions, but it is indispensable for our civilization, and only the fool or the philistine can fail to see its value.”

Those of us who knew Father Clancy personally and others who knew him solely as the one who laid the foundation for Worldview’s mission mourn his death from cancer at the early age of fifty-nine.

—The Editors

how a certain rhetoric affects the lives of citizens. Instead, the Ottaways have sculpted a body of beliefs and values, called them “Afrocommunism,” and purport to find them in three or more African societies. The reality looks a lot more like pragmatic opportunism to keep shaky regimes and rulers in power than a vision of a new society. [WW]

Briefly Noted

THE MAN WHO LEADS THE CHURCH: AN ASSESSMENT OF POPE JOHN PAUL II
by John Whale, Peter Hebblethwaite, and Staff of the London Sunday Times
(Harper and Row; 271 pp.; $10.95)

There is much to enjoy here, if one is not put off by other aspects of this journalistic stitching. Best of all, it is a mix of reporters’ notebooks on the odd and sometimes wondrous things that happened offstage during the pope’s journeys to Poland, Ireland, the U.S., Latin America, and elsewhere. Worst of all, it claims to be a serious “assessment” of the person and work of John Paul II.

The assessment doesn’t work because the authors seem unable to make up their minds; or perhaps there are just too many authors. The recurring judgment is that John Paul II is a truly remarkable man who has, regrettably, turned in a “clearly conservative” direction. He is encouraging a “new papalitry” that is essentially hostile to change, especially on questions of women’s rights and sexual ethics. At the same time, it is acknowledged that the pope envisions his mission as one of helping to bring about a major international realignment of powers shaping the modern world. As the authors (or an author) say, “In this vast [global] perspective, comprehending past, present and future, American and European agonizing over birth control and ordination of women seemed merely an irrelevant distraction.” At another point we are told that this conservative pope is more accurately called a “radical” because he has startled the world with a witness in which the Christian faith “is his norm, his only norm.”

This book might have been more helpful if it had more consistently acknowledged that John Paul’s course simply does not fit such secular thought slots as liberal and conservative. Right or wrong, he is advocating a quite new direction. The evidence of that, contra their dominant assessment, is to be found in the authors’ often engaging narration of what John Paul has said and done to date.

—Richard John Neuhaus

CONTRIBUTORS

Beryl Lang is a member of the Department of Philosophy at the University of Colorado, Boulder.

Gordon Zahn, Emeritus Professor of Sociology at Boston University, is now associated with the Pax Christi Center on Conscience and War in Cambridge.

Stephen J. Rosen is Professor of Economics at Edward Williams College of Fairleigh Dickinson University and a labor arbitrator.

Gerald Freund, a Worldview Contributing Editor, is Vice President of the John D. & Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation and Director of its Prize Fellows Program.

Aaron Segal, former editor of Africa Report, is co-author of The Traveler’s Africa.