

War and Peace. *It is useless to talk vaguely of One World unless the changing shape of that world is known. The studies reviewed this week describe the unique postwar position of the United States in the world in terms of foreign economic and political policy. As a contrast, we recommend Barbara Ward's recent "The West at Bay," a brilliant analysis of the world situation from the European point of view. Miss Ward's concluding words define the ultimate issue involved in war or peace in Europe: "The West is offered the choice of fulfilling the promise inherent . . . within it of creating a free, good, and just society. Or it will fail all the more speedily because of the chasm between its pretensions and its practice. These are the stakes. Who will say they are not worthy of the supreme effort of free men?"*

Appraising the Globe

THE UNITED STATES IN WORLD AFFAIRS. By John C. Campbell. New York: Harper & Bros. 1948. 572 pp. \$5.

FOREIGN ECONOMIC POLICY FOR THE UNITED STATES. Edited by Seymour E. Harris. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1948. 490 pp. \$6.

Reviewed by FOSTER RHEA DULLES

THESE two impressive books could hardly stress more strongly the tremendous importance of the United States in the present-day world. While in many respects quite different in their approach to international problems, they are wholly agreed that the way in which this country meets the challenge of our times will largely determine the future of mankind.

This emphasis upon our paramount influence in world affairs is not, however, their most significant contribution to an understanding of the present critical situation. Such a point hardly needs to be labored. Their real value lies in their broad and authoritative treatment of the topics which they take up, the hard core of objective fact in every chapter, and the sober appraisal which they make of American foreign policy against the background of the division today existing between Soviet Russia and the Western democracies. Neither book will sweep the best-seller lists. They do not have happy endings, are not guaranteed to stop our worrying, and do not present any panaceas for the problems of war, peace, and economic stability. But both of them might well be required reading for those editorial writers, radio commentators, and other publicists whose obligation it is to provide the American people with an understanding of

world affairs which will give intelligent direction to the influence they exert in the making of our foreign policy.

In several ways, "The United States in World Affairs" is the more valuable of the two books. One of a continuing series that has been issued since 1931 by the Council on Foreign Relations, it is a survey of American foreign policy from the spring of 1937 through the spring of 1948. It neither defends nor criticizes that policy. The degree to which it maintains this objectivity in discussing the Russian-American controversies which overshadow every major phase of our policy, whether in regard to European recovery, the Far East, or the United Nations, is a valuable corrective to so much of what is today being written on international issues. There is throughout the book highly intelligent interpretation of world developments, but basically these nearly 600 pages are a quiet recording of facts.

"Foreign Economic Policy for the United States" is also informed and authoritative, but, made up as it is of individual contributions by some twenty-five practising and academic economists, there is a greater tendency for interpretation to conform to individual theories on the proper approach to an adjustment of the world's economic ills. In an introductory chapter on "Issues of Policy," however, Mr. Harris stresses what appears to this reviewer to be a fundamental point. So far as the leaders of Soviet Russia have convinced themselves that capitalism is bound to fail in the United States, and consequently feel no need at this time to seek any real rapprochement with the West, it is imperative that the United States stabilize its economy at high levels of employment and in-

come. Mr. Harris is highly critical of the course that we are pursuing. The alternatives he sees before the nation under existing circumstances are a dubious prosperity maintained by spending for military purposes, including contributions to the European Recovery Program, or a major depression in which the United States would drag down the rest of the world. However valid the discouraging view may be, there would appear to be little question that in the long run an effective foreign policy is wholly dependent upon our economic well-being.

To return to "The United States in World Affairs," Mr. Campbell emphasizes the importance of economic issues from a somewhat different angle. He believes that it was when Molotov broke up the first European conference on the Marshall Plan in July 1947—and it is hard today to realize that there was ever any remote prospect of Soviet participation—that the really decisive break occurred between the East and West. The Western powers, he writes, could afford delays on such political issues as the negotiation of a peace treaty with Germany, but they could not afford delays in taking steps to save western Europe from economic disaster. And when the United States adopted the positive concept of creating a free, stable, and prosperous Europe, it did not matter whether there were any aggressive designs behind this program. Russian fears and hostility were inevitably aroused.

The broad scope of both these books graphically illustrates how closely interwoven are the destinies of the countries making up the world community today. "The United States in World Affairs" takes up the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan,

FRASER YOUNG'S LITERARY CRYPT: No. 282

A cryptogram is writing in cipher. Every letter is part of a code that remains constant throughout the puzzle. Answer No. 282 will be found in the next issue.

THROWLWA BLFGECF

FGECAGF LK TRMEO TEKF.

NEWPCNLCK

Answer to Literary Crypt No. 281

To have what you want is riches; but to be able to do without is power.

—GEORGE McDONALD.

the problem of Germany, developments in Asia, Latin America, and the Near East, the crisis in the United Nations. In "Foreign Economic Policy for the United States," there are discussions of individual countries and areas, efforts toward international economic cooperation, the European Recovery Program, and what are termed "problems of international equilibrium." Each of these topics intimately concerns the United States. We can no more escape the conse-

quences of struggle in Palestine, inflation in Latin America, civil war in China, or disagreements in the International Trade Organization than we can those of a contest with Soviet Russia over control of Berlin. It remains One World, even though we have so far tragically failed to prevent its political division into two rival camps and have been unable to realize the hopeful aspirations that three short years ago underlay the establishment of the United Nations.

nestle the feelings of pride, revenge, hatred, and jealousy, which every now and then burst their bounds and deluge whole countries with blood." He quotes Proudhon: "Let us suppress the tariffs, and the alliance of the peoples will thus be declared, their solidarity recognized, their equality proclaimed." What was the common principle which led them to such agreement? Both believed in the basic value of human liberty, and no matter how much their circuits diverged they came back to the same point: people can accommodate themselves to each other because they are members of the same human family; governments cannot because their existence depends on the differences between them. In other words, they saw that in the nature of things individuals will unite while governments must, contrariwise, quarrel in order to be "strong."

Although we often talk of them as if they were real, none of the international panaceas which Professor Morgenthau analyzes so exhaustively ever functioned in modern times. There has been no world union of governments, nor any government that conquered the world, nor any disarmament machinery that actually disarmed anybody. But there was, when England occupied the position the United States does today, a liberal government which nearly succeeded in eliminating war from the politics of the Western world. Its policy, as formulated by Cobden, was "Peace, Free Trade, and Good-Will amongst Nations." It stood for a peaceful free-trade commercialism in place of aggressive monopolistic imperialism, and it almost persuaded the greatest empire of our era to cease being an empire. Through England it exerted a paramount influence for peace, until Bismarck created a new Germany on the fire-eating Prussian model. Then it failed, to be sure; but the useful fact for us to remember is that it once succeeded. Of what other policies or devices can this be said?

Those who fear the corruption of wealth and see the sins of liberalism in its emphasis upon the individualistic virtues of foresight, industry, thrift, and saving—who see something malign in its insistence upon every person's responsibility for living his life so that he can, toward the end of it, furnish his own social security—may adopt its formula of freedom for men, goods, and ideas under the more gaily colored flag of anarchism. What is an anarchist, after all, but a jived-up liberal? This suggestion is worth pondering by Professor Morgenthau's students after they emerge from his stimulating course in international relations.

Peace Through Diplomacy

POLITICS AMONG NATIONS. By Hans J. Morgenthau. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 1948. 489 pp. \$5.50.

Reviewed by ASHER BRYNES

IT is a pleasure to find a book about international affairs which has, for once, an accurate label on it. Nor is this virtue limited to the outside covers. Professor Morgenthau takes his theme seriously, refrains from disguising his own point of view, and, despite the fact that he appears in full academic regalia (footnotes, appendix, bibliography, and analytic index), he casts a vote like any other citizen. His scholarship, in other words, is used to support his convictions and not to disguise them. This is an unusual textbook. Readers who can bear with the author's pedagogic habit of frequently classifying the obvious under numbered heads, i.e., firstly, secondly, thirdly, and so forth, will find it a valuable introduction to the study of diplomacy in the present century.

Professor Morgenthau's fundamental postulate is that we will continue to live in a world of nations for a long time to come. "Politics Among Nations"—notice that he does not say *between* nations—is therefore a capsule statement of his conclusion. To be sure, he is careful to make the reservations and add the qualifiers you would expect of a well-trained scholar. Diplomacy, he says, is the best means of preserving peace, but it is not good enough now. He is crushingly specific, however, in discarding all other courses of action. Ideas of a world state or world federation or, in fact, any kind of international government, of global Socialism or planetary Communism or any kind of universalistic nationalism—they are all lumped with collective-security schemes, arbitration devices, and disarmament machinery. Indeed, Professor Morgenthau does not even forget to dispose of the old Manchester School formula for peace: free trade. With one exception, all are

copiously and, in the opinion of this reviewer, convincingly checked out.

Free trade is dismissed with a single sentence printed twice at the beginning of the book. "Adherents of free trade, such as Cobden and Proudhon, were convinced that the removal of trade barriers was the only condition for the establishment of permanent harmony among nations and might even lead to the disappearance of international politics altogether." That is all. But who were Cobden and Proudhon? One was a liberal, the other an anarchist; they flourished in the middle of the last century. They were the most important exponents of their respective political creeds, and the latter, indeed, is being revived by Dwight MacDonald at the present time.

Professor Morgenthau has thoroughly examined the political horizon. He just notices—but few others have seen even so much—that anarchists and liberals were moving toward the same goal. He quotes Cobden: "Free Trade! What is it? Why, breaking down the barriers that separate nations; those barriers behind which



—© Chicago Times, Inc.

"Lost, Little Boy?"

NOVEMBER 13, 1948

21