

terms. In his early chapters he shows "materialism" repudiating the great tradition of democracy that fosters the highest hopes of men as individuals. It has at last come to full fruition in the menace of Communism that staggers half the world; it is a philosophy that ignores man's spiritual yearnings, his high aspirations, and his unconquerable faiths; it is categorically dogmatic; it turns man into a machine; and it stands opposed to most of what religion has always valued.

I run no risk of the charge of dogmatism in asserting that not one of these statements is philosophically well founded or categorically true. Professor Sinnott comes closer to fact when he charges that nineteenth-century materialism was "simple and naive" because physics was simple and naive, and "matter" was a thing debased by being placed in antithesis to "spirit."

Then, after 1900, came the revolution in which the Newtonian cosmos became blurred in the theory of relativity. Democritus's "hard atoms" became blurred in quantum mechanics, nuclear physics, and probability theory. Matter became energy and energy became matter, and time was tied to both. Space became curved. The universe took on the appearance of a great atomic explosion renewing itself by perpetual and spontaneous creation. Thus, when Professor Sinnott tells us that materialism is founded "on the concept that matter is the ultimate reality and that man himself, with all he is and strives to be, must be regarded finally as nothing but a 'complex material system,'" it does not hurt quite so much, because if man is "nothing but" a complex material system, he is also, in G. G. Simpson's words, "The most highly endowed organization of matter that has yet appeared on earth—and we certainly have no good reason to believe that there is any higher in the universe." Peculiarly, for many people, it is less distressing to be "part of" the great atomic explosion than it was to be part of the old-fashioned Newtonian universe.

Consequently, it is not surprising to find that in this same chapter Professor Sinnott comes at last to equate materialism with humanism, wherein "God is indeed abandoned, but man is left." By the humanists, man is regarded "not as a sinful and degraded being, fallen from his previous high

estate and needing to be redeemed, but as a noble animal who has struggled up the long evolutionary pathway to that exalted biological level where he can accumulate the experience of the past and thus become the heir of all the ages, moving on to heights of which he now hardly dreams. Science he sees as the bright sword of the mind, cleaving through ancient irrationalities, taboos, and dogmas that hinder the free sweep of his powers toward that more abundant life where the immense possibilities of man will come to full fruition." This is, in essence, the creed of Julian Huxley, Irwin Edman, Bertrand Russell, and many others. "Such an attitude," Professor Sinnott says, "has within it a quality deserving to be called religious, though far from orthodox." This humanist materialism goes back to John Dewey, who called it "naturalism" long before matter became energy and vice versa.

To many who want to see man better than he is, and who sincerely believe that, if science and religion could find a common ground man would actually be better for it, it seems that this common ground will have to be sought within the terms of "naturalism" (though call it materialism if you will).

But Professor Sinnott is more apt to lose than to gain aid for this synthesis by placing "intuition" on a philosophical parity with scientific knowledge, ignoring that intuition works as frequently for error as for truth, as frequently for evil as for good. Intuition can logically justify any and every end, and therefore logically it cannot be used to justify any end. And when he speaks of man's "instinctive ideas" he ignores the fact that man, of all mammals, has almost no demonstrable instincts whatever, but lives by the acquired knowledge of the individual and the race. These are not literary devices but the instruments of ontology, as when Professor Sinnott argues that man's instinctive aspirations for beauty, goodness, and divinity prove that there is something in the universe to satisfy these longings, that intuitive apprehension goes directly to reality, or that the religious experience needs no proof that that which it maintains is true. Uninstructed intuitionism is a road to neoplatonism and intellectual chaos.

In these areas where I disagree with Professor Sinnott, "it is not because I can swim but to show that the water is really deep." We should listen to sermons not to confirm our faith but to broaden it. Whatever the road to ultimate truth—if indeed any road will ever lead there—we all believe that, by giving thought, man can stir his earthy dust to finer things.



—Blackstone Studios.

Frank Howley—"tough-and-cocky."

The Strong Reaction

YOUR WAR FOR PEACE. By Frank L. Howley. New York: Henry Holt & Co. 166 pp. \$2.75.

By MARGUERITE HIGGINS

BRIGADIER GENERAL Frank Howley, former American commandant in Berlin, was popular with foreign correspondents because he was colorful, voluble, and courageous. So is his new book.

In the early days of the German occupation, General Howley's comments used to send shivers down the spines of some of the more cautious State Department diplomats, especially those sheltered from direct contact with Soviet negotiators. As long ago as July 1945, General Howley began learning about the Russians through the practical business of trying to cooperate with them in the administration of the city of Berlin. He decided quickly that there was no such thing as a compromise with a Soviet Communist and his new book shows he hasn't changed his mind. "Your War for Peace," written in General Howley's typically blunt and provocative manner, denounces the so-called "containment policies" of the past and suggests a more dynamic method for coping with the Soviet menace in the future.

General Howley's diagnosis of foreign policy is based on a very recent trip to Europe as well as on his war and postwar experiences. The former Berlin commandant, who is now vice chancellor of New York University, definitely addresses his book to the average man rather than to the historian or to the professional student of foreign affairs. He makes no attempt at complete documentation, but relies rather on anecdote to convey

Homer W. Smith is professor of physiology at New York University College of Medicine, and the author of "Kamongo" and "Man and His Gods."



—J. H. K. Press Features.

Budu Svanidze, with Gregory Bessedovsky—"the question of honesty is crucial."

the flavor of a country or to put across an opinion. For example, his anecdotal description of the French as individualists *sans pareil* was hilarious and, as anyone who has visited France will agree, very true.

To this reviewer, General Howley's position is weakest when he is discussing areas of the world that he has not actually visited, such as India, Yugoslavia, and Iran. Concerning Iran, for example, he indicates that the thing to do is get tough with that country in order to force its recognition of British rights to the Abadan oil refineries. But this policy would, in this reviewer's opinion (and I have just returned from Iran) accomplish just the opposite of what General Howley advocates in his book, since the Iranians, embittered by many years of British interference in their affairs, would prefer Russian Communism to the return of British authorities. But in fairness it should be pointed out that only a small proportion of "Your War for Peace" deals with second-hand impressions.

The failure of the State Department's containment policy, according to General Howley, is that it has left the initiative completely to the Russians. As General Howley puts it: "The trouble with our past actions is that we were always making plans to meet the aggressive plans of the Russians, instead of making them adjust their plans to fit ours."

Marguerite Higgins, Pulitzer prize winner for her correspondence from Korea in 1951, at one time was chief of the Berlin bureau of the New York Herald Tribune.

General Howley advocates "a program of aggressive righteousness—a policy which will use whatever force is best calculated to serve our purposes, be they military, economic, political or psychological. Such a policy cannot be piecemeal. There is no point in being strong in Korea if we are weak at the conference table in Paris. To follow such a policy we must first build up our military might to the point where it would be folly for the Russians to resort to the use of military force. . . ."

As for the Soviets, General Howley feels that "they are out to get us and we had better get them first." Among the weapons that can be used effectively against the Soviet world, he says, are total economic boycott and encouragement of subversion in the satellites.

Here is another excerpt typifying the tough-and-cocky note of "Your War for Peace": "As part of our detailed plan, when we are ready, we should withdraw the respectability of recognition which the present criminal organization in the Kremlin enjoys. We should put an end to the farce of joyously bowing to the Russians at social functions while they stimulate warfare which is killing our people. We should close up our consulates and our embassies where we are not welcome and kick theirs out of the United States in those areas where they are simply serving espionage purposes and we should not accept insult or imprisonment of American citizens on flimsy charges."

General Howley writes very much as he talks. It may not be great prose, but it is intriguing enough to hold your attention.

Old Man of Moscow

MY UNCLE JOSEPH STALIN. By Budu Svanidze. Translated by Waverley Root. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 235 pp. \$3.

By HARRY SCHWARTZ

OF ALL the outstanding figures in the contemporary world, none surely presents so personally (as well as politically) mysterious a guise as Joseph Stalin. Of the flesh-and-blood man beneath the august symbol, we know surprisingly little. Is he married? What does he do for relaxation? What is the state of his health? These and a multitude of other similarly personal questions are deliberately left unanswered by the Soviet press as it seeks to hide the human feet of clay concealed by the aura of jovian infallibility.

Mr. Svanidze's book purports to offer us new and reliable information on the human being who is Joseph Stalin. As the title indicates, the author claims to be Stalin's nephew, an assertion backed in the book's introduction by one Gregory Bessedovsky, said to be a former Soviet diplomat who served in France. The body of the volume consists of the author's alleged recollections of Stalin, Stalin's behavior, and Stalin's associates on the various occasions between 1904 and 1945 when the author claims to have been in the dictator's company.

The picture of Stalin's personality drawn here is not obviously an unreasonable one. Stalin is presented, as a Georgian who has never completely shaken his heritage; a devoted family man who can be and is bossed by his daughter, Svetlana; basically a simple soul who finds surcease and relaxation from his massive labors in such simple hobbies as cobbling, gardening, and hunting; an elderly gentleman who has been very sick at times during the past decade; and the like. Stalin's relations with his three wives are discussed at some length, including the assertion that his marriage to Rosa Kaganovich in the 1930's lasted only a short time—a matter on which there has been much speculation. We are even given a blow-by-blow account of Stalin cross-examining Malenkov on history, and tripping him up. The over-all impression given is that Stalin is basically a good-natured bear of a man, crude, perhaps, but also hard working and devoted to his job.

If this book were offered as a flight

Harry Schwartz, author of "Russia's Soviet Economy," is a member of the staff of The New York Times.