

dilemma by naming a group of "indispensable enemies." Their indispensability, I fear, is only in Karp's mind. Karp is partially correct in arguing that politics is not epiphenomenal, but that is a long way from saying that the party structure exists independently of other social

and economic institutions. *The Indispensable Enemies* ill serves the cause it claims to promote. Republican self-government can only happen when citizens are given a true picture of their world. Walter Karp's conspiracy fables are not helpful toward that end.

number) other houses, including one in Milton described as "a Monticello in Massachusetts." *Item*: Bailyn nowhere explicitly faces up to the fact that the radicals were partly right in their persistent charge. Hutchinson *did*, albeit not deliberately, misrepresent to English authorities the truth of the situation in Massachusetts. *Item*: Bailyn repeatedly stresses that Hutchinson was "driven into exile" by his enemies; in fact Hutchinson chose to go into exile, at first "intending to return quickly; he did not even rule out a resumption of his governorship."

The Ordeal of Thomas Hutchinson by Bernard Bailyn

(Harvard University Press; 423 pp.; \$12.50)

Robert K. Landers

Thomas Hutchinson, the last civilian royal governor of Massachusetts, has been, to the general reader at least, a rather dim and neglected figure, despite the fact that some of his contemporaries, Lord North reportedly among them, believed his indiscretions had brought on the Revolution. Until now there has been only one full biography, and that written in the last century. If Hutchinson is known at all, it is usually from the scornful sketch by Vernon Parrington, who found that in this great-great-grandson of the antinomian enthusiast Anne Hutchinson there had survived only the native stubbornness, "which stubbornness, dominating a character cold, formal, arrogant, dogmatic, unimaginative, self-righteous, was finally to play havoc with Thomas Hutchinson's good fortune. . . . [I]n spite of his wig and scarlet broadcloth robes, he was only an unintelligent politician, who served the hand that fed him."

The neglect of this once imposing American conservative has not been repaired by our neoconservatives, who mostly prefer to keep their spotlights fixedly trained on John Adams or, across the ocean, Edmund Burke, lest troublesome doubts beset the notion that the Revolution was no more than a conservation.

So it has been left to Bernard Bailyn, eminent student of the Revolution's origins, to give us, without derision or embarrassment, a sym-

pathetic recreation of this perhaps most important American Loyalist. Through Bailyn's meticulous and graceful efforts Hutchinson, who departed his native land for exile in England exactly two hundred years ago, is returned to a semblance of life and, more, is made to fascinate—a feat which, however, exacts its price.

Thomas Hutchinson: wealthy merchant, ever acquisitive; successful politician, ever ambitious; cold, calculating, cautious man, ever striving and grasping. He *knew* that England, despite its blunders, did not mean to oppress the Americans, and he *knew* too, that the colonial radicals, despite their protestations to the contrary, did mean to rouse the deluded rabble to rebellion. He knew no more.

Yet there was another, a *suffering* Hutchinson beside the *grasping* one: a decent and devoted man who tried tirelessly to serve his cherished colony by keeping it safely tied to England and who, for all his patriotic efforts, was pursued as by furies. He was hated, harassed, defamed, destroyed.

Hutchinson's "ordeal" was a very real one; but Bailyn swells it beyond proportion. *Item*: Bailyn dwells on Hutchinson's distress at the gutting of his Boston mansion during the Stamp Act resistance, but neglects to remind us that Hutchinson possessed several (seven seems the

This tendency to exaggerate the *suffering* Hutchinson, examples of which could be multiplied, results from the same forces that make this study so vibrant, so fascinating. There is a subversive desire to attain a "tragic" interpretation of the Revolution, to overcome the inevitable anti-Loyalist bias, to see with Hutchinson's eyes. The viewpoint must contend with the powerful influence exerted by the course of American politics two centuries after Hutchinson's travail. So the distortion was probably inescapable (as Bailyn indicates, he suspected some distortion would be), given the purpose; and it does not seem too high a price, given the product, which is, in brief, a masterpiece.

"More intelligent, tolerant, experienced, and perceptive—and less sanctimonious and self-righteous by far—than most of those who opposed him," writes Bailyn of Hutchinson, "he was yet overwhelmingly the loser. A multitude of circumstances, events, and personalities shaped this defeat; but ultimately Hutchinson failed, and died in exile grieving for the world he had lost because, for all his intelligence, he did not comprehend the nature of the forces that confronted him and that at a critical point he might have controlled or if not controlled then at least evaded. He was never able to understand the moral basis of the protests that arose against the existing order. Committed to small, prudential gains through an intricate, closely calibrated world of status,

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—docmed 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

WORLDVIEW

VOLUME 17, NUMBER 9

SEPTEMBER 1974

- Connections 4 **Some Undecided Issues**
- Articles 16 **The Philippine Archipelago**
Raul S. Manglapus
- 21 **The Soviet Union in World Trade**
O. Edmund Clubb
- 26 **The Ultimate Dilemma: Two Views**
Speaking of God After Auschwitz
Franklin Sherman
Is the Holocaust Unique?
A. Roy Eckardt
- 39 **Foreign vs. Local Ownership**
Jack N. Behrman
- 47 **A Survey of Freedom**
Raymond D. Gastil
- 52 **A Time to Think**
Michael Harrington
- 36 **The Holocaust As a Question**
David Glanz
- Excursus 4 **Cyprus/Watergate and Amnesty/Brazilianization/The Sahel
Soviet Jews—and Others/Loyalties**
Wilson Carey McWilliams/Richard John Neuhaus/Paul E. Sigmund
George A. Silver/Michael Novak/James Finn
- Correspondence 2 Norman Markowitz, Alan Waters
- Books 57 **Stephen Rousseas** *Outside the Walls*, by Vassilis Vassilikos;
The Harpoon Gun, by Vassilis Vassilikos
- 61 **Peter L. Berger** *Religion and Revolution*, by Guenter Lewy
- 62 **Henry Plotkin** *The Indispensable Enemies*, by Walter Karp
- 64 **Robert K. Landers** *The Ordeal of Thomas Hutchinson*,
by Bernard Bailyn
- 65 **Willard Barber** *The Birth of Nations*, by Philip C. Jessup
- 66 **Briefly Noted**

Cover design:
Bill Skurski

WORLDVIEW is published monthly by the Council on Religion and International Affairs. Subscription \$10.00 for one year; \$18.00 for two years; \$25.00 for three years. Student rate \$6.50 per year. Add \$1.00 for overseas postage. Second-class postage paid at New York, N.Y. and at additional mailing offices.

Opinions expressed in **WORLDVIEW** are those of the authors and not necessarily of the Council on Religion and International Affairs. Copyright © 1974 Council on Religion and International Affairs, a private operating foundation under the Tax Reform Act of 1969.

Unsolicited manuscripts must be accompanied by a stamped, self-addressed return envelope.

Editorial & Business Offices: 170 East 64th Street, New York, N.Y. 10021. Telephone: 212/TE 8-4120.

Advertising: Mrs. Ruth Taylor, 40 Parkway Circle, Scarsdale, New York 10583.

Articles appearing in this journal are abstracted and indexed in **Historical Abstracts** and **America: History and Life**.

Editor: James Finn

Senior Editor: Richard John Neuhaus

Associate Editors: Peter L. Berger, Hillel Levine, Wilson Carey McWilliams

Managing Editor: Susan Woolfson

Contributing Editors: Robert W. Barnett, C. Fred Bergsten, Nuri Eren, Gerald Freund, Robert C. Good, Gunnar Myrdal, Michael Novak, Wolfhart Pannenberg

Editorial Board: Hans Morgenthau, Chairman, William J. Barnds, Eugene B. Borowitz, Noel J. Brown, Jorge Domínguez, J. Bryan Hehir, A. William Loos, Donald F. McHenry, Paul Ramsey, Seymour Siegel, Paul Sigmund, John Philip Sousa III, Kenneth W. Thompson, Howard Wriggins