

Correspondence

Stalin & the Cold War

To the Editors: In the December issue of *Worldview* Walter C. Clemens, Jr., I think, makes a serious mistake when he writes: "My own conclusion is that he [Stalin] would have preferred a harmonious continuation of the Grand Alliance into the postwar era, and resorted to unilateral measures harmful to the alliance largely in response to what he saw as Western breaches of good faith, especially on reparations."

Clemens, like a number of other non-Communist American writers, is quite prepared to give Stalin the benefit of the doubt, and to heap blame particularly on the United States for the breakdown of the wartime alliance between the Soviet Union and the Western powers. In contradiction to this thesis I would like to cite the testimony of no less a person than Earl Browder, the general secretary of the American Communist party from 1930 to 1945.

This testimony is to be found in an extensive interview with Browder by Steven G. Neal, staff writer of the *Philadelphia Inquirer*, which was published in the *Inquirer* on August 5, 1973. Neal interviewed Browder at the home of Browder's son in Princeton, New Jersey.

Said Browder: "Stalin needed the cold war to take the place of the hot war then coming to a close. He needed it to keep up the sharp international tensions by which he alone could maintain such a regime in Russia. Stalin had to pick a quarrel with the United States, the leading capitalist country. And I was the victim of it." (Stalin expelled Browder from the Communist party because Browder was inextricably linked with the policy of friendship between the United States and the Soviet Union.)

Browder's expulsion from the Communist party, which occurred about the beginning of June, 1945, was the signal that heralded the beginning of the cold war, with Stalin as the engineer. World War II had ended in Europe only a month before that but was still going on in Asia. At the Potsdam Conference, which began in July, 1945, the Ameri-

cans and the British discovered for the first time following the war the deep hostility of the Soviet leaders.

Robert Heckert

Walter Clemens Responds:

Analysis of the cold war's origins requires a sober evaluation of many kinds of evidence. Mr. Heckert cites one important source, which, however, could by no means be considered as the last word. My own judgment, to which Mr. Heckert objects, is based on many other sources as well, Soviet and Western. The debates among orthodox and revisionist historians, and those who try to create a new synthesis (with whom I would like to be included), cannot be fully resolved unless we obtain access to Soviet and other materials not yet in the public domain. The importance to Moscow of the reparations issue, however, was noted by U.S. negotiator Philip E. Mosely even before Potsdam, and has been argued further in the recent book by Daniel Yergin, *Shattered Peace* (Houghton-Mifflin, 1977).

With Mrs. Gandhi

To the Editors: Why do we have to have served up, almost unchallenged, Mrs. Gandhi's apologia for the Emergency and her assessment of Janata? I was sad to read Ralph Buultjens's interview with the former Indian prime minister ("No Room for Vengeance," *Worldview*, December), and the more so when I noted *Worldview's* statement of editorial purpose: "To place public policies, particularly in international affairs, under close ethical scrutiny." This seemed to be the one scrutiny that was missing from the article.

I write with some feeling as I have just been in India for the publication by Macmillan of my book on the Emergency. After a fairly intensive study of this twenty-month period I had to give the book the title, "Experiment with Untruth." One cannot in correspondence deal with all the unbegged questions. But may I make just three points.

Firstly, all the evidence now being presented to the Shah Commission makes nonsense of Mrs. Gandhi's justification for the imposition and retention of Emergency legislation.

(Continued on p. 55)

WORLDVIEW

Statement of Purpose

The purpose of *Worldview* is to place public policies, particularly in international affairs, under close ethical scrutiny. The Council on Religion and International Affairs, which sponsors the journal, was founded in 1914 by religious and civic leaders brought together by Andrew Carnegie. It was mandated to work toward ending the barbarity of war, to encourage international cooperation, and to promote justice. The Council is independent and nonsectarian. *Worldview* is an important part of the Council's wide-ranging program in pursuit of these goals.

Worldview is open to diverse viewpoints and encourages dialogue and debate on issues of public significance. It is edited in the belief that large political questions cannot be considered adequately apart from ethical and religious reflection. The opinions expressed in *Worldview* do not necessarily reflect the positions of the Council. Through *Worldview* the Council aims to advance the national and international exchange without which our understanding will be dangerously limited.

Philip A. Johnson, *Publisher*

Editorial Board:

Hans Morgenthau, *Chairman*
William J. Barnds
Eugene B. Borowitz
Noel J. Brown.
Jorge Dominguez
James Finn
J. Bryan Hehir
Donald F. McHenry (on leave)
Paul Ramsey
Seymour Siegel
Paul Sigmund
Kenneth W. Thompson
Howard Wriggins (on leave)



sharply specified in the preface, and there are indeed significant variations of tone, with Seifert as the more cautious judge of phenomena such as transnational corporations, the future of world government, and so forth. The book grew out of a seminary course taught by the two authors and will likely serve as a text in such courses elsewhere.

Scotland and Nationalism: Scottish Society and Politics, 1707-1977 by Christopher Harvie

(George Allen & Unwin; 318 pp.; no price)

England must maintain title to North Sea oil if it is ever to get out of hock or survive in hock. The Scottish nationalists know that well and are determined to use it as leverage in their campaign for independence. Mr. Harvie speaks for a more leftward view and is willing to give the English the oil money if Scotland is then freed to move ahead with its own internal socialist revolution. Most everyone agrees that the current discussion of "devolution" of powers means that the relationship between Scotland and England is undergoing major change. In the debate over the nature of that change Harvie represents an intriguing but distinctly minority argument. The book is more of a tract than the dispassionate historical analysis its title and subtitle might suggest.

Correspondence (from p. 2)

Secondly, everything that happened under the Emergency is definitely not happening now. The mood of fear that I encountered a year ago is absent. The rule of law has been restored and the complete lifting of censorship is self-evident.

Thirdly, the Janata government's performance is better than its image. It may appear slow, but it is heading in the right direction. It is having to deal with a legacy of economic mismanagement.

Its price policy has been reasonably successful in the light of world inflation. Its economic ideas are revolutionary. The impatience and cynicism are more evident in the cocktail circuit than among those doing constructive work.

Finally, may I say that the idea that democracy is good for us, but not for others, is a Western attitude that many Indians find abhorrent. Indeed, the prime minister, Morarji Desai, was saying to me only a few hours before I read your article that he hoped the March election results would have dispelled this idea. He also said, with much vigor, "Nowadays people regard politics as a place without ethics or morality. That is all wrong. Unless you bring morality into politics you cannot bring morality into society because government has the greatest influence in people's lives, whatever people may say about it."

Michael Henderson

London

Ralph Buultjens Responds:

Mr. Henderson's objections to *Worldview's* publication of my interview with Mrs. Gandhi suggest a somewhat one-dimensional focus; as a professed advocate of democracy, it is strange that he wants to prevent publication of viewpoints with which he does not agree. I draw to his attention Voltaire's sentiments, which encapsulate the essence of democracy: "I disapprove of what you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it."

To indicate that it is possible to make an objective evaluation of events in India during the past decade without attempting to examine Mrs. Gandhi's perspectives is a suggestion unworthy of serious consideration. Mrs. Gandhi is a significant historical figure, who retains a considerable public following, and should be treated as such. In my interview I attempted to probe elements of her personality, beliefs, and views that would give us some insight into what motivates her and how she perceives events.

Mr. Henderson also makes three other observations that suggest a rush to judgment at a pace exceeding that of even the present Government of India. Those who profess to believe in the rule of law should be particularly careful not to confuse with judgments evidence presented before commissions of inquiry; indictments must not be presented as convictions of guilt. It is

almost one year since Mrs. Gandhi's defeat at the polls. Thus far, despite intensive and often aggressive investigation, she has not been convicted of any act of malfeasance in office.

In assessing the public mood, wide differences of opinion are possible. My own observations, based on several visits to India, differ sharply with those of Mr. Henderson. I have to report that several members of the Janata government themselves, in public and private statements, express disappointment in the performance of their own party. Its economic ideas, rather than being revolutionary, are as yet vague blueprints primarily reflecting an amalgam of rurally oriented economics with Gandhian (Mahatma) sentiments. As yet little has been done to give these any real form or meaning. A mood of fear, which Mr. Henderson claims to have encountered one year ago, is far from absent—supporters of Mrs. Gandhi and many others who disagree with the present government will currently testify to this. One can argue that the objects of fear may have shifted, but given recent events, one surely should not proclaim that India is free from fear.

In controversial times, such as those on which Mr. Henderson and I have focused, most viewpoints are contested. However, in such conflicts objectivity and truth should not be the first casualties!

"The Legacy of Echeverría"

To the Editors: A resident of Guadalajara, Mexico, born and raised in that city of nearly two million in the Mexican highlands, the writer of the letter that follows, is fluent in both Spanish and English. He has visited the United States and Canada and does much in his homeland to encourage better communication and understanding between his countrymen and people of the U.S. and Canada. Six years ago this studious and intelligent young Mexican was in Seattle for a month as my guest, and whenever I am in Guadalajara, his home and the homes of all in his family are always open to me. In forwarding the November *Worldview* article on Mexico ("What Mexico's President Inherited" by Robert Drysdale) to this Guadalajara friend I had asked for his comments on the report so that they might be sent on