

Correspondence

Revising Revisionism

To the Editors: It is perhaps to be expected that revisionism is in a constant state of revision. Ronald Steel, who is commonly recognized as one of the chief architects of the revisionist history of the cold war ("The X Article—25 Years Later," September *Worldview*) seems to be stepping away from the doctrines of his own, direct or indirect, creation. "One need not accept the revisionist contention that U.S. foreign policy in the early postwar period sought to use the Marshall Plan to stave off a Depression at home, the atomic bomb to force the Soviets out of Eastern Europe, and the Truman Doctrine to achieve the 'break-up or the gradual mellowing of Soviet power.'" Agreed that such fantasies need not be accepted. But then Mr. Steel goes on to say: "Yet there is something inadequate in the conventional explanation that the postwar interventionist policies were designed solely to contain the Soviet military threat." Just what does Mr. Steel intend to say? It seems he wishes not to be considered so dull as to accept the "conventional explanation" nor so paranoid as to accept the revisionist conspiracy theories. The mere avoidance of dullness and paranoia, however, does not achieve lucidity.

Walter Lippmann, in whom, as I understand it, Mr. Steel has a vested interest as literary executor, is clearly the hero of the article. Steel's enthusiasm for Lippmann's critique of George Kennan would be more plausible if Mr. Steel indicated more clearly his own position with regard to, for example, Lippmann's enthusiasm for the Marshall Plan and other policies which, not so incidentally, were aimed at blocking Communist aspirations.

Mr. Steel's revising of cold war history (and now apparently also of revisionist cold war history) would be further enhanced were he more

candidly to confront some of his own monumental errors of judgment. One thinks, for example, of Mr. Steel's confidence, prior to 1968, that Eastern European Communist parties, such as that of Czechoslovakia, had nothing to fear from the Soviet Union, since they enjoyed a virtual equality with the Party of the Leninist motherland. As he picks and chooses among various "explanations of reality," one hopes that Mr. Steel will in the future nurture a healthier reverence for hard historical fact.

James Byron

Chicago, Ill.

Ronald Steel Responds:

To clear the record it should be pointed out:

First, Lippmann's enthusiasm for the Marshall Plan rested precisely on the fact that it offered a way of restoring Western Europe to economic and political health without embarking on a costly and dangerous rearmament program. It was thus an alternative to the policy of military intervention inherent in Kennan's "X" article and in the Truman Doctrine. To imply that Lippmann's support of the Marshall Plan was tantamount to approval of the containment doctrine is to miss the whole point of the argument. Second, had Mr. Byron read my article on Czechoslovakia himself rather than paraphrasing another critic, as he has apparently done, he would have discovered that I never made the assertion for which he criticizes me. What I wrote at that time was that during the Dubcek period the Czechoslovakian Communist Party asserted its right to speak on matters of doctrine with equal authority to that

of the Soviet Union, which indeed it did enjoy until the Russian invasion. However I never said or implied that it had nothing to fear from the Soviet Union for taking this stand, and to say this is totally to distort what I wrote. Third, I never said that the revisionist contentions about the origins of the cold war were "fantasies." That is Mr. Byron's word. What I said was that even if one did not go all the way with the revisionists, the conventional arguments failed to explain the evidence, even as such a nonrevisionist as Lippmann pointed out in his columns at the time. The purpose of my article was simply to compare the positions of Lippmann and Kennan, not to provide an alternate theory for the origins of the cold war, as Mr. Byron so indignantly takes me to task for not doing. One can certainly disagree with my position or Lippmann's. But in his enthusiasm to make points against the revisionists, Mr. Byron ought not be so eager to distort the arguments, and he should know that gratuitous innuendos weaken rather than reinforce his critique.

Re Taiwan Independence

To the Editors: William Bueler's "Taiwan Tangle" (September *Worldview*) raises an elementary moral question in a fascinating, and finally painful, way. Perhaps he is right that there is a widespread and deep longing among the Taiwanese for continued independence from China. Perhaps one can even make the case on purely moral grounds that the U.S. has a responsibility to follow

(continued on page 55)

Dear Reader,

Now, before you forget, use the enclosed gift subscription envelope. Your friends will welcome WORLDVIEW too.

prove by experimental analysis, they easily impress, and gradually eat their way into the once sacrosanct realm of religion. They have an added advantage: they are new and fashionable! Moreover, traditional standards of morality are not easy to keep. . . . The temptation to throw traditional norms overboard in favour of a more attractive, less demanding way of life is therefore great. . . .”

~ ~

“How many times has the American priest, pastor, layman or religious asked himself the following questions? Why am I here in Chile? Should I really be here? Couldn't a Chilean do what I'm doing and do it better? Am I just filling holes? What should be my effective contribution to Chile, to the people, to the social process which we are living, and in what should consist my testimony to the Gospel of

Christ? These are questions which have to be asked and have to be answered in one way or another, since upon their resolution depend the posture and orientation one assumes in relation to 'mission' and 'service.' The way one subjectively justifies his presence here is a personal matter, but it is not something that can be resolved in a vacuum. Without critical dialogue and feedback from Chilean sources such a justification is at best very inadequate and at worst objectively harmful.”

The September issue of *Adentro Afuera*, a newsletter published by the Missioners' Committee on International Awareness, contains some of the “feedback” called for from Chileans “who have known and worked with U.S. religious personnel.” *Adentro Afuera* may be addressed at Casilla 5497, Correo 3, Santiago.

PAMPHILUS

Correspondence

[from p. 2]

through on the pledges, explicit and implicit, made to Taiwan over the years. But is it not the better part of morality to recognize the limitations of a situation? Surely neither China nor the U.S. nor the USSR has any “reason of state” for backing Taiwanese independence. If none of the great powers is likely to back Taiwanese independence either in the U.N. or on the high seas, is it not then irresponsible, perhaps immoral, to encourage independence aspirations?

The realities of the situation are not what we may wish; they may be formed by considerations that are wrong both morally and politically; but surely it only exacerbates the wrong to entertain illusions about what can be done. Since it is clear that the U.S. will not jeopardize its new China policy for the sake of Taiwanese independence, Mr. Bueler's energies might be better spent in seeking whatever amelioration is possible of what may be a painful transition as Taiwan is inevitably reunited with the Mainland.

L. Perry Francis

Buffalo, N.Y.

Pannenberg's Worldview

To the Editors: No doubt some readers will rejoice that there seems to be something going on in theology these days, the death of God notwithstanding. I find it not so difficult to restrain my enthusiasm. Prof. Carl Braaten (“Theology and Our Common World,” September *Worldview*) heralds the breakthroughs represented by the work of Munich's Wolfhart Pannenberg in a way which is perfectly understandable to theologians, who, after all, have a very immediate reason for hoping theology has a future but which leaves at least some of us who are not theologians with severe misgivings.

The essential point, if I understand Braaten correctly, is that Pannenberg's efforts are aimed at restoring a kind of universal significance to theological language. That is, theology is not to be viewed as some sort of specialized “faith language” for people who are into the “religion” or “Christianity” thing. Further, we are told that the evidences for Christian claims are in some sense public, not dependent

upon privileged revelation but accessible to any rational being for objective examination. While many theologians might have difficulty with such an approach, I find it perfectly amenable, except why must it be called theology? Surely there is a whole range of scientific disciplines that can, at least in theory, examine the evidences pertinent even to the largest “meaning” questions about human nature, history, even metaphysics. The problem in the university is not that we lack theology's partnership but that we lack the evidences that warrant taking theology seriously as a partner.

. . . If indeed rational inquiry can lead to the comprehensive conclusions proposed by Pannenberg, let the Pannenbergs and Braatens join those disciplines that have a better track record of rational inquiry than does theology. Braaten presents no persuasive argument for the university to burden itself with the intellectual imperialism and ecclesiastical presumptions that have traditionally accompanied theology.

Craig Doernberg

Cambridge, Mass.