partly explained by the growing number of people who want to reclaim their moral principles by ending the nuclear terror. These readers can't be entirely satisfied with the book. Though Schell writes firmly and precisely as he delineates the nuclear problem, firmness and precision disappear as he wrestles with finding a way out. His passages plod toward some goal, become mired in abstractions, and usually arrive at a useless generality.

Schell's treatment of national sovereignty, which he regards as a major villain, illustrates the point. On page after page he tells us that it is the system of sovereign nations, extended into the age of nuclear weapons, that has brought us to the edge of extinction. Perhaps so, but daily headlines provide convincing evidence that this system isn't about to self-destruct. What is Schell's solution? "Just as we have chosen to live in the system of sovereign states, we can choose to live in some other system." For most of the world's people this remark is inaccurate, and it isn't very useful to anyone.

Fortunately, the diverse groups around the world that constitute the growing movement against nuclear weapons are capable of fashioning their own paths toward an elusive goal. The need is to incorporate more and more informed, committed people in that movement. *The Fate of the Earth* makes an important contribution here by its skillful unveiling of the political and moral bankruptcy that underlies entrenched nuclear policy. One can only hope it reaches many more readers.

THE CONDUCT OF JUST AND LIMITED WAR
by William V. O'Brien
(Praeger; 510 pp.; $39.95)

Terry Nardin

One of the more encouraging developments of recent years is the revival of concern for the regulation of warfare. We see evidence of this concern in the conduct of belligerents, in public debate, in international and military law, and also in the writings of moralists, political theorists, and military strategists. Although there will always be vigorous disagreement about the principles that should guide the use of military force, a serious effort is again being made to articulate such principles. Indeed, in view of the rapid accumulation of specialized studies on regulated warfare, there is an increasing need for general works that consider the relation of different traditions of thought. The *Conduct of Just and Limited War* is such a work.

O'Brien sets out to integrate the scholastic just war tradition and the secular tradition of positive international law. More ambitiously, he seeks to bridge the even wider gap separating these two traditions from that branch of strategic studies concerned with limited war. This latter effort derives from the sound premise that justice requires the controlled and discriminate application of military force: "there can be no just war without limited war policies and capabilities." It is not enough to define just war standards; one must also consider the conditions required for them to be effective. O'Brien devotes many pages to case studies illustrating the extent to which just war constraints have been observed during recent major wars in order that the moral, legal, and prudential standards of the past may be brought to bear on future wars, and in particular how the military forces of the United States should be equipped and trained to fight within the limits prescribed by the traditions of just and limited war.

In the course of these inquiries the author reaches a series of moral conclusions that many readers will not welcome. On the issue of Vietnam, for example, he is a revisionist. Although O'Brien grants that the American forces relied on disproportionate and often indiscriminate firepower, he concludes that these violations of the rules of war were not so grave as to make the Vietnam war an unjust war. He gives considerable weight to the judgment that the intervention was a justified attempt at resisting international aggression, comparable to American resistance to the Communist invasion of South Korea, but he asserts this judgment with scarcely any supporting argument. Looking for even more trouble, O'Brien goes on to defend Nixon's Christmas bombing campaign against North Vietnam and the invasion of Cambodia.

Others will be put off by the author's treatment of nuclear deterrence and nuclear war, rejecting as naive his rather sanguine view of the efficacy of deterrence and his cautious defense of the moral acceptability, in certain circumstances, of limited nuclear war. Although no new arguments are presented, he restates the familiar case for "flexible response"—the development of a capability on the part of the United States and its allies to wage limited counterforce, theatre, and tactical nuclear wars. O'Brien's discussion of the only limited nuclear war to have occurred so far, the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, is also unsatisfactory. It merely repeats the old justifications without even considering, much less rebutting, some of the most powerful objections that are offered against dropping the bomb. Here, as in the case of the Vietnam debate, one senses that the author has given up trying to persuade those who do not share his basic assumptions.

It is unfortunate that O'Brien has felt compelled to push his moral investigation of past events to such firm and, I think, unwarranted conclusions. The book's simplistic conception of moral reasoning as the "application" of general "prescriptions" to particular performances is equally unsatisfactory. Yet these defects are perhaps of little moment, given the author's main intention. The book is, and should be read as, an effort to demonstrate the mutual relevance of the just war and limited war traditions and to get American political and military leaders to pay more attention to the accumulated wisdom embodied in them. What these traditions teach has less to do with the correctness of particular verdicts than with the overriding importance of restrained, principled conduct in war. O'Brien is entitled to his version of the past. His readers—some of them presumably those officials to whom the book is addressed and upon whose fateful decisions we all depend—must draw their own conclusions for the future. WV

THE HOUSE AND FOREIGN POLICY
by Charles W. Whalen, Jr.
(University of North Carolina Press; 193 pp.; $18.95/$9.95)

Robert F. Drinan

The author of this thoughtful study was a Republican congressman from Ohio in the years 1967 to 1979. Immediately after leaving the Congress he became a Democrat. He confesses in this volume

that he is a "maverick" and that he has "probably done as much as any politician to erode America's two-party system." During his dozen years in Congress Mr. Whalen served with distinction on the Foreign Affairs Committee, where he was one of the most consistent and articulate opponents of the war in Vietnam.

A professor of economics and political science before and after his years of service in the Congress, Mr. Whalen writes in a painstakingly scholarly way about the turmoil in procedure that characterized the Congress of the 1970s. He traces the origin and evolution of each of the major procedural reforms in the House—and notes how all of these led to decisions on the floor of the House in matters of foreign policy that he judges erroneous. Among the floor actions he cites are those that impeded aid to Nicaragua and led to legislation that "slowed the flow of Soviet emigres." In Mr. Whalen's view, the Executive branch of government should be permitted greater discretion; it is "not possible for Congress to develop a concept that orchestrated into a cohesive plan of action." He laments the fact that in ten years, 1969-79, the number of floor amendments on foreign policy matters escalated from 44 to 155 and concludes that "by attempting to placate a public which does not take the time to inform itself, House members...often subvert our broader international interests."

While the author laments the fragmenting effect of a House of Representatives that, more strongly than ever before, was asserting its claims to be heard in the area of foreign policy, he gives inadequate coverage to a spectacular fact: that for the first time in history Congress terminated a war by defunding it. This unique accomplishment might have been impossible but for the very reforms in procedure he decries.

Mr. Whalen recommends three changes to modify what he deems the balkanization of the House into 148 committees and subcommittees. He proposes that 44 members, rather than 25, be present on the floor before a recordeo vote becomes obligatory. He also wants consistent application of the principle that an appropriations bill contain no extraneous legislation. In addition, he wants the Rules Committee to expand what is called a "modified open rule" by which amendments contrary to the thrust of American foreign policy are ruled out of order during House consideration of a bill.

Some commentators will disagree with Mr. Whalen that these three proposals would correct what he considers the undesirable results of the explosion of procedural reforms enacted during the past decade. Others will not agree that the results Mr. Whalen laments are in fact undesirable. But this carefully crafted volume by someone who is thoroughly knowledgeable about the subject matter and has had some twenty-five years of experience in various legislative bodies will deepen the admiration of those who have followed Mr. Whalen's academic and professional career with profound respect and gratitude. [WV]

CONTRIBUTORS

Robert Sharlet, a specialist on Eastern Europe and the USSR, is Professor of Political Science at Union College. His recent publications include The Soviet Union Since Stalin *(co-edited with Stephen F. Cohen and Alexander Robinowitch).*

Howard Goldblatt is Associate Professor of Chinese at San Francisco State University.

Kenneth W. Thompson is Director of the University of Virginia's Miller Center of Public Affairs and a member of the Worldview *Editorial Board.*

Richard H. King teaches philosophy at the University of the District of Columbia. He is the author of The Party of Eros *and* A Southern Renaissance.

Albert L. Huebner teaches physics at California State University and does documentary programming on science for station KPFK, Los Angeles.

Terry Nardin teaches international relations and political philosophy at the State University of New York, Buffalo.

Robert F. Drinan, S.J., who served in the House, is Visiting Professor of Law at Georgetown University and serves on Worldview's *Editorial Board.*

Briefly Noted

DOROTHY DAY:
A BIOGRAPHY
by William D. Miller
(Harper & Row; xv+527 pp.; $18.95)

One memorable night during the trial of the Catonsville Nine, I drove Dorothy Day around Baltimore. Occasionally I looked at her column in *The Catholic Worker*, and I read *The Long Loneliness*, her autobiography. Ultimately, however, what I know of her is what I have seen reflected, darkly or brightly, in the faces of her friends, colleagues, and acquaintances. But we need history with almost the same urgency as we need progeny, and I looked forward to reading Miller's biography. Miller, unfortunately is not very interested in history. He has tried to make a fireside tale from his subject's writings and from his own recollections. He has used interviews with people who knew her to confirm her own versions of events. The advantage of his work is that his subject speaks for herself.

The disadvantages are rather more numerous. Miller's documentation of sources is not helpful to the student of Dorothy Day's life who would like to go beyond the text. His interest in Dorothy Day as "subject" ignores the fact that her opinions and biases became objective contributions to the dialogue that formed the community of the American Catholic Church in her lifetime. Miller tells the stories of her various arrests as though they took place in a political vacuum. We learn of Dorothy Day's feelings about the arrests, that she was somehow more ashamed to have been arrested in an IWW boarding house than with advocates for women's suffrage. But we do not see how these arrests were related to each other as political actions. And a Dorothy Day without politics becomes, here, a woman afflicted with the disease of random indignation.

Though Miller professes concern with the theme of "community," the concept remains empty. He mentions the difficulty certain families had sustaining a long association with the Catholic Worker, and he details the counterpoint of Dorothy Day as mother of her daughter, Tamar, and mother of Catholic Workers. But the information available to him cries out for some development of the idea of community in its

relationship to family life in the Catholic Worker movement and in American Catholicism at large. We learn that Dorothy Day came to the conclusion that family responsibilities conflicted with participation in Catholic Worker life, but there is no sense that American family life itself, its rituals, its hierarchical structure, and even its modes of emotional interaction underwent any development during the fifty years of the movement. While Miller tells us of Dorothy Day's reaction to aspects of the '60s sexual revolution, we get no comparison of this with the sexual revolution of the Bohemian Greenwich Village. Community, family, and sex are reduced to the personal; this most political of women is denied her politics.

There are friends and followers of Dorothy Day, perhaps including Miller, who would hold that Dorothy Day the saint did not have a politics, that she had let go of that world sometime in her youth, perhaps with her conversion to Catholicism. In many senses of the word *politics*, this estimate is correct. She was not partisan, for instance; nor, as time went on, did she employ an explicit class analysis. However, actions have objective consequences, even if largely in the development of the lives of others. The more "personal" the person, the more "political." The politics of Dorothy Day can be found in the lives of the people she has touched and even shaped. It is this objectivity, this historical factuality of Dorothy Day's life that William Miller has not developed.

—J. F. Donnelly

AMERICAN FREEDOM AND THE RADICAL RIGHT
by Edward L. Ericson
(Frederick Ungar Publishing Co.; viii+ 117 pp.; $4.95 [paper])

The author is chairman of the board of leaders of the New York Society for Ethical Culture—a "secular humanist" as the radical Right would style him. Ericson, on the other hand, considers himself sympathetic to religion and, in the face of challenges from the Right, asks the question: Will religious faith in America in the coming years be a "force for understanding and human dignity, or for sectarian warfare and social strife?" His answer in this factual, carefully reasoned analysis of the radical Religious Right leaves one with little doubt of the outcome.

The radical Religious Right—which Ericson quotes extensively and allows to speak for itself—obviously wants to foment sectarian warfare but has found a devil to do battle with immediately: secular humanists, also called liberals. Ascribing McCarthy-like tactics to today's electronic ministries, Ericson examines the influence of political conservatives like Richard Vigourie and Paul Weyrich on the Reverends Falwell, Robertson, and Robison, its high priests. With a successful mix of conservative politics and religious exhortations about drug abuse, abortion, permissiveness, and disintegration of the family, disciples conducted single-issue campaigns that brought down congressional "liberals" who "gave away" the Panama Canal, were soft on communism, or believed in murdering fetuses.

On the financing of the Religious Right, *American Freedom* is particularly commanding. Ericson supplies a list of major companies and foundations that contribute generously to the cause; and he does not overlook the millions of dollars TV viewers contribute on occasions such as the one on which Oral Roberts reported having seen a sixty-foot Jesus cross his property.

Ericson's book is rational; it respects human thought. And probably it will be read by relatively few. In contrast is the bible of the radical Religious Right, Tim LaHaye's *The Battle for the Mind.* LaHaye's book is literally a call to battle against the devil, an emotional appeal to fight the evil of secular humanism and a screaming, almost hysterical tract against the modern world. *Its* simple message requires no thought and apparently appeals to a mass readership.

—Stephen S. Fenichell

THE RELIGIOUS RIGHT AND CHRISTIAN FAITH
by Gabriel Fackre
(Eerdmans; 119 pp.; $8.95)

Fackre's analysis represents a new level of maturity in discussions of the Religious New Right. (He calls it simply "the Religious Right." How long can any movement, right or left, be called new?) Unlike almost everything else on the subject, Fackre's book does not focus on the political impact and prospects of Moral Majority, Religious Roundtable, and similar organizations. He wants to explore what these people believe religiously, paying them the courtesy of accepting the claim that their actions are motivated by their faith. For readers of all faiths or none this book offers entrance to the cognitive world of politicized fundamentalism. The author, who is evangelical but not fundamentalist, gives over each chapter to a classic Christian doctrine (creation, fall, church, etc.) and then compares it, both positively and negatively, with the teaching of the Religious Right. Political and ethical implications are by no means overlooked but are woven through the text. Those who belong to the Religious Right will probably object at several key points that Fackre does not treat their beliefs fairly. But others in that community should welcome a book that takes them seriously as people who do have a more or less coherent belief system and not simply as a political threat or nuisance.

—Richard John Neuhaus