

A Student Anti-War Quarterly

anvil

And Student Partisan

ICHI-BAN:

**The Man Behind
The Bamboo Curtain**



Penetrating General MacArthur's Mystic Veil

America's Welfare Imperialism

The Myth of Totalitarian Invincibility

Organized Labor as a Political Force

Cold War Hits the American Campus

The Vitalism of George Bernard Shaw

Editorial • Reviews • Poetry

20¢

S p r i n g 1 9 5 1

anvil a student anti-war quarterly and student partisan

Volume III - No. 1



Spring Quarter 1951

IMPORTANT NOTICE

ANVIL AND STUDENT Partisan has had a tough time of it with both the business end and most of the editorial work being handled in New York. This made for inefficiency, unanswered correspondence, practically no promotion, etc. Consequently the magazine has not nearly reached its potential readership.

But that is now a thing of the past. Beginning with this issue there is to be a division of labor between the New York and Chicago editors. The magazine will continue to be edited mainly in New York but the entire managing end of the magazine will be handled in Chicago. Anyone who knows the caliber of the Chicago editors will readily understand the enthusiasm with which we greet this change. We are sure that it will not only result in a financially stable publication, but will produce a steady and increasing audience for the magazine.

All communications from our readers, subscriptions, contributions, etc. should be sent to the following address:

Andrew Mills
6337 South Kimbark Ave.
Chicago 37, Illinois.

Unpaid bills from previous issues should also be paid to the above address.

All articles submitted to Anvil and Student Partisan for publication should continue to be sent to the following address:

Editorial Board
Anvil and Student Partisan
247 Lexington Avenue,
New York 16, N. Y.

The Focal Point of Yale University has voted to accept the invitation of the editors to join the other three student organizations as publishers of Anvil and Student Partisan. Focal Point is an organization of graduate and undergraduate students devoted to the struggle against war and totalitarianism. Students in New Haven and others interested in learning more about this club should write to Bob Bone, 230 Prospect New Haven, Conn.

A number of other student and youth organizations have expressed an interest in the magazine. We hope that by the next issue these organizations will have voted, too, to join us in publishing the best and most effective anti-war magazine on the American campus.

The circulation figures on the Fall Quarter 1950 issue are not completed as yet. This is largely due to the failure of many clubs and individual agents to inform us of how many have been sold and to pay their bill, accordingly. However, it is apparent that the paid circulation will come to over 4,000. That's not bad, but it can and will be lots higher.

IN THESE PAGES

Editorial: Democracy: Victim of a War Economy	3
Editorial: Is it Unscientific to Have an Opinion?	4
MacArthur: Man Behind the Bamboo Curtain	5
James Fenwick	
The Myth of Totalitarian Invincibility	9
Al Mimsey	
Two Poems: Song of the Enemies; Guernica 1950	11
William Robert Miller, Hal Vetter	
Ends and Means of U. S. Welfare Imperialism	12
Sam Bottone	
A Poem: Halftrack	17
Hal Vetter	
The Vitalism of George Bernard Shaw	18
Avel Austin	
The Labor Movement After the Elections	22
Don Chenoweth, and Bill Wittthoft	
The Cold War Hits the American Campus	25
Marvin Stone, Bill Kemsley, Jr., Irving Halpern, Ralph Stiles	
Book Reviews	29
Victor Kaplan, Sander Katz	
Movie Review	30
Ernest Callenbach	

EDITORIAL BOARD

Julius Jacobson, <i>Editor</i>	Bill Wittthoft, <i>Business Mgr.</i>	Murray Wax
Laura Citron	Sam Bottone	Don Chenoweth
Bob Bone	Abe Victor	Norman Eiger
	Bill Stone	

ANVIL AND STUDENT PARTISAN editorials reflect the views of the majority of its editors. However, no single publishing club necessarily endorses all of the views expressed in the editorials. The magazine is published by the following student organizations:

NEW YORK STUDENT FEDERATION AGAINST WAR
247 Lexington Avenue New York, N. Y.

SOCIALIST CLUB OF ROOSEVELT COLLEGE
POLITICS CLUB OF UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
FOCAL POINT OF YALE UNIVERSITY

Editorials:

Democracy: Victim of a War Economy

THE INVASION OF OUR civil rights is reaching into the most obscure corners of American life. Loyalty oaths, purges, threats, warnings, persecutions are setting the authoritarian tone not only in government agencies, but among workers in private industry, free lance lecturers, school teachers; and, above all, among all non-conformists, singled out for persecution regardless of their occupation.

Recently Pearl S. Buck, a noted anti-Stalinist liberal, has had her appearance as a commencement speaker banned by school authorities.

The Columbia Broadcasting System announces itself as an important war industry and fires a girl for refusing to sign a loyalty oath.

A student is arrested and convicted of disturbing the peace because he called Truman a "bum" (apparently it is no threat to the peace when Truman publicly refers to a journalist as an "S.O.B." or when he threatens to castrate a critic of his daughter's musical talents).

A member of the Socialist Party with five years of military service and ten years seniority at Bell Aircraft in Buffalo is fired from that plant because the Army now finds that he "lacks the integrity necessary to work on or have access to classified contracts."

The Stalinist hack writer, Howard Fast, is banned by school authorities at Columbia because he is deemed unfit, and is then banned by NYU school authorities on the ground of being a criminal.

At Brooklyn College, President Gideonse continues to run amuck banning college newspapers, suspending students and disciplining clubs.

The above are a few varied

individual samples of how the war atmosphere is affecting personal rights. There are hundreds of other violations of civil rights occurring weekly.

These individual cases are important not only in themselves but as part of a pattern that is being set in Washington. There is no direct conspiracy between the Capitol and the office of the President of Brooklyn College against student rights, but the connection is nonetheless real. The government is consciously setting an authoritarian pattern,

creating a national mood of witch-hunting and suspicion. These local, individual examples of discriminatory acts cited above are natural concomitants of the McCarran Act, the Smith Act, the Taft-Hartley Law and the Truman speech advising Americans to be ever watchful of subversion and to report their neighbor's misdeeds.

This government assault on democratic rights is complemented on the economic front through higher taxes, an enormous war budget, and a wage and prize freeze policy which discriminates against the workers.

There are many liberals who feel that the government is being "excessive"; that the administration is making a "mistake" in its authoritarian policies. How long can these liberals carry on this self-deception? The government strategy is no "mistake" from *its point of view*. This is a government which is preparing to defend its "way of life" in the only way it can under the present world conditions. It has neither the respect for nor concern with democracy as do our liberal theorists. (And even some of our liberals are finding it possible to reconcile themselves to loyalty oaths, firing of Stalinist teachers and the McCarran Act).

It is true that even from its

F. B. U. DOSSIER

Subversive Subject: Samuel Clemens

This man goes under the alias of "Mark Twain"

DOCUMENT NO. 1 OFFERED AS EVIDENCE

"There has never been a just war, never an honorable one — on the part of the instigator of the war. I can see a million years ahead, and this rule will never change in so many as half a dozen instances. The loud little handful — as usual will shout for the war. The pulpit will — warily and cautiously — object — at first; the great, big, dull bulk of the nation will rub its sleepy eyes and try to make out why there should be a war, and will say earnestly and indignantly, 'It is unjust and dishonorable, and there is no necessity for it.' Then the handful will shout louder. A few fair men on the other side will argue and reason against the war with speech and pen, and at first will have a hearing and be applauded; but it will not last long; those others will outshout them, and presently the anti-war audiences will thin out and lose popularity. Before long you will see this curious thing: The speakers stoned from the platform, and free speech strangled by hordes of furious men who in their secret hearts are still at one with those stoned speakers — as earlier — but do not dare to say so. And now the whole nation — pulpit and all — will take up the war-cry, and shout itself hoarse, and mob any honest man who ventures to open his mouth; and presently such mouths will cease to open. Next the statesmen will invent cheap lies, putting the blame upon the nation that is attacked, and every man will be glad of those conscience-soothing falsities, and will diligently study them, and refuse to examine any refutations of them; and thus he will by and by convince himself that the war is just, and will thank God for the better sleep he enjoys after this process of grotesque self-deception."

MARK TWAIN in *The Mysterious Stranger*.

* * *

The above F.B.U. document was first brought to public view by the Students' Union to Resist War, at City College of New York (Evening Session).

own point of view many government acts are absurd, but as a whole, the shift towards government dictation and the national witch-hunt atmosphere is a logical and terrifying policy of an inherently reactionary social system arming itself economically, politically and militarily for total war.

Foreign Policy Parallels Domestic Reaction

The foreign policy of Washington is further evidence that its domestic program is not based on "mistakes," "over-excitement" of an individual here and there, or "bad advice." America's international diplomacy is a logical partner to its domestic policies. While the government is attempting to regulate our thoughts and actions at home it is making a parallel effort to control the economic and political policies of ostensibly independent nations. The content of this increasingly successful attempt to bring other nations "into line" is no less reactionary than Washington's growing tentacular controls at home. The form and content of this foreign "diplomacy" is discussed in the article on Welfare Imperialism, elsewhere in this issue. As this editorial is being written the most outrageous demonstration of America's foreign policy was exhibited. India, threatened with famine, has been warned by American policy makers that unless it is willing to keep more in line with the Truman-Acheson foreign policy it will not receive American foodstuffs.

The Prospect of a Garrison State

The third world war is still in the preparatory stage. Only a preview is offered in Korea: a proving ground where American political policies and military armaments are being tested against the social program and guns of Stalinist imperialism. That the Korean War is but a tragic preliminary skirmish compared to an all-out war is all the more appalling when one thinks of the effects it has already had on every aspect of American life.

Although the United States is not yet on a full war footing the foundations of a total war economy have already been laid. And on these foundations the skeletal structure of a wall can be seen; a wall whose brick and mortar is composed of government bureaucracy, military controls, political authoritarianism, economic inequity and psychological insecurity. It is a wall which if completed will place America in darkness. What is most shocking is the pathetic sight of a weak-kneed trade union leadership—leaders of a movement which has nothing in common with the aims or methods of American imperialism—buckling under the pressures of Washington and "public opinion." Thus, there is the anomalous situation of a labor movement tolerating, sometimes abetting, the growth of an authoritarian government which will number an independent union movement among its first victims.

If the world is to be secured from chaos and darkness we cannot look to the present administration in Washington. Certainly, we cannot look to that most barbarous of social orders, Stalinism, as any source of light and hope.

The youth, who are the first victims of war, and labor, which can gain nothing and will lose everything by it, have only one realistic alternative: to act as an independent force, opposed to both Russian and American

imperialism and to fight for an equitable and democratic society. That we do this is more than a moral responsibility. It is a matter of life and death.

Is Loose Thinking a Virtue?

DAVID HUME, THE GREAT Scottish philosopher widely known for his skepticism, told us that our belief that there is a necessary connection between a series of events, is primarily the result of our imaginations. By habitual recurrence, we have become accustomed to expecting certain events to follow when other events precede; that is all we can surely assert about causal relation. Hume, nevertheless, believed that judgments about the necessity for certain kinds of action, in moral terms, are possible and essential.

Today's students seem to have inherited Hume's skepticism about the succession of social events, without his concomitant conviction as to the necessity of making judgments.

Most frequently this takes the form of a reaction against "dogmatic" assertions. But what is a "dogmatic" assertion? For many students, unfortunately almost any general political assertion is "dogmatic." "Russia is today, fundamentally, an imperialist state," "The United States is today, fundamentally, an imperialist state." These are examples of what today's student would call a "dogmatic" judgment, depending upon whether he happened to accept the first or second of these propositions as essentially true. There are also a vast number of students who accept neither: they would consider *both* statements "dogmatic."

What they mean, is that there are some facts which throw doubt upon both propositions. "Russia has a non-capitalist economy," "The United States has a Marshall Plan." We must grant that these facts make it impossible to assert these propositions in simple form; i.e. defining imperialism simply as "capitalist economy" or simply as "extraction of revenue." For the average student, however these doubts mean, ultimately an "eclectic" or a "liberal" resolution. "There are some things about Russia that are imperialist and some things that are socialist." That is the end of his thinking. He does not struggle with the concept of imperialism itself, seeking a definition which might account for the odd fact. He takes the lazy and the safe outcome, convinced that his failure to generalize is scientific skepticism.

It is striking that much of the loose, "eclectic" thinking is introduced into the classroom by the professor of sociology or economics. The inability to generalize is made into a great liberal virtue and the student who prefers to escape the bitter choice necessitated by today's politics, follows suit.

Skepticism need not paralyze the making of judgments; "eclecticism" usually does. This paralysis of judgment often has the most reactionary consequences. *Anvil and Student Partisan* strives toward judgment, and is not at all shamed into an indefinite point of view. The modern scene requires an exercise of critical thinking and the forming of definite opinions.

MacArthur: Man Behind the Bamboo Curtain

Removing the Mystic Veil of a Military "Genius"

HANGING ON THE WALL of General Douglas MacArthur's office in Tokyo is a framed quotation from Livy. It contains the speech of a Roman general who had just been chosen by the Senate to lead an expedition into Macedonia. The credo ends with these words: "The city itself furnishes abundance of topics for conversation; let it confine its passion for talking to its own precincts . . . we shall pay no attention to any counsel but such as shall be framed within our camp."

That these words should evoke a sympathetic response from our twentieth century proconsul is not a cause for wonder. What is truly surprising, however, is that over the years an authoritarian and limited type such as MacArthur should call forth so remarkably little adverse criticism and, up to the very recent past, so much favorable comment.

Secretary of Defense Marshall has referred to MacArthur as "our most brilliant general." The former Secretary of Defense, James Forrestal, while still in possession of his sanity, spoke of him as "America's beachhead in Asia . . . our greatest strategist." Winston Churchill, with that prodigality of adjective which, unfortunately, never seems to have been affected by the British program of austerity, called him "that glorious commander."

Among the General's Admirers

That MacArthur's entourage, closer to the irradiation of the MacArthur charisma, should express themselves more intensely is not unexpected. This, for example, is Lieut. Gen. George E. Stratemayer, who is in charge of all the air forces in the Far East: "He's the best informed man I have ever known." It is, of course, entirely possible that MacArthur is the most informed man that Stratemayer has ever known. This, however, is saying precious little, in view of the fact that Stratemayer's associates consist of such luminaries as Maj. Gen. Emmett O'Donnell, the strategic bombing expert and ambassador of western culture, who recently returned from the Orient advocating the use of the atomic bomb in China and an end to getting "mixed up further with a lot of knotheads."

But that so many newspapermen return from an interview in the same state of critical catalepsy—the eye glazed, the mouth sagging—is more interesting. John Osborne, writing in *Life* magazine, says that MacArthur is "a great man, one of those rare men whose stature totally fills the area of his authority, whose complete competence qualifies him for the most complete command." Cornelius Ryan in an article in *The American Mercury* states, "He will talk on any subject brilliantly. . . ."

Even Roger Baldwin returned from Tokyo crying *Et in Arcadia ego!* "The key to the great drama is General

Douglas MacArthur!" he stated. This former expert on jurisprudence considers the Japanese constitution to be "among the most democratic in the world." This of the constitution of which the Japanese joked: "What do you think of the new constitution?" "I don't know—I can't read English."

As a result of the recent defeats administered the United Nations forces in Korea the MacArthur reputation is beginning to assume manageable proportions. The British and members of the British Commonwealth have begun to question the mythology, as have the French. Colonial powers like India have expressed alarm. There has even been restrained criticism in this country—criticism which is currently being inhibited by the necessity of saving face before the actual and potential Stalinist world.

It is, therefore, not an unpropitious time for an examination of the career of this general whom no newspaperman has ever quite had the cynicism to call "the soldier's soldier."

MacArthur Follows Suit

An initial point must be made. MacArthur is unquestionably an exceptionally unlovely public figure in a trade where varieties of boorishness form the substratum of the personality. Nevertheless, in the realms of military and occupation policy he has, over the past decade, almost always hewn closely to the mark prescribed by political and military echelons higher than his own. The credits and debits of his activity, therefore, should be entered not against his account but against that of the government as a whole. The essential congruence of policy is in part demonstrated by the fact that up to the present, at least, MacArthur's antics have not been so badly out of line as to cause his removal.

It is the fashion of most journalism to see history as the activity of great men, and MacArthur is not one to discourage the dissemination of such first principles, but it is not difficult in the present instance to show the limitations of this concept. For example, the recent defeats suffered by United Nations forces in Korea cannot properly be ascribed to MacArthur. Prior to the invasion by the North Korean Stalinists, China and Korea had been written off politically and militarily by the State Department. The Pentagon generally considered Korea indefensible in any major conflict. When the United States decided to intervene the operation of necessity had to be an improvisation mounted with slender resources in most categories. Defeats were inevitable.

Similarly, the intervention of the Chinese Stalinists was implicit in the context of the whole world and Far Eastern situations and not in whether MacArthur stopped a few miles closer or nearer to the Chinese border. The

whole operation was a fine example of what the military is fond of calling "a calculated risk."

The blame for the present course down the flaming road of war can be more properly laid upon Truman and the leading figures of the State Department for their commitment of the United States to an adventure delicately fused with many explosive possibilities. It is today much easier to criticize the *execution* of a hazardous policy than to raise the question of the whole character of the policy which has proved a military and political disaster and whose end it is obvious Washington has not the slightest idea.

The Dilemma of American Capitalism

The fact is that United States capitalism finds itself confronted with a totalitarian collectivist world movement possessed of a dynamism it has heretofore not encountered on the world arena. Stalinism, in addition to possessing powerful basic industries in Russia and tremendous manpower resources, has a political program with great appeal (initially, in particular) to the proletariat and peasantry of the world, including those sections not under its direct control. This program of nationalization of industry, redistribution of the land, "social reform," and "anti-imperialism"—alone, or when linked with military operations, as is now occurring in Korea—is what is frustrating the intentions and understanding of even reasonably informed political figures—not to speak of their tradition-bound military colleagues.

Up to the present the United States has not produced a military type such as has emerged in other countries and periods. We do not have in our literature, for example, the braggart soldier of the Roman drama, the East Prussian Junker with his monocle, corset, and periodic unemployment, or the retired Colonel Blimp of the tweeds, the bird-watching, and the letters to the *London Times*. Isolated geographically, without colonial empire in the classical sense, lacking a feudal military tradition, occupied largely with the exploitation of the internal market, the United States never developed a full-fledged military caste. The army, *relatively* speaking, has been a democratic one. The democratic spirit permeating the military forces, as depicted, say, by Parkman in *The Oregon Trail* somewhat over a century ago, has been far from stamped out.

A Born Military Man

MacArthur is about as close as the United States has come to the commonly accepted picture of the professional soldier type.

"He was born," we are informed by a biographer who has obviously achieved complete mastery of the MacArthur style, "with a silver sword in his mouth." It is not recorded if he was also wearing spurs. This obstetrical *coup de theatre* took place in 1880 at the Little Rock, Arkansas, army post, where his father, who ultimately became a major general, was stationed. MacArthur's entire life was to be lived out in the military microcosm of oblique values.

As a young man MacArthur was enrolled in the West Texas Military Academy. From here, as is normal with

generals' sons, he was picked to go to West Point. Under the guidance of his mother, who served him as coach, publicity agent, lobbyist, and whip he lived through the hazing, that fusion of childishness and sadism which took the lives of two of MacArthur's classmates, to emerge in 1903 first in a class of ninety-three. His marks were the highest for the entire preceding twenty-five year period.

From West Point he was sent to the Philippines, where he participated in the subjugation of the national movement, one of whose leaders was the well-known Aguinaldo. He returned to the United States in 1904 and shortly thereafter accompanied his father to the Far East when the elder MacArthur was sent as a military observer to the Russo-Japanese war. When the young MacArthur returned to the United States he became military aide to Theodore Roosevelt. He accompanied Funston's expedition to Vera Cruz.

During World War I he commanded the famous 42nd division. Immediately following the war he was made superintendent of West Point—the youngest one ever to hold the post. In 1922 he contracted his first marriage—with Louise Cromwell Brooks, a product of wealthy Philadelphia and Baltimore banking circles. During this period MacArthur served on the court-martial board that in

The Wisdom of ICHI-BAN*

ON HISTORIOGRAPHY (to a group of Navy historians): "I have nothing particular to say to you, gentlemen, except that your history shall agree with my communiques."

* * *

ON CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTION (in reference to a questionnaire circulated to 13,372 United States clergymen which indicated that a majority would not bear arms in case of war): "The attitude of the majority in this poll apparently stamps the clergyman as a leading exponent of law violation at individual pleasure."

* * *

ON SPORTSMANSHIP (when Ichi-Ban was the superintendent of West Point): "Louie, go out and hire me the best damned basketball coach money can buy!"

* * *

ON GREEK PHILOSOPHY: "It is fascinating to go back and read Plato's vision of Utopia and to see how far we have progressed. . . . What a remarkable vision—what intellectual flashes—those old fellows, had, living under their backward conditions. . . ."

* * *

ON HIS FITNESS TO HEAD THE OCCUPATION: "Gentlemen, even after fifty years among the Orientals, I still do not understand these people."

* * *

ON GOD AS ICHI-BAN'S G-2: "This is the Voice of Freedom, General MacArthur speaking. . . . I have returned. By the grace of Almighty God our forces stand again upon Philippine soil. . . . The guidance of Divine God points the way. Follow in His name to the Holy Grail of righteous victory!"

* * *

ON THE POLITICS OF CRITICISM: "There is a letter in the *London TIMES*, criticizing me and the whole occupation, written by Sir Robert Craigie (pre-war British Ambassador to Japan). That is playing the Russian game."

effect cashiered Gen. Mitchell, the proponent of air-power, from the army.

From 1930 to 1935 he served as army chief-of-staff—also as its youngest incumbent. During his term of office he personally led troops down Pennsylvania Avenue against the bonus marchers, mounted on a white horse. In 1935 he returned to the Philippines as military adviser to the Philippine government. At this time he married his second wife, Jean Faircloth, a wealthy “daughter of the old South . . . educated in chaste old Southern schools,” and a member of the Daughters of the Confederacy and the Daughters of the American Revolution. In July 1941, when war with Japan was imminent, he was made commander of United States forces in the Far East.

Thus, all the essential aspects of his personality had long been shaped by the time World War II broke out, permitting MacArthur, like some aging Robert Mantell stamping out D’Artagnan, to ham it on the world stage. There was his long military background, training, and experience, which permitted him to discharge his military functions without conspicuous slips. There was his pre-occupation with the Far East, derived from his years of service. There was his contempt for the ordinary civilian world, compounded of the long life in the military cocoon,

*** “The Great One” -- a Term Applied by the Japanese to MacArthur, not always, we trust, seriously.**

ON THE LIBERAL TEMPERAMENT: “I came here with the idea of using the emperor more sternly. But it hasn’t been necessary. He is a sincere man and a genuine liberal.”

* * *

ON THE DEMOCRATIC PROCESS (as reflected in Ichi-Ban’s approach to the Japanese CP): “The only way to deal with these fellows is to bloody their noses.”

* * *

ON THE TRAGEDY AND LONELINESS OF GENIUS: “Napoleon was a genius on the battlefield. He could make combinations that no one else thought of, but in political affairs he listened to his advisers too much. He had some excellent ideas but he lost his belief in them when he listened to those around him. . . . I find the same thing in political affairs. I believe I have a good idea, but after I listen to all the experts I don’t have as much faith in it.”

* * *

ON CHARACTER ANALYSIS: “A man with a pipe is a man after my own heart.”

* * *

ON THE MILITARY ART OF ESTIMATING THE ENEMY’S CAPABILITIES AND INTENTIONS (1950): “I hope to keep my promise to the GI’s and have them home by Christmas.”

* * *

ON HIS ESTIMATION OF THE STATE DEPARTMENT: “My major advisers now have boiled down almost to two men—George Washington and Abraham Lincoln. . . . If you go back into their lives you can find almost all the answers.”

* * *

ON AN APPEAL TO THE THRONE (by a bonus marcher who asked: “Will you give us half an hour to evacuate our women and children?”): “Take an hour!”

* * *

ON THE ROLE OF WOMEN: “Any husband will tell you that the wife really rules the family.”

his marriages into wealth, and his contacts with the Confederacy Redivivus which forms such a disproportionate part of the regular army milieu. There was his contempt for all other military ranks, formed by his—alas, not always recognized—seniority over such rookies as Marshall, Eisenhower, Vandenberg, etc.

Politics and Military Talent

Whether MacArthur is a first-rate general or not is impossible to know. Now as never before, given conditions of modern technology, war is a collective effort in which the role of a single individual is pretty much assimilated into that of others. The big strategy is devised by the political and military summits. In World War II this meant Roosevelt, Churchill, and their political advisers, and the Combined Joint Chiefs of Staff. Much the same is true on every succeeding lower level. Beyond this, modern wars are wars of materiel and political program, with the individual by no means the critical figure he once was.

The real test of ability occurs when a leader is deprived of some of these advantages, as was Rommel in North Africa. On this basis of evaluation the successful attacks of the Chinese Stalinists in the latter days of 1950 seriously posed the question as to whether MacArthur was simply a genius and not a god after all. The criticisms of MacArthur’s policies by Homer Bigart in *Look* magazine may well be correct. In any event, the limitations of MacArthur’s type of leadership, which (unlike Eisenhower’s, for example) permits him to have only stooges or enemies around him has been made more than a little apparent.

We must, however, revert to our previously made point that what is involved is a clash of world systems whose determining forces and personalities are beyond any effective control by MacArthur. A minor exhibit: we are perfectly willing to agree that MacArthur’s intelligence work has been of a pitiful order and that the North Korean’s has been first rate. But most of this is beyond the powers of MacArthur and his staff, for the political program of the North Korean Stalinists permits them to find all sorts of support behind the United Nations lines—a possibility which does not exist to the same degree for the United Nations forces in regard to conditions behind the Stalinist lines.

MacArthur, of course, can hardly be aware of all this. He does only what all other authoritarians do under similar circumstances—finds scapegoats. Generals commanding divisions, who had considered themselves lucky simply to be able to hold their forces together, let alone attack, and who had periodically found themselves engaged in all sorts of activities not prescribed in field manuals on generalship—such as firing bazookas, for example, suddenly found themselves on planes returning to the United States. They, as well as MacArthur, are unaware of the historical cross-currents which made such wreckage of their intentions.

Despite the idiosyncratic interventions of MacArthur, the occupation of Japan has in all essentials not been his product but Washington’s. That a democratic capitalist United States was able both to impose a large number of

reforms upon a bureaucratic capitalist Japan which had hardly emerged from an Asiatic feudalism, and to encourage the institution of others, cannot be gainsaid. Multi-party politics revived, trade unions were established, many civil liberties were restored, a freer press was possible, education was liberalized, land reforms were begun, the status of women was elevated, the secret police was abolished, the free activity of leading reactionaries was curbed, etc. It was, as it were, a democratic occupation, and not one on the order of Hitler's New Europe or Stalin's People's Democracies.

But that all this was incomplete and subject to continuous ratification by the occupying powers is also true. No serious step is taken by the Japanese without prior consultation. For a democratic structure to be stable it must be the product of an inner development, not the result of acts of benevolence or imposition from without. The basic fact about the occupation of Japan is that *it remains an occupation*—that is, for all practical purposes the United States controls Japan lock, stock, and barrel through its direct representatives on Japanese soil. Criticism of the MacArthur regime without criticism of the occupation *per se* is criticism of a secondary order. And normally it has not even been that, but simply journalistic griping about MacArthur's undoubted megalomania, his press censorship, the lack of steam heat in Tokyo, the ritual of MacArthur's daily arrival at work—known to the irreverent as The Second Coming of Christ, and similar phenomena of greater or less importance.

No change in the character and number of prescripts from MacArthur can resolve the fundamental economic facts which have kept Japan in a state of permanent economic, political, and social crisis since the end of the war: the loss of foreign markets, the seizure of her colonial areas, the competition of other capitalist countries, the absence of the necessary quantities of raw materials, the backward agricultural economy, an outmoded technology, the loss of shipping, an absence of skilled manpower, etc. With these absent it is impossible to establish the material basis for a stable democratic regime.

The General and the State Department

The recent steps taken toward signing a peace treaty with Japan and toward rearming that country are another illustration of the thesis that MacArthur policy is in reality State Department policy. Though MacArthur has been for signing a peace treaty with Japan for several years and for using her as a base for a war against Stalinism in the Far East, this latest policy was not implemented until international events and State Department thinking decreed it. MacArthur is far from the independent consul some persons like to imagine him.

From the point of view of the State Department and the administration MacArthur's faults are (1) that he has tended to give priority to the Orient over Europe in the struggle against Stalinism, (2) that he thinks almost exclusively in military terms and does not attempt to exploit possible differences between the Russian and Chinese Stalinists, and (3) that he has difficulty collaborating with anybody.

In turn, MacArthur can quite easily retort that since the end of the war he has consistently been for a strong policy against Stalinism in the Far East while the State Department was successively experimenting with a Stalinist-Nationalist coalition, military aid to Chiang Kai-shek, the abandonment of the mainland to Chinese Stalinism and the dumping of Chiang Kai-shek, and, most recently, the sudden darting back into Korea with United States forces. If amid all this MacArthur seems to achieve a certain consistency it is due not only to his simple-minded military approach to a complex problem but to the vague and contradictory policy of the administration.

The Vanishing General

MacArthur, however, is a sort of "free enterprise" general who is destined to disappear from the United States scene just as surely as the old rugged individualist capitalist has all but vanished. The same centralization of the economy which has taken place on the national arena and extended itself to the international one in the form of cartels and the close political and economic alliances of the Marshall Plan type is occurring in the military structure.

It was foreshadowed in World War II, in which the allied capitalist leadership was centered in the Combined Joint Chiefs of Staff, which was resident in Washington. The new type of general was typified by such men as Eisenhower, the supreme commander in Europe, and by his British deputy commander, Tedder. The upheavals attending the creation of the single department of defense, and the adjudication of the B-36 controversy, revealed the inner strains accompanying the continuation of the centralization process in the post-war period. The speed of this centralization will be accelerated by the example of the apparent utility of the Stalinist monolithic structure.

If MacArthur has been able to indulge his megalomania and other eccentricities in the past it is only because he operated at the end of long lines of communication in a country and in a hemisphere whose value to the United States was, in any case, never regarded too highly. Minor errors of policy, and even something more than minor errors, were permissible because of this estimate, and because most of the errors could in any event be rectified by virtue of the enormous material wealth the United States had at its disposal.

But an epoch is rushing down upon us in which the material wealth and the manpower of the United States and its associates are being challenged on a scale dreamed of by Hitler, perhaps, but impossible of realization by him. Backing this up is a powerful ideology which, though totalitarian in its ultimate consequences, exerts an initial appeal upon workers and peasants which cannot be duplicated by the United States.

That is a brute fact which is going to break many a person more astute than the general who in his childhood witnessed Indians waging wars with bows and arrows and in his old age is prepared to witness inter-hemispheric warfare with nuclear weapons.

JAMES M. FENWICK

The Myth of Totalitarian Invincibility

Discussion of Totalitarianism's Inherent Weaknesses

INTELLECTUALS WITHIN the Anglo-Saxon democratic tradition have always found it difficult to achieve a genuine understanding of the absolute state, past or present. They are unable to understand how ordinary people live under a tyranny; and they create, therefore, bizarre theories of the forces sustaining the tyrant. One contemporary example is George Orwell's *1984*, a novel which is as its advertisers claim an excellent work of science fiction, but which has major deficiencies as a piece of political analysis and prediction. But prior to discussing this work, I should like to make some general comments on theories of the totalitarian state.

In the tradition of Anglo-Saxon political philosophy the individual has been viewed as existing autonomously prior to the state. The state, therefore, has been viewed as the product of a free compact among such autonomous individuals. It follows that the state either possesses the enthusiastic support of the people or their equally enthusiastic enmity—in which case it falls and is replaced. It is on this logic that it is possible to ask the Germans: "Do you repent?" For since they did not revolt nor leave the country they must obviously have supported and been responsible for the policies of Naziism. On the same logic, it is possible to build a mythical picture of German culture and character of which Naziism was the logical culmination; and in this way many subtle webs of theory are spun. It is also quite comforting to ourselves: since if totalitarianism is the consequence of an irrational (German or Russian) national character, we could never be, and have never been, similarly guilty.

The Efficiency of Totalitarianism

Correlatively with this myth, that the tyrannized support the tyrant, is another myth, that the totalitarian state is somehow terribly efficient. Since it is never bothered by the time-consuming processes of achieving parliamentary consensus, nor by the vacillations in policy that destroy carefully elaborated plans, since it enjoys the whole-hearted support of its people, and since its structure is so highly rationalized, many people are inclined to believe that it is as efficient as it modestly claims.

It is only relatively recently that social scientists seem to have become aware of a popular sentiment toward the state, a sentiment in between enthusiastic support and enthusiastic enmity, namely apathy, cynicism, and indifference. Once this sentiment is taken into consideration the analysis of fascism becomes considerably more complex.

We take as fundamental the notion that the modern state is composed of classes which have vastly different power relative to the political structure. The elite, despite their numerical weakness, have always the advantages which stem from control of the state apparatus: organization, centralization, superior armament, and legality itself.

In order that open revolt should occur, a peculiar and unique set of circumstances must come into existence. Some of these can be mentioned briefly: the population must be relatively equalized in their (mis)fortunes; it must be organized across the boundaries of traditional interest groupings; it must be armed in some sort of parity with the elite; and it must have hope and the vision of a possible, concretely better future. Such circumstances are rare. Much more frequently, hostility against the government is expressed through the covert action of relatively intimate groups (e.g. workers in a single section of a factory). The dominant manifestation of such hostility is sabotage of national goals by way of inefficiency through carelessness and indifference or through deliberate intent. Against such action carried through by determined and important groups in the economy the government is relatively powerless. At best, it can confine and atomize such efforts by the shrewd use of terror and bribery.

Terror Versus Conscience

Indeed, the existence of terror in the totalitarian state should teach us that support of the state is far from total. Terror is notoriously less efficient than government by consent, where the guardian of the law is neither the Gestapo nor the police, but the norms firmly internalized within the individual. No armed force is ever as relentless or efficient in its surveillance and in its prompt punishment as is the conscience. But terror is the only method yet existing by which an elite can govern a hostile, civilized population.

Propaganda, it is true, is a valuable auxiliary to terror. But, again if it were as efficient as claimed, if it caused the populace to support its government, why concomitantly is there terror? Propaganda seems unable to convince people that they have shoes when their feet are being bruised by the rocks on the road. The best it can do, and this is of course a great deal, is to encourage them to vent their hostility on some group other than the elite. Unfortunately for the propagandist, people have a way of noting the fine leather boots worn by the elite.

But, the elite and the mass do not exhaust the total configuration: in between is the party, the instrumentality of the elite. A great deal depends upon the nature of the ties binding the party members to the elite. Here, too, attachment by ideological belief gives great strength and efficiency to the state. Functions necessary to the maintenance of the state are discharged expeditiously. But, in the long run, the price of ideological adherence by party members is government policy in accord with the ideology, and this imposes great restrictions upon the elite. It is not always easy to construct rationalizations justifying the aggrandizement of the elite at the expense of the populace. The Comintern has performed some rare feats here, but

outside of the USSR the price has been paid in declining party membership. It is much simpler to attach party members to the elite by bribery: spoils, sinecures, and exceptional privileges. This brings with it a decrease in efficiency as ideological fervor is replaced by time-serving, but the increase in policy flexibility seems worth the price. (The rumor that Stalin on a particular occasion awarded a post to one man as against another on the ground that the first was interested in self-advancement, and therefore always reliable, whereas the second was an ardent Communist, and therefore might someday join the opposition, is a primitive index to this point.)

Victims of Our Terror

Once a party has been so corrupted, we expect to find that the dominant activity of each member will be intrigue. Administrative issues will be decided more and more upon the basis of factionalism and reciprocal favors. Terror, too, becomes corrupted, for while in principle it is to be directed against all ideological opponents of the regime, in actuality it becomes a weapon in factional strife. This does not mean that ideological opponents do not still continue to bear the brunt of the terror, but rather, first, that they may hope to avoid it through bribery and blackmail, and, second, that ideological adherents of the regime may themselves be attacked if they have not paid the proper price to the proper authority.

In civilized society it is practically impossible for the typical individual to avoid committing crimes. Usually this is of no significance, since the law enforcement agencies are not interested in punishing those who violate certain laws and are only interested in a cut from those who violate others. The past commission of crimes becomes crucial only if the individual is singled out, for some exterior reason, as being an enemy of the government. This phenomenon is exaggerated in the totalitarian state. Here the number of crimes and the magnitude of their punishment increases enormously. Safety lies then in the cultivation of the proper authorities. And, for the authorities, safety from other authorities lies in blackmail, bribery, and the reciprocation of favors. The instruments of internal surveillance are thus turned, not upon the opposition, but upon the opposing faction.

Given the propaganda barrage, and the curtain—iron, silken, or nylon—it is very difficult for one observing from another country to perceive this. The unanimity of expression of their mass media tends to convince him that the nation solidly supports its leaders; so, too, does the horrible fate of rival ideological leaders, who appear to have no popular following. The misleading statistics of economic success tend to convince him that the regime is efficient. But consider the impression that an outsider would have of popular support of our national foreign policy if he merely read our propaganda and noted our aggressive actions.

State Exploitation of Family Schisms

These false impressions find confirmation in the testimony of middle class refugees. They have, for instance, seen the way in which the state has turned children against their parents in the middle class, and they tend to believe that it is equally efficient throughout the entire society. Yet,

the modern middle class family is, as we know, already highly disintegrated, with the children often antagonistic to their parents. Surely it is no great feat to channelize this antagonism into the service of the state. And it is an entirely different question as to whether the state can create a similar schism in working class families. As we should know from the "failures" of our own educational system, it is one thing to force children to submit to ritual, and quite another to convert them to a belief to which the family gives no support. Moreover, even if the conversion is successful at the age of six or sixteen, in any class—middle or working, there is very little guarantee that this conversion will still be strong at twenty-six.

In any society, and particularly in an economically impoverished one, people do not devote much energy to the question of larger political problems. There is the much more important task of getting enough to eat, and perhaps a few luxuries, and of advancing oneself, when this is possible. The same problems of human existence as in a democracy recur in the totalitarian state. To be sure, there is the terror; but for the average man it is simply another risk, another threat, which at fortune's whim may or may not strike him down. One discusses politics, within the limits of free speech, and perhaps a little beyond, but national policy is like the weather and death: beyond one's control and beyond one's responsibility.

Orwell's View Analyzed

Perhaps some of these considerations may be illuminated by a discussion of George Orwell's *1948*. As a novel, it is quite weak, and in any case this aspect of the book would seem to be not germane to the present discussion. But, in fact, this weakness is symptomatic of the author's lack of comprehension of how humans live under totalitarianism. In effect, Orwell assumes that human nature is so malleable that a society of the sort he describes can come into existence and that once it is in existence the beings who inhabit it become completely dehumanized. In accord with this, all the characters of the book are flat, uni-dimensional.

Orwell recognizes the material inefficiency of the totalitarian state and deliberately emphasizes it. But he does not recognize that the inefficiency is more general, permeating the entire structure. He presupposes a tremendous efficiency in all aspects of the state having to do with social control: a loyal corps of Thought Police; a rationalized system of propaganda production and dissemination; and submissive party members. One instance of this incredible efficiency is the plot itself: in which it is revealed that the hero, a minor and unimportant bureaucrat, had been for seven years under the most intense and thorough surveillance. Such intense investigation of a minor personage is not impossible in a totalitarian society, but it is rare. It has to be rare, because economically it is a losing proposition. Likewise incredible is the sheer number of Winston Smith's fellow bureaucrats who with him end up in the torture chambers.

1984 is a nightmare, and a peculiarly middle class nightmare. Its two threats are violence and the corruption of the intellect, and neither of these threats are directed against the proletariat of *1984*. The Proles have it easy. They are permitted to live as unreflecting animals, content with simple

joys, and required only to love Big Brother and to hate the enemy. And in Orwell's view of human nature, this brute existence is satisfying to them.

This is, of course, ridiculous, but in one respect Orwell is correct. One sub-section of the middle class, the free professionals and especially the intellectuals, is a special victim of fascism, and indeed of the modern state, whether fascist or democratic. They find it increasingly difficult to maintain themselves as economically free. Their talents, instead of being directed by their conscience, for purposes of criticism, creation, or gain, are now purchased by private industry or the government and subverted to the manipulation of public opinion. Thus, Winston Smith with his knack for writing and his desire to write freely and truthfully, rather than for the state, represents the last heir to the tradition of the free intellectual.

Alienation of Proletariat

Yet again, Orwell over-simplifies in favor of the middle class. For precisely the same battle was fought through against the manual worker by an earlier stage of capitalism. He, too, was stripped of his freedom, his skills, and his creativity, and transformed into an appendage of the machine. So successful was this despoilment that, today, scarcely anyone (and this includes Orwell) thinks of it, or regards it as significant in the protest of the proletariat. They have it easy!

But the fact that other groups have already been degraded does not negate the tragedy of the free intellectuals. Moreover, their existence, based upon the bourgeois freedoms, has been one of the outstanding virtues of capitalism. Yet, concomitantly, one expects of them a larger perspective, a perspective which realizes that their freedom had its basis in the estrangement of other groups from their crafts. And this basis having been destroyed with the transformation of the capitalist economy, there is for the intellectual no salvation from his own estrangement which does not involve the salvation of others whose estrangement is earlier and more pronounced.

AL MIMSEY

Al Mimsey is a student at the University of Chicago.

Interest and Membership

If you are interested in joining or receiving more information about the *New York Student Federation Against War*, fill out the blank below accordingly and mail to the Federation at 247 Lexington Avenue, New York City.

I Want to Join I Want More Information

Name

Address

School

Song of the Enemies

Coarse cleft of the forest rampant,
rending the dark, dark dome;
hoarse wrath of the tyrant night,
bleeding the trees with the scimitar-moon.

Night is a place for hiding
Night is the time of the tomb
Great stone robe of silence
A place to be lost and dying

A pallid silver-fingered hand of tongues
held up its voice for silence, shrieking
Moonstone
Bloodstone
Whetstone

Grass is a battle, bleeding.
Morning is a sorcerer
of sources and resources,
healing.

O brother, brother, brother of grass
mown in the red, red rain —
how shall our father know us,
slain in the dark of night?
How shall our mother find us
hidden beneath the dawn?

WILLIAM ROBERT MILLER

Guernica, 1950

After the swoon
The syntax,

After the spasm
the desperate expanse
Of trial-and-error

Of recapitulation
And decision.

The paraphrase of past
Into complaint
While the ashes of allegiances
Are sifted:

The oaths affirmed
And signatures presented

And vertigo dismissed
Like a taxicab.

HAL VETTER

Ends and Means of U.S. Welfare Imperialism

Economic and Political Motives Behind Interventionism

ONE OF THE COMMON errors of the American liberal is to discuss American imperialism as if it were a thing of the past, an adolescent aberration in the development and growth of the "American way of life." The purpose of this article is to discuss the distinctive features of American imperialism, and above all to demonstrate that imperialism, far from being a thing of the past, is in new forms integrally a part of American capitalism—more so than ever before.

There are two popular objections to describing the United States as "imperialist." One dissenting view denies that American prosperity bears any significant relationship to foreign trade. This view is superficially strengthened by the fact that in the last thirty years U. S. exports never exceeded 10 per cent of the gross national product. The figure appears small, but actually it is decisive for the direct benefits of export trade do not accrue to all industries. There are industries which are dependent upon trade and if cut off from foreign markets would not only verge on collapse but would have a disastrous effect on related industries not directly dependent on the foreign market. America's reliance on the world market was summarized by the Brookings Institute:

Although American foreign trade is small in comparison with national output, it affects large sectors of industry and labor and provides an outlet for a large and steadily expanding productive capacity. A decline in foreign sales would have an adverse cumulative effect on the rest of the economy because of the close interrelationships among all parts of the economy.¹

Facts Prove Importance of Exports

A breakdown of some industries reveals that in 1938, 53 percent of refined copper was exported, 28 percent of the tractors, 18 percent of the printing machinery, 17 percent of the agricultural implements and 14 percent of the industrial machinery, cars and trucks.² Similar significant estimates could be cited for agriculture. *The Seventh Report to the Congress of the Economic Cooperation Administration* pointed out that 20-25 percent of the total production of cotton, wheat and tobacco in the fiscal year 1948-49 were financed by ECA exports alone.

The importance of the foreign market for domestic prosperity is further illustrated in the *Report of the ECA-Commerce Dept. Mission*. The report notes that from 1914 to 1948, U. S. exports were \$270 billion, imports were \$169 billion, leaving an export surplus of \$101 billion. Although 50 per cent of this export surplus was built up during the two world wars, it nonetheless indicates the

dependence of domestic prosperity on the foreign market. From 1946-1949 total U. S. exports have been \$67 billion, with over \$30 billion being an export surplus.*

These figures, substantial as they are, still do not reveal the full importance of the foreign market to the export capitalist, for the rate of profit of exported goods is often higher than that realized on the domestic market. Perhaps the most dramatic fact establishing the economic importance of foreign trade is a 1938 estimate that the livelihood of 10 percent of American workers and their families (approximately 14 million people) depended on U. S. exports.

The need for foreign markets is but one of the economic drives behind American interests. The increasingly desperate search for sources of raw materials and the need to find profitable areas of investment for surplus finance capital, are no less important than the foreign commodity market. But what is weakest in the liberal argument is that it ignores a serious new *political* motivation behind American intervention in foreign lands, a new form of *political* imperialism which will be discussed further on in this article.**

Imperialism and Colonial Empire

A second more popular misconception is that imperialism is necessarily based upon territorial acquisition. Therefore, it has been concluded that the United States, lacking a colonial empire of significant proportions, can in no way be considered an imperialist power.

Granting self-rule to the Filipinos is presented as conclusive proof that the few possessions still retained by the United States are but hangovers from an earlier era. But the fiction of American benevolence in the Philippines is wearing thin even in the short space of five years. Let us imagine that the U.S.-Philippine relations were reversed: suppose an official Philippine mission came to the U. S., criticised the American government for its corruption, then announced a loan of \$250 million which the Philippine government would administer. Further, suppose the Philip-

* When the \$46 billion on military expenditures for the same period is included with exports, the \$113 billion is seen to have provided a solid base for the prosperity of the last five years.

**Washington's increased emphasis on the economic, military and political importance of the foreign market is highlighted in the *Report to the President on Foreign Economic Policies* (Gray Report), Nov., 1950:

"It is important to increase the production of raw materials necessary for defense. It is not enough simply to buy existing supplies—new capital must flow into raw material producing countries to increase production. Moreover, it is vital not to lose the sources of these needed raw materials to the forces of Communist aggression."

¹ *Major Problems of U.S. Foreign Policy 1950-1951*, pp. 122.

² Herman Finer, *America's Destiny*, pp. 270-271.

pine government had the right to exploit U. S. raw materials written into the U. S. constitution and had military bases in the U. S. on a 99 year lease. Would anyone venture to say that the U. S. was an independent country, or that the Philippine government was not imperialistically exploiting the U. S.?

Imperialism in the Philippines

The Bell Economic Survey Mission Report sharply criticised the Philippine government for the conditions in its country, pointing to the graft, corruption, poverty and political bankruptcy of the U.S.-supported Quirino regime. The reaction of the Philippine bourgeoisie to this criticism demonstrated the hostile side of the ambivalent attitude that all colonial bourgeois maintain towards the foreign exploiter. The following statement by the personal secretary of President Quirino, although later called "unauthorized" was made without tongue in cheek:

Filipinos, there is no question, are inefficient all right—even in their grafting—due no doubt to their simple lack of sufficient experience. With more time and greater chances, they will yet show that they can equal or even surpass the stink familiar and now taken for granted in Washington and such very proper centers of power, prosperity and culture. . . .

The Filipinos are now getting it in the neck, because they are not rich enough to cover up their own stink and be lofty and moral about it before a devastated and hungry world. It costs a lot of money, dollars if you please, to enjoy that privilege and not having it, they accept momentarily the considerable inconvenience of being regarded always in the wrong. . . .⁴

The U. S. concern for the Philippines does not stem from American capitalism's concern for clean government. The strategic proximity of the Philippines to the Asiatic mainland, and the necessity for the U. S. to have a major staging depot for military operations against the Asiatic continent requires political stability in the islands. The speech of Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, on Jan. 12, 1950, in which he outlined the U. S. military perimeter of Alaska, Japan and the Philippines in the Pacific shows that the Philippines are to be regarded as a pawn in America's strategic interests. This idea was most clearly formulated by Paul V. McNutt, former U. S. High Commissioner to the Philippines:

We are already committed to the maintenance of naval and air bases in the islands. These are not designed merely for the protection of the Philippines, nor even for the defense of the U. S. These bases are expected to be secondary, supporting installations for supply, repair and staging activities for all our armed forces in the Far East. . . . Committed as we are to the long-time occupation of Japan, to a strong policy in Asia, the Philippines are destined to play a major role in our diplomacy in the Orient.⁵

Non-Colonial Imperialism

Our discussion of the Philippine situation reveals the error in the view that colonial empire is the sum and sub-

³ Report to the President of the U. S. by the Economic Survey Mission to the Philippines, October 1950.

⁴ *New York Times*, Oct. 26, 1950.

⁵ *Colliers*, July 6, 1946.

stance of imperialist control. Not even a necessary concomitant of imperialism, it is but one form of imperialist exploitation. Empire building was characteristic of aggressive capitalism during the 19th century, when backward areas were exploited as sources of raw materials. Whole sections of the world, where economies and political consciousness were backward, were easily subjugated by, and divided among capitalist nations. This empire building which was the predominant feature of early capitalist expansion remains an objective of European powers today but no longer carries the same weight. As capitalism flourished it was faced with new problems of surpluses of goods and capital. This placed more advanced capitalist nations in a position to encroach upon the economic and political sovereignty of ostensibly independent nations through investments. Thus, the most advanced capitalist power in the world today, the U. S., finds it politically expedient and economically more profitable to extend its pressure through economic rather than military might. The fact that the U. S. has been able to establish its hegemony over the capitalist world without acquiring large colonies is a tribute to the wealth, resources and power of American capitalism—and the decline of capitalism in the rest of the world.

American capitalism, not confined to a limited land mass as were its European counterparts, spread across the vast North American continent. The opening of the West created a large internal market, eliminating the need felt by England, France and Germany for far-flung overseas colonies. However, with the closing of the frontier before the end of the 19th century and with a geometrically expanding industry, the more farsighted representatives of American capitalism foresaw the necessity of new markets overseas. The initial economic impulse to secure foreign markets was largely responsible for a crude imperialism—the high point of which was the Spanish-American War—reminiscent of a British foreign policy dominated by the thinking of a Cecil Rhodes.

From Empire Building to the "Open Door"

This primitive imperialism, however, was supplanted by the more subtle "Open Door" strategy. America's rapid economic growth* and the prior distribution of the colonial world among the European powers formed the basis for this concept of world trade: a demand that American capitalism have the same rights as European states to exploit the world market. However, while the U. S. was demanding an "Open Door" in China it was busy trying to close its door on the Philippines, the Caribbean and Central America; nor did this "liberal" foreign economic policy prevent the U. S. from demanding of Japan, in 1906, a treaty port at Shantung, China.

* The turn of the century witnessed a shift in the relative weight of American capitalism in the world economy; by 1890 the U. S. had surpassed Great Britain in volume of industrial production. Twenty years later it accounted for over one-third of the world's industrial production, by 1928 it was 45 percent and today it is estimated at 50 percent.

(Fritz Sternberg, *The Coming Crisis*, pp., 118-121.)

With its vastly superior technology, America presented a serious challenge on the free markets of the world and even pressed for entry into areas more or less closed by restrictive trade practices. It was this drive for markets and areas for investment that gave rise to the current four freedoms of American capitalism; not the non-existent freedoms of the Atlantic Charter, but *free enterprise, free competition, free access to markets and free convertibility of currency.*

Dollar Diplomacy: Partner to the Open Door

"Dollar Diplomacy," supplementing the "Open Door" concept has been one of the two roads by which America reached its international economic and political supremacy, the other, the two world wars. The classical example of "Dollar Diplomacy" can be found in American economic penetration of Latin America. Here, "Dollar Diplomacy" was coupled with violence and the threat of force. For example, in 1923, the Central American republics under the threat of force signed away their "right of revolution," and a year later when Nicaragua attempted to reassert its sovereignty, American Marines were quickly dispatched to crush the rebellion.

Up until 1914, U. S. investments in the Caribbean and Central America were \$2 billion. With the outbreak of World War I, American investments moved to South America and into sharp competition with British investments. In 1913, U. S. private investments were only about \$175 million, and by 1930, they leaped to over \$3 billion. To protect its investments, made profitable through cheap labor, American capitalists with Washington's support have had no moral compunctions about supporting brutal dictatorial regimes. Between exploitation by American capital and the corruption of American supported governments, the South American peoples have been kept in a state of permanent poverty. When confronted with a choice between the interests of the people or the protection of private American investments, Washington invariably places its diplomatic and political machinery at the disposal of Big Business.

The Government as an Investor

Since the middle of the Thirties, the U. S. government has assumed a larger role as an investor through the extension of loans not only to Latin America but to the rest of the world. The activities of the Export-Import Bank and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation have encroached upon areas once held sacred by private capital: transportation, armaments, and the development of new industries. This does not mean that *today* state investment threatens to supplant private investment. Private capital has taken on sizeable new investments in recent years; the exploitation of oil fields in the Near East and South America and the development of iron ore deposits in Venezuela and Labrador. But the state is interested in obtaining raw materials and starting industries that private capital may be unwilling to work. The loss of Southeast

Asia to Japan in the last war increased the U. S. drive for the procurement of raw materials.

State Imperialism -- Growing Tendency

This new role of the state as a direct foreign investor on an increasing scale poses the theoretical possibility of the development of a new and dominant form of imperialism—*state imperialism*. Heretofore, the main role of the state was to protect and sanctify private foreign investments.* In addition, the tendency toward a direct state imperialism is reinforced by state-directed investments such as the proposed Point Four Program. These state-directed investments have their antecedent in the traditional close relation between Big Business and the State Department. But the difference between the "Open Door" policy and today's state directed imperialism is that the former was a general governmental strategy designed to open and protect areas for private investment through diplomacy and the threat of force, while the state-directed investment (Point Four) proposes a state guarantee for *specific* private foreign investments.

The difference between the Export-Import Bank loan-investment (direct state imperialism) and the Point Four investment (state-directed) is that in the former, the state itself makes and administers the investment. But the Point Four guarantee is in *itself* a form of investment by the state. The danger to the private capitalist is that the state may see fit to "meddle" in the affairs of the private investor in order to protect its own interests, i.e., the guarantee. The tendency in this direction has already led to considerable friction between the government and those sections of the capitalist class concerned with foreign investment.

The New Imperialism and the Post War Conflict

The private foreign investment is made for one simple economic purpose: the realization of a profit. On the other hand the state-directed investment has an additional motivation of a *political* nature. And the political motivation can be directly traced to the nature of the world conflict between Russian and American imperialism.

The post-war world finds the only two world powers, Russia and the United States, engaged in a life and death struggle with each other. This conflict is totally different from pre-war power conflicts in that it is a head-on collision between two contradictory social classes and systems. The victory of Russia in a third world war would mean the end of capitalism in Europe, a Stalinist dominated Asia, and a completely isolated America. The U. S., assuming the leadership of a disintegrating and demoralized capitalist world, is being forced to adapt radically different methods in its economic and political policies

* With the state assuming the role of an investor and administrator of foreign loans through the Export-Import Bank and RFC, it presents the possibility of the state completely displacing the private investor. This tendency to displace the private foreign investor parallels the political and economic tendencies within capitalism at home to negate capitalism, i.e. to destroy private property.

at home and abroad. With capitalism itself at stake, the U. S. government must operate on a new plane of international class policies, subordinating, when necessary, the immediate needs and interests of the individual capitalists to the historic class interests of the bourgeois world. The inefficiency and shortsightedness of private capitalists can not be brooked where the interests of the capitalists as a class are at stake.

State-directed investments and direct state imperialism which emerged in the Thirties as barely visible new tendencies have become more prominent and sharply delineated features of American foreign policy. Fundamental political and social considerations—which are responsibilities of the government, often in conflict with immediate private capitalist interests—are largely responsible for the Marshall Plan and the Point Four program. The Marshall Plan has nothing in common with the fictitiously charitable, disinterested, selfless “Uncle Sam.” They are state directed political and economic strategies designed to make secure the position of American imperialism in its inevitable climactic battle with an aggressive Stalinist world.

The last war shattered the European economy, while the U. S. emerged richer than ever before. The most lucrative colonies were lost to European nations through nationalist revolts which rocked the post-war world, and Stalinist expansion sealed off major economic areas from both Europe and America. Within Europe, Stalinism unfortunately achieved enormous popularity among the French and Italian workers. Europe’s economic instability could in no way be overcome by the inept and demoralized capitalist governments.

European Recovery An Economic Necessity

To accomplish the major economic and political objective of resurrecting the Western European economy a large investment was made—the Marshall Plan. It would have been necessary to make this investment, in one form or another, even without the particular threat of Stalinist expansion because of the danger of the physical collapse of capitalism in Western Europe. The prosperity of the U. S. has always been dependent to a large degree on an economically solvent European capitalism. This was recognized in the following section of an ECA report.

By the early summer of 1947, the earlier hopes of a rapid and sustained recovery from the effects of the war has receded. Agricultural recovery was halted by frost damage. It became apparent in May that the prolonged winter and spring drought would lead to poor harvests. . . . Industry in most European countries in fact recovered well from the winter crisis, and the levels of the previous autumn had been generally restored by the middle of the year. But this improvement was being maintained only at the cost of the cost of depletion of financial reserves.

The effects of this process reached far beyond Europe and threatened the foundations of the world economy.⁶ (my emphasis, SB.)

⁶ Committee of European Economic Cooperation, *General Report*, pp. 8.

The Marshall Plan has also been of direct aid in temporarily stabilizing the American economy itself. The Plan financed an important part of American exports when Europe was unable to pay for them. During the second half of 1948, the Marshall Plan financed almost 40 percent of U. S. exports, while in 1949, it financed 27 percent.⁷ And in the recession of late 1948 and early 1949, the same ECA report states:

Early in 1949 there was a mild recession in some sectors of the economy. Total gross national product fell by \$5 billion in 1949, compared with 1948. From the end of 1948 to July 1949 industrial production declined by 16 percent and non-agricultural employment fell by 2 million. There was no longer the same necessity to safeguard U.S. supplies. Rather, emphasis was placed on the use of surplus commodity stocks wherever needed to meet foreign aid requirements. Against this background the ERP, in contributing to the financing of exports, incidentally had a stabilizing effect on the American economy.⁸

The Marshall Plan has been particularly concerned with the surplus stocks of American agricultural products and special provisions are written into the Marshall Plan law giving them preferential treatment. Before the outbreak of the Korean War, when it appeared that the disposal of these supplies would be of major concern, a sharp dispute broke out between the European Marshall Plan Council and the ECA. The European Marshall Plan Council at the insistence of ECA was setting up a payment union, ostensibly to ease Western Europe’s dependence on U. S. dollar aid. But, suddenly, in early February, 1950, the Department of Agriculture stepped in and vetoed this plan because it feared that it would “discriminate” against American agricultural exports.

In a statistical sense it may be said that the Marshall Plan has met with a fair amount of success; at the end of 1950, industrial production in Western Europe was 24 percent over the 1936-1938 index but agricultural production is still below pre-war levels. However, living standards remain below the pre-war levels of the depression and they are bound to fall even lower with Europe’s increased armament programs. The Marshall Plan had a more ambitious goal: the restoration of the trade balance between Europe and the rest of the world. And if today there is the temporary disappearance of the “dollar crisis,” it is not because of the Marshall Plan but the increased demand for European exports brought on by the war economy in the U. S.

Vehicles for U. S. Domination of Europe

The Marshall Plan and today the North Atlantic Pact are the mechanisms whereby the U. S. applies pressure on the economic, political and military policies of Western Europe. There have been numerous statements by U. S. officials and Congressmen designed to discourage nationalization of industry notably directed toward Britain. A less publicized fact is that such statements have also been written into the ECA reports themselves. The ECA has

⁷ *Seventh Report to Congress of the ECA*, pp. 58.

⁸ *Ibid.*

stated that it believes that the Marshall Plan "would reduce the insistent economic pressures that compel governments to ration, to control and to regulate" and thus "release the individual energies and individual initiative that must be fostered if any type of economy is to be vigorous and healthy." Also, the U. S. has made it plain that a "return to a free price system as the effective means of allocating resources"¹⁰ is regarded as a sign of progress in the direction of solving Western Europe's problems.

But the main avenue of American pressure comes through the presence of the ECA Missions in the various countries and the actual operation of the Marshall Plan itself. For the nation that controls the purse-strings also tries to make the political and economic decisions. It is the demise of European capitalism as a world power and its dependence on U. S. aid for its survival that Washington exploits. The conditions surrounding the Plan illustrate this: *first*, the U. S. has to approve the yearly economic reports of the European Marshall Plan participants; *second*, the amount and type of U. S. aid exerts a great influence on the member nations investment programs; *third*, the U. S., determines how the counter part funds (for every dollar of aid the recipient has to put the equivalent amount into a fund) shall be utilized, (thus Britain has not used these funds since December, 1949, because of a dispute with the U. S. over their allocation); *fourth*, the U. S. has forced Western Europe to reduce many of its trade restrictions under the threat of withholding Marshall Plan funds. The effects of these influences reach into almost every corner of the economic life of a nation. Never before have a group of advanced independent states been subjected to this type of direct control by a foreign country.

That the Marshall Plan is much more effective than private investment in bringing Western Europe into alignment with the political ambitions of Washington is cautiously suggested in a report by the Brookings Institute:

It may well be that government lending will lead to a greater degree of foreign interference in domestic affairs than would be contemplated in connection with investment by private capital. The U. S. Government has learned from experience the need for the right of following public money to its end use, and it now insists on it.¹¹

The American Dream

The Marshall Plan is the product of the frustrated dream of American capitalism. In the year immediately following V-J Day, the "democratic" imperialists and their Russian allies were cavalierly carving up the world into spheres of influence. In 1945-46, after Yalta and Potsdam, American imperialism had visions of a world in which its expansionist freedoms would reign supreme. It was the bourgeois heaven where the U. S. would have access to

⁹ ECA, European Recovery Program: A Report on Recovery Progress and U. S. Aid, pp.2.

¹⁰ ECA, Sixth Report to the Congress of the ECA, pp. 3.

¹¹ Brookings Institute, Major Problems of U. S. Foreign Policy 1950-1951, pp. 126.

markets all over the world; a dream world which did not take into account the expansionist drives of Russian imperialism, the revolt of the colonial world and the extent of the collapse of European capitalism. The delusion of permanent prosperity in America based on its exploitation of the world market is best illustrated in a report on foreign loans submitted by President Truman to Congress in 1946. This report signed by former Secretary of State, James M. Byrnes, Marriner S. Eccles of the Federal Reserve Board and the then Secretary of Commerce, Henry A. Wallace, pointed out that the U. S. must have large foreign markets in order to assure a high level of employment and production at home. However, it added, the world does not have the dollars to pay for these goods, and consequently it will be necessary to embark upon a program of large scale loans and private capital investment which, of course, will have to be paid back. This investment was to continue until the debt the world owed the U. S. became so large that it would exceed the new investment and then "net repayment" would begin.

In the grand finale of the culmination of the American dream, the U. S. was to live off the rest of the world as a coupon clipper:

When net repayment begins, whether this be a few years or many decades from now, it will involve an excess of imports of goods and services. The growth of our population and the depletion of our natural resources and the increase in our standard of living will increase the need for imported products and these developments together with the maintenance of a high and stable level of employment will facilitate this adjustment. . . . The receipt of payments on our foreign loans in the form of goods and services is entirely consistent with increased exports from this country and rising production at home and will contribute to a rising living standard in the U. S. in the same way that a private individual's earnings on his investment make possible an increase in his own living standard.

The Second Part of Over All Imperialist Strategy

The Marshall Plan is but one of two prongs in the overall strategy of American imperialism. The plan finds its natural complement in the North Atlantic Pact and together they constitute the Truman Doctrine,—the application on a world scale of a new Monroe Doctrine. The military provisions of the North Atlantic Pact are the means by which the United States is determined to protect its Marshall Plan investment. This military intervention is a natural concomitant of America's growing stranglehold over the economic and political life of Western Europe. It could hardly be otherwise, given the nature of the conflict between Russia and America, and the inevitable demoralization of a European bourgeoisie made subservient to American capitalism. In the months following the signing of the Pact, the necessary coalescence of the two prongs became evident, until today, there is the disappearance of the independent functioning of the Marshall Plan committees. Those who supported the Marshall Plan believing that it was altruistic economic aid are today shocked by this merger. But this development is only one among more numerous and increasingly reactionary manifestations of American foreign policy: military aid

to reactionary Greek and Turkish regimes, the rearming of fascist Spain, Marshall Plan aid to Bao Dai and Chiang.

Since the inception of the Pact the U. S. has been constantly prodding Western European nations to increase their military expenditures. However, with the weakened condition of these nations, increased armaments are having the effects of increasing their economic dependence on the United States and depressing the living standard of the people. This development has reached the point where a *New York Times* correspondent can write:

The Italian government was waiting today for the green light from Washington to go ahead with its rearmament program and its parallel production program on behalf of the North Atlantic Pact nations. Hope was expressed that approval of the Italian plans might be received before the cabinet meets next week.¹²

Here is the picture of a supposedly independent government awaiting approval from Washington to place into operation a program that would affect the life of every one of its citizens.

The military expansion of American power is not limited to the North Atlantic Pact. Since the end of the war the U. S. has been quietly acquiring bases all over the world. A partial list of these military outposts includes: Malta, Gibraltar, the Azores, Greenland, Bermuda, Panama and Cuba. Bases are being sought in North Africa, Greece and Turkey. In the Pacific, the U. S. has use of the Philippines, Japan, the Bonin Islands and the former Japanese mandated islands which are held under a United Nations trusteeship.

The Greater Danger in State Imperialism

Before the Second World War American investments in Europe were financed by privately owned capital. This form of investment still persists, but, is of subsidiary importance today to the major investments by Washington's Marshall Plan and the Atlantic Pact. This investment does not seek profits for the state but provides the means through which enormous profits have been reaped by the American businessman. The state's repayment is to consist in the creation of a solid economic-political-military bloc against Russia. This task cannot be accomplished merely by finance capitalist imperialism.

This new state imperialism is as yet but a tendency carrying an even greater threat for humanity than exploitation by private capital. It is more consciously motivated, is better integrated, and has infinitely greater resources than finance capital imperialism; it strives for global domination.

SAM BOTTONE

Sam Bottone is a graduate student at New York University. He is on the editorial board of *Anvil and Student Partisan*.

¹² *New York Times*, Dec. 30, 1950.

Halftrack

Each evening
In its sullen cavity
Is haggard with ritual
Before the feeding;
Each night
A strident-footed
Scurrying migration
Into the relentless exuberance
Which some call morning.

It arrives . . .

The casual affront
On pursed lips
Moistened for a resume

While the eye
Performs its catatonic blur—
While the thinking mechanism

Convulsively deployed

Nudges bulldozerlike
Against the raving.

Then it arrives . . .

And nude shoulders
Settling with a shrug
Over timetables of appointed threat
After the placards
From staccato to precise;
Each desultory globe
Of streetlight

Door by door

Consumes the map—
And the pestilence revolves again.

HAL VETTER

Subscription

Enclosed find 80 cents for a 4 issue subscription to ANVIL.

Name

Address

School

Mail to: ANDREW MILLS

6337 South Kimbank Avenue

Chicago 37, Illinois

The Vitalism of George Bernard Shaw

The Late British Author and His Liberal Critics

THE DEATH OF George Bernard Shaw underlined the fact that although the life of a vegetarian, moralist and believer in the "life force" must itself come to an end, the same thing is not necessarily true of the stream of interpretations which have obscured both his plays and his ideas for half a century. It is especially unfortunate that Shaw should have been interpreted to us by the critics who identify themselves with the liberalism of the last two decades; the tremendous vigor and positivism of this Irishman cannot be contained within the boundaries of eclecticism.

Recent critics such as Edmund Wilson and Eric Bentley, although among the better of those who dedicated themselves to defending Shaw, remained, nevertheless inadequate, both for want of understanding Shaw himself as well as for understanding his severest critics. Shaw cannot be defended against the main charge. Nevertheless, he was as much an invigorator of the English theater as the morality play was a source of energy for the Elizabethan stage. Shaw's was the rough hewn conflict between modern depictions of virtue and vice. It remained for others to deal with the refinements and subtleties of the characters.

What was the main charge? One had best leave the formulation of it to T. S. Eliot whose language is sparing, precise and as lucid as are his frequent insights into the main problems of literature. Peculiarly enough we have to begin by quoting Eliot, not on Shaw but on Henry James. The simplest exposition is sometimes oblique. Eric Bentley quotes Eliot as praising James for his "mastery over, his baffling escape from, ideas; a mastery and an escape which are perhaps the last test of a superior intelligence. He had a mind so fine that no idea could violate it. . . ."

Mastery Over Ideas

At first glance this might seem like a rejection of ideas; Eliot's own interest in ideas, however, as well as James' preoccupation with them make this interpretation absurd. The only correct interpretation seems, then, to be the other one: James "mastered" ideas to the extent of not making his characters the obvious representatives of them. This is, in fact, the assumption of T. S. Eliot's *Dialogue on Dramatic Poetry*. One of the characters in this dialogue tells us that the dramatists "need to assume some moral attitude in common with their audience. Aeschylus and Sophocles, the Elizabethans, and the Restoration dramatists had this. *But this must be already given: it is not the job of the dramatist to impose it.*" (Emphasis mine.—A.A.) Here is Eliot's subtle distinction repeated: A "mastery" over ideas is the ability of the writer to assume an idea

which already exists in common between himself and the audience; not to "impose it."

This notion of Eliot's is further elaborated in his essay comparing the Roman dramatist, Seneca, with the Greek dramatists:

In the Greek tragedy . . . the moralizing is not the expression of a conscious "system" of philosophy; the Greek dramatists moralize only because morals are woven through the texture of the tragic idea. Their morals are a matter of feeling trained for generations, they are hereditary and religious, just as their dramatic forms themselves are the development of their early liturgies. Their ethics of thought are one with their ethics of behaviour. As the dramatic form of Seneca is no growth, but a construction, so is his moral philosophy and that of Roman stoicism in general. (Selected Essays p. 57).

Substitute the name Shaw for Seneca and you have the most important clue to Eliot's main charge against Shaw. Shaw's moral philosophy is not a growth, but a construction which he attempts to impose upon his audience. To quote another one of the characters in Eliot's *Dialogue on Dramatic Poetry*:

But it does seem to me that it is as much the lack of moral and social conventions as the lack of artistic conventions that stands in the way of the poetic drama today. Shaw is our greatest stage moralist and his conventions are only negative: they consist in all the things he doesn't believe. But there again, Shaw cannot help that. (Selected Essays p. 41).

Here, then, is the criticism of Shaw, rounded out. His *conventions* are negative. His religion, his moral philosophy is a *construction* rather than a growth which should be based upon a tradition which already exists implicitly between himself and the audience. Shaw, therefore, attempts to *impose* his moral system upon the audience. The assumption is that he does so by way of the characters.

The Shavian Religion

The statement that Shaw had a religion will come as a great surprise to many readers who think of Shaw as an atheist, a Fabian Marxist, and an iconoclast. Shaw has himself talked about his religion a hundred times but Shaw's own remarks are evidently accepted as a kind of buffoonery. And the recent critics have obscured Shaw's point of view by interpreting him in the light of their own politics.

Edmund Wilson, for example, was persistent in his attempt to interpret Shaw's theory of the Life Force in terms of his Fabian notions of society and Wilson's own Marxist views. This minimized the essentially religious element in Shaw's thinking and made his praise of Stalin and his remarks about Russia an "applauding of the Soviet system." This made Shaw's former political ideas and his recent notions seem like complete contradictions. Wilson, in fact, made a virtue out of "contradiction":

... actually the mind of Bernard Shaw is always fluctuating between various emotions which give rise to various points of view ... but ... in the theater ... Shaw's conflicts of impulse, his intellectual flexibility and his genius for legerdemain, all the qualities which have had the effect of weakening his work as a publicist-have contributed to his success as an artist. (*Triple Thinkers*, pp. 240-241.)

This confusion of emotional projection or empathy into the point of view of several different characters with a kind of political liberalism which cannot choose between two sharply opposed points of view having opposite historical consequences was carried even further by Eric Bentley. Bentley made this interpretation into a system. Bentley classifies thinkers into two groups: the "either/or" type and the "both/and" type. The "either/or" individual must, when he encounters two contradictory points of view choose one or the other. The "both/and" type is able to find some justification for both points of view. This vulgarized eclecticism may be characteristic of Bentley; but it is a distortion and an injustice to attribute it to Shaw. The Irish playwright had constructed a religion and a philosophical system and his political utterances, as we shall later see, were in his own mind justified by his intellectual construction.

The Liberal Absurdity

Edmund Fuller in a very recent book on Shaw carries this point of view to its logical absurdity. Notice how he makes Shaw appear to be a typical liberal of the 1950's who is "enriched" by all the thinkers of the nineteenth century but is unable to identify himself with any of these points of view, even critically:

The lesson of Shaw is to take from all and follow none (emphasis mine—A.A.). In every man is to be found that which you will accept and that which you will reject. ... The creative mind ... must say: I am richer for Marx, but I am not a Marxist; I am richer for Darwin, I am not a Darwinian; I am richer for Freud, I am not a Freudian. ... This is what has kept Shaw from obsolescence. ... It is what makes ironic his current identification of himself as a Marxian Communist, even though he adds, characteristically, that nobody else means the same thing by the term.

Ironic, indeed. Shaw has, all his life, been an agitator and a *follower!* When he gave up agitating in Hyde Park and at dockers' strikes he continued expounding his point of view in his prefaces. Critical he was; he constructed his own religion and his own philosophy. And on the basis of this construction he endorsed men like Mussolini and Stalin, and even Hitler. To analyze his philosophical and political reasoning is one thing; to depict it as "intellectual flexibility" or as a "both/and" type or as a man whose teaching is "to take from all and follow none" is to interpret Shaw not in terms of his own time but in terms of mid-twentieth century liberalism, an injustice both to Shaw and ourselves!

The Vitalist Strain

What, then, is this intellectual construction which Eliot accuses Shaw of imposing upon his audience? Shaw began as a middle class Fabian, undoubtedly. With the publication of *Man and Superman*, in 1903, however we learn

from the Preface that Shaw has become a believer in some form of vitalism. Between 1903 and 1920 the vitalist strain in his thinking is strengthened at the expense of his Marxism so that he already calls himself a believer in "creative evolution." Before the time of his death a few months ago, the word "evolution" had been changed to "revolution". His last will and testament reads:

My religious convictions and scientific views cannot at present be more specifically defined than as those of a believer in creative revolution.

Perhaps the best expression of Shaw's doctrine of vitalism is to be found in the Preface to *Back to Methuselah* published in 1921:

I call special attention to Lamarck, who ... really held as his fundamental proposition that living organisms change because they want to. ... This seems absurd to inconsiderate people at the first blush; but it is within the personal experience of all of us that it is just by this process that a child tumbling about on the floor becomes an adult walking erect; and that a man ... becomes a bicyclist and a skater. The process is not continuous as it would be if mere practice had anything to do with it; for though you may improve at each bicycling lesson during the lesson, when you begin your next lesson you do not begin at the point at which you left off: you relapse apparently to the beginning. Finally, you succeed quite suddenly, and never relapse again. (Preface p. xix, Oxford ed.)

He then maintained that such changes of habit and additions of learning may be inherited by succeeding generations:

But when your son tries to skate or bicycle in his turn, he does not pick up the accomplishment where you left it, any more than he is born six feet high. ... Your son relapses ... Now this is odd; for certain other habits of yours, equally acquired, equally unconscious, equally automatic are transmitted without any perceptible relapse. ... In the act of yelling he begins to breathe: another habit, and not even a necessary one, as the object of breathing can be achieved in other ways, as by deep sea fishes. He circulates his blood by pumping it with his heart. ... (*Back to Methuselah*, Preface p. xx Oxford ed.)

Shaw came to believe that the condensed recapitulation of the development of the race in the embryonic development of the individual was possible if the human race, or even a small part of it *willed* such a development:

The time may come when the same force that compressed the development of millions of years into nine months may pack many more millions into even a shorter space; so that Raphaels may be born painters as they are now born breathers and blood circulators. But they will still begin as specks of protoplasm, and acquire the faculty of painting in their mother's womb at quite a late stage of their embryonic life. They must recapitulate the history of mankind in their own persons, however briefly they may condense it. (*Back to Methuselah*, Preface p. xxii Oxford Ed.)

This evolution theory, as Shaw many times stated, was a religion and a metaphysics. It was *not* part of the Neo-Darwinism of the turn of the century. Above all, it was not a Marxist theory. One of Shaw's criticisms of Marx was that Marx applied a theory very like natural selection to civilization; "To him civilization was an organism evolving irresistibly by circumstantial selection" ... Shaw

could not abide the thought of an evolution which was without a *will a vital force* aiming at a higher and higher development. Marx would have dismissed such a conception of will as teleological.

Nature of Genius

Shaw's conception of the nature of genius and of the requisites for political leadership were based directly upon his concept of evolution. This is the light in which, for example, he interpreted Joan of Arc. In his Preface to the play in 1924 he wrote:

... men will, in the pursuit of knowledge and of social readjustments for which they will not be a penny the better and are often indeed many pence the worse, face poverty, infamy, exile, imprisonment, dreadful hardship, and death. . . . There is no more mystery about this appetite for knowledge and power than about the appetite for food: both are known as facts and as facts only, the difference between them being that the appetite for food is necessary to the life of the hungry man and is therefore a personal appetite, whereas the other is an appetite for evolution and therefore a superpersonal need. (Preface to *Joan of Arc* p. 11 Penguin Ed.)

Shaw's interpretation of Joan of Arc was that she was driven by this appetite for evolution. She was one of the exceptional individuals who was compelled to overcome the limitations of her own time and her own segment of humanity. Even her religion is interpreted in terms of creative evolution:

... the figure Joan recognized as St. Catherine was not really St. Catherine, but the dramatization by Joan's imagination of that pressure upon her of the driving force that is behind evolution which I have just called the evolutionary appetite. (Preface to *Joan of Arc* p. 11 Penguin Ed.)

Edmund Wilson's Confusion

When Shaw finally chose to support Mussolini and Stalin as political leaders it was not an "applauding of the Soviet system." This latter phrase of Edmund Wilson's is at best vague and at worst confusing or inaccurate. Shaw did what no follower, or very few except the most cynical of Stalin's followers have ever been able to do. He recognized that to accept the policies of Stalinism, one had to do so on faith exactly as one accepts the infallibility of the Pope. He also recognized, by implication, that this Faith or religion had little or nothing to do with Marxism but that it seized upon Marx as one of its ikons in order to make it appear that Stalin had received his power by legitimate descent from Marx. And Shaw's applause for men like Stalin and Mussolini was granted in terms of their role as men with an appetite for evolution:

... A tremendous importance is given to a clear understanding of the Catholic system at this moment by the staggering fact that the biggest State in the modern world . . . unconsciously and spontaneously established as its system of government an as-close-as-possible reproduction of the hierarchy of the Catholic Church. The nomenclature is changed of course: the Church is called the Communist Party; and the Holy Office and its familiars are known as the Komintern and the Gay Pay Oo. . . . But essentially the system is that of the old Christian Catholic Church, even to its fundamental vow of Communism on Ananias and Sapphira for violating it. . . . Mr. Stalin is not in the least like an Emperor, nor an Archbishop, nor a Prime Minister, nor a Chancellor; but he

would be strikingly like a Pope, claiming for form's sake an apostolic succession from Marx, were it not for his frank method of Trial and Error. . . ." (Preface to *Too True To Be Good* pp. 17 and 24. Constable and Co. ed.)

This was written in justification of Stalin in 1933 shortly after Shaw's public endorsement of Stalin. Shaw had come to believe that only nationalized property could provide the next step in the creative evolution of the world. This was, in part, a carryover from his beliefs as a Fabian Socialist. But he had, in the meantime, become convinced that the liberals and the liberal parliamentary systems were incapable of any decisive action toward nationalization. In short the liberals did not have the evolutionary appetite, the life force. He decided now, that he preferred men of action. Between Kautsky and Lenin, he preferred Lenin. Between Salvemini and Mussolini he preferred Mussolini.

In addition to Shaw's other hallucinations, he was under the illusion that "Fascism is still wavering between Empire and Church, between private property and Communism." (Preface to *Too True to Be Good*. p. 24. Constable and Co. ed.)

Shaw's acceptance of Stalin as Pope of the new Church was based upon his belief that creative evolution demanded faith, that it demanded a new religion and that Stalin's Church, however inadequate was a recognition of the right direction.

Creative Evolution

These latter decisions, however, were made as part of the exigencies of practical politics. The fundamental basis for them was the theory of creative evolution explained above. This was, to use Eliot's phrase "a conscious 'system' of philosophy", "a construction". It was moreover quite different in style and approach from the systems of evolutionary philosophy worked out by Bergson, Whitehead and Pierce.

Shaw had an indescribably vulgar streak, a taste for catch-words and catch-penny pamphlets. He was an undoubtedly great prose essayist who could not inhibit his fits of overpopularization and oversimplification in the exposition of popular notions of history and science. One of the more prejudiced critics of Shaw in Eliot's *Dialogue on Dramatic Poetry* says "The best you can say for Shaw is that he seems not to have read all the popular handbooks on science that Mr. Wells and Bishop Barnes have read." The amount of truth in this charge seems the greater when you realize that Shaw believed *The Outline of History* by H. G. Wells to have been a profound historical work.

Shaw Chooses Religion

In spite of its vulgar aspects, however, Shaw's theory of creative evolution was upheld by its author in all seriousness. That is precisely what makes it so ridiculous for Edmund Wilson to analyze Shaw's contradictions in Marxist terms and justify the resulting confusion by telling us that "actually the mind of Bernard Shaw is always fluctuating between various emotions which give rise to various points of view." Bentley's characterization of the "both/

and" mentality is equally absurd when applied to Shaw. The Irish playwright made a clear and specific choice among religious and political doctrines. He did not favor *both* Marxism and Creative Evolution. He simply threw out everything in Marxist theory which conflicted with religion, creative evolution and purpose or will in the universe. In justice to Eric Bentley it should be stated that he gives a fairly adequate exposition of Shaw's theories of vitalism and evolution. What Bentley fails to do is to realize that Shaw was not a twentieth century *liberal*. No liberal would have the audacity and the bravado to tell the world quite seriously that he chooses Stalin, Mussolini and Hitler over modern liberal parliamentarianism.

To say that Shaw's political writings make a blatant jackass of him is another matter, and quite true. He was foolish enough to think that fascism was a step toward nationalized property, or that the Russian State Church, unlike the British empire, had eliminated imperialism. Would it not be appropriate to ask his liberal interpreters and critics how many liberals believed exactly the same thing? The acceptance of Russia as a non-imperialist ally of the "democratic nations" is an absurdity which was churned out in daily newspaper editorials during the last war, and found its sanctification in the memoirs of statesmen and on posters for U. S. Army barracks.

Structure And Poetry

To return to the essential point, however, this entire theory, as T. S. Eliot's description implies, is a "construction", a system of morality worked into philosophical form. It should be noted, as an aside, that this was equally true of the structure of thought of a great number of modern poets, including Eliot himself. Eliot would prefer to believe that his Christianity is based on the centuries of Christian tradition and upon a morality implicitly accepted both by himself and the audience. Actually, the essential parts of Eliot's Christianity differ in many respects from the Christian tradition and represent Eliot's personal structure to a great degree. The personal element is even more true of William Butler Yeats's system of the magic world of mythological symbolism embodied in *The Vision*. And similar points could no doubt be made about the "construction" of Ezra Pound.

Within the limits of this article it is impossible to do more than touch upon the influence of Shaw's "construction" upon his plays. It is important, however, to remind the reader of Eliot's admonition that "it is not the job of the dramatist to impose" his system of morality upon the audience. Eliot is unfortunately right, when he implies that Shaw failed in this respect.

The Human Crisis

Shaw's characters more often than not miss the main subtle opportunity to realize themselves in the human relation. It is precisely at some human crisis in the play when the immediate action of the character must turn on his own understanding of himself and his situation, that his understanding is influenced to a greater degree by the fact that he does or does not have the "appetite for evolu-

tion." This results in surprise, usually of a pleasant kind for the audience. The outcome of any complex problem in a Shaw play, precisely because of the unique factor of the "life force" is almost certain to be a novel outcome. And novelty is a great delight in the theater. Moreover the delight has not yet worn off, after twenty or thirty years of repeated production of the plays, because the idea of "creative evolution," or at least its implications for the human being remain a novelty and to most theatergoers today, something of a mystery.

Moreover, Shaw's handling of this novelty has always been according to the masterly rules of stagecraft which he learned both from the Norwegian playwright, Ibsen, and from the German opera. No matter how many times a basic motif is repeated in Shaw's better plays, it is always varied in its performance. If the variation does not come from different instruments, it comes from the variation of the theme itself. Each actor is given his due prominence against a musical background performed for him by the others.

This combination, for twentieth century drama, was irresistible. The emphasis upon "ideas" without sacrificing to them the needs of the theater itself, was just the approach to succeed as a modern dramatic form. That is the source of Shaw's vigor on the stage.

AVEL AUSTIN

Avel Austin is a graduate student at Columbia University.

Among the Articles and Contributions in The Next Issue:

❖
The Philosophy of Experimentalism
by Professor Churchman

❖
Civil Rights and the Security Program
by Rowland Watts

❖
The American Labor Movement
by Frank Marquart

❖
American Liberalism
by C. Wright Mills

❖
Pacifism and the War
by Sidney Aberman

See Subscription blank on Page 17

The Labor Movement After the Elections

An Analysis of Labor's Participation In Politics

THE LAST ELECTION MARKED one further step in the political development of the American labor movement. While it was not the first time that the trade unions had intervened to influence the outcome of an election, never before had they done so on such a large scale, with such an expenditure of funds, or with such united determination. In many instances the union functionary replaced the regular precinct captain. In Ohio, where the race was considered by both sides as a decisive test of labor's strength, millions of leaflets were distributed, thousands of speeches made, and for those who presumably could be reached in no other way, a brightly colored comic book was printed, in which Taft was portrayed as an Associate of Mr. Moneybags, while Ferguson became the Honest Auditor, the Family Man, and the Workers' Friend.

Prior to last November the official labor movement viewed our contemporary scene with placid, albeit somewhat jaundiced, eye. Basking in a post-war prosperity which facilitated bargaining for higher wages, pensions and the union check off, top union officials felt basically secure in their position and power, largely unmindful of any threats to their organizations or problems concerning membership. They were aware, of course, of some few annoyances such as the Taft-Hartley Act and the failure of Congress to pass any but the most insignificant of the President's Fair Deal proposals; these were matters shortly to be put right, merely by the defeat of such arch-reactionaries as Taft, and the election of a few more liberal "friends of labor." And if the union leaders had any doubts as to their ability along these lines, there was little evidence of it in their pre-election pronouncements; pronouncements which found confident echo in Truman's assertion that the Democratic Party would win a sweeping victory. Yet in the majority of cases these hopes were frustrated in the landslide which all but eliminated labor as a political force in Washington. Not only has talk of repealing the Taft-Hartley law practically ceased, but it has become clear that the new "business man's Congress" will not even get around to considering such "frills" as civil rights legislation while caught up in its central obsession with war measures.

It was not the fact of defeat itself which stunned the labor movement; it was rather its complete unexpectedness. Even as they had been set to play a greater, not lesser role, labor's political mentors were suddenly reduced to the level of backstage advisors of ex-congressmen. The gloom which settled over places like Detroit, Toledo and Chicago has not yet begun to clear away. Any demoralization among labor's leaders must necessarily give way to renewed efforts. For labor cannot exist and develop by ignoring or repudiating politics. The famous southern organizing drives of both the CIO and AFL were stymied largely through the effects of the Taft-Hartley law; an es-

calator clause won in collective bargaining is of little use if a government agency arbitrarily declares such a contract void as part of a wage-freeze program; seniority rights mean little if the FBI can succeed in getting "poor security risks" fired from their jobs. The government's increasing intervention in the economy by setting up controls which limit the arena of collective bargaining makes its policy of supreme importance. Its role in labor-management disputes, as well as its over-all policy, is primarily determined by the balance of political forces, and among these forces labor is one of the strongest. However, labor's political weight is proportional only to the votes it can muster and the voice it can raise. And this, in turn, depends on how it exerts its influence and in what form it organizes its political activity.

Labor and the Democratic Machines

If labor were to follow the advice of the daily editorial writers it would either withdraw from politics altogether (and thus save everybody a lot of trouble at its own expense) or, it would confine itself to "working with other groups in the community" behind a common candidate. This is the old idea of a "coalition of forces" which is presumably the secret of electoral success. Up to now this coalition of forces has meant the alliance of the labor movement with the Northern Democratic machines, and through them with the capitalist interests represented by the Democratic Party. In practice, this has always meant the *subordination* within the coalition, of labor to its "allies." The basis of this alliance has been the ability of the Democratic Party in the past to satisfy some of the popular demands for social reform, while at the same time defending the basic institutions of our social order. Previous articles in *Anvil and Student Partisan* have pointed out the growing incompatibility of classical liberal doctrines with the demands of the cold war, and how, given the alternative, liberal politicians like Paul Douglas tend to give up their liberal ideology in favor of cold war necessities. In the immediate past period this has left labor in an increasingly untenable position; the more closely it became tied to the Democratic machine, the less was the latter able to deliver in return.

In this regard, the last campaign represented no deviation from labor's traditional policy. It took more or less anybody the Democratic party recommended (providing his record wasn't *too* bad) and told its followers to vote for him. "No-civil-rights" Lucas, the nondescript ignoramus, Joe Ferguson, and "the world's richest cop" in Chicago are good examples of the kind of men labor supported. More important than the men themselves were the record and policy to which they were tied. While many had unexceptional records on the few questions which the PAC and

LLPE considered "crucial" there were few indeed who could be presented as even militant liberals. And besides this, on the issue which turned out to be of vital importance—namely, foreign policy—there were none who could appeal to the voters as effectively as the Republicans did. Labor was lucky when it had a candidate who even knew what foreign policy was. Its standard bearer in Ohio, the inimitable Joe Ferguson, when asked what he stood for in the field of foreign affairs, replied tersely: "Beat Michigan." Without candidates, and without a program which answered the people's most insistent question: can we avoid war?, the unions could only raise their customary demand for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law and speak for the Fair Deal program of social reforms.

Attempt to Cover Up Failures

The defeat of its candidates, and the ineffectiveness of this program should have led the labor movement to re-evaluate its past policy. It is somewhat disheartening that the union leaders have not always admitted their mistakes or been able to learn the lesson of their failure. The 1950 convention of the CIO demonstrated that their sole aim was to justify past actions, and reiterate that "next time will be different." The report and speeches on political action claimed that the recent campaigns were successful. Why? Because, even though the elections were lost, more work had been done than ever before in the history of CIO-PAC! It ought to follow that by doing nothing, victory could be assured. Actually, the conclusion which this conclave actually arrived at was the opposite, but no more adequate, idea of "bigger and better comic books." If such is the thinking of top CIO men, we can feel certain that no more piercing insights emanate from the even more hide-bound AFL and Railroad Brotherhoods. If the latter are more inclined than ever to retreat from political activity entirely, the reaction in the CIO is basically healthy: to do a better job in the future.

Yet it should be clear that hard work and comic books are not enough to win a political election. A searching discussion of the reasons for labor's political failure was obviously in order at the CIO convention, if only in order to prevent discouragement from hindering future activity. Of course, it is true that the conditions which would have made such a discussion possible were lacking at the convention, where every speech, besides being a eulogy of Phil Murray, pronounced the rosy dreams of the bureaucracy to be accomplished facts. Representing labor's privileged stratum, the delegates had to protect themselves from the truth in order to continue believing in their power. They had to substitute ultimata for programs of action and oracles for understanding. Thus it was that even mild attempts at criticism were rudely squashed. Murray's apology that "the people had been misled by false propaganda" was no explanation for the fact that labor's truth had not convinced a majority of the people, and in many cases, had even failed to convince labor's rank and file.

If the polls were correct, and they were confirmed by results which showed even industrial centers voting Republican, class differences were less important in deciding the

election than at any time since the 1920s. This only means that the decisive issues were not considered as related to basic class alignment. Recent studies of American "class psychology" have shown that a majority of the people consider themselves of the "working class" and that this identification usually plays a decisive role in their voting behavior. That this was not true in the last election, however, can only be explained by examining the issues on which the election was decided, and the positions which the different parties took.

The Witch-Hunt Atmosphere

If there was one issue which played a key role it was the question of "communism." In part this was the question of foreign policy; in part it referred to the action to be taken against domestic Stalinists. That a witch-hunting atmosphere prevailed was undoubtedly true; that this atmosphere worked to the detriment of anybody who could by any device be linked with non-conformism is also true. Yet, when liberals decry this result, and the labor leaders use it to explain their defeat, they are both concealing the fact that it was their own acceptance of witch-hunting, which made it a popular pastime. If McCarthy stands for irresponsible charge making, it is still true that McCarthy could only achieve notoriety in the pursuit of a popularly accepted goal. It was Truman himself who issued the executive order setting in motion the whole loyalty board process. It was the Federal Bureau of Investigation which has taken great pains to build up the picture of the dangerous communist criminal; and it was the Democratic Attorney General who invented the subversive list. McCarthy had only to pick up where the administration left off, and to do a better job of exposing "communists" in high places. He did not initiate or invent the policy of making peoples' opinions a qualification for government employment; he only showed he could do a better job of finding out whoever might have escaped the notice of the State Department Loyalty Board. Agreeing with the basic postulate of McCarthyism, however, it was obviously difficult for liberals to defend themselves from his attacks; for while they might believe in the desirability of ideological purity, they were encumbered with scruples about fairness, and burdened with nice distinctions between Stalinists and liberals which McCarthy was unable to understand. Hence they were obviously unable to do as good a job at witch-hunting as he was.

The labor movement's own position on this question was hardly less enviable. While it issued feeble protests against the McCarran Bill, it took no real steps to demonstrate its belief in the right to unrestricted freedom of opinion. Indeed, the CIO had just passed through a purge in which most of its Stalinist minority had been bureaucratically expelled. In this action it was merely aping the government and adding fuel to the fires of the concentration camp Congressmen.

With such a record, the labor movement was hardly in a position to take a principled stand with regard to McCarthyism or to fight for the traditional democratic right of freedom of speech and belief. The consequence

was that while the liberals kept silent about the whole thing, all the little McCarthys were claiming they could do a better job of kicking the Stalinists around. Since this is probably true, it is not surprising that the "liberals" came out second best.

Labor and International Affairs

But it was in the field of foreign policy that labor's tie-up with the Democratic party was most costly. For it was here that liberals stood four-square behind the administration and its record in international affairs—a record which led straight from Potsdam to Pusan. The central issue in American politics today is not reform versus non-reform—in that field there can be little talk of even preserving what we have. What is considered primary by all sections of the populace is—how to deal with Russia. It is a problem, however, which is perceived differently by different kinds of people. Among our ruling circles, Stalinism represents *the* immediate threat to capitalist society, and hence to themselves. They seek to answer this threat by whatever means are available. Unfortunately, these means do not measure up to the task. That is why American foreign policy in its alliances with corrupt, reactionary, unpopular governments has not succeeded in preventing the advance of Stalinism. Whatever else may be said of Acheson and the policy he represents (that he's doing the best possible job, that no other course is open, that any other policy would have led to worse results—all of which are true from the capitalist point of view) the bald fact remains that in terms of his stated objective, he has failed. Not only has he failed to stop the spread of Stalinism, but, at the time of the last election, we stood on the brink of war.

Whatever doubt there may have been last November, it is clear now that the Korean war is an unpopular enterprise. Patriotic as they are, detesting Stalinism as they do, the American people — and this is apparently equally true of the soldiers in the field—have no stomach for fighting this war. Their positive reaction to Hoover's proposal is only the latest sign of this. At the polls last November they showed their feelings by voting for the Republican opposition. It did not matter that this opposition represented no positive alternative to Truman's War Deal—that only served to make the protest gesture futile.

The Reuther Proposals

But the lack of a real alternative to Washington's present foreign policy, that lack rests squarely on the shoulders of labor for not presenting a policy of its own. Walter Reuther recently published a plan for *A Total Peace Offensive*. Though defective in many ways, this plan did have some of the elements of a positive program which, if put in operation by a progressive government, would have the chance of ideologically defeating Stalinism. Basically, it called for the spending of 13 billion dollars yearly to raise the living standards of other nations and help them achieve a level of technological development comparable with the United States. Now this is the kind of plan which a labor or socialist government in America might be expected to advance as part of an international outlook aimed

toward helping backward peoples. Yet, Reuther does not see any reason why our present capitalist government should not do the same thing. Indeed, he accompanies his plan with assurances of support for a government which is hell-bent on war preparations to the exclusion of any more altruistic aims.

Stalinism appears a "lesser evil" to increasing numbers of Asiatic people—perhaps even to growing numbers of Europeans—who abhor and detest the capitalism and imperialism which America represents. If Stalinism is to be defeated, these millions must be presented with some alternative leadership to that of American dollar diplomacy. They must be encouraged to fight for a perspective which leads to their freedom, not their domination by one of the two great imperialist powers. The American labor movement could play a vital role in helping and supporting these peoples wherever they claimed the right to decide their own destinies. Instead, the labor leadership gives unqualified support to the Marshall Plan, the Atlantic Pact, and the Korean adventure. And when these programs fail, the labor movement itself becomes discredited.

Labor Must Act Independently

Labor remains tied to the Democratic party through a "cultural lag." It seeks favors from a party which no longer has them to dispense. The demands of fighting a cold war are already so heavy that from now on the fight to *preserve* labor's position will be in the main a struggle against the government and the party which administers it. Remaining in its present alliance with this party, not only assures labor's impotence on domestic issues; it also allows the Republicans to be our only opposition. No outcry was raised over our recognition of Franco, since it was done by the administration which labor and its liberal friends supported.

The American people, despite their political backwardness, are presently prepared for any new program which has the chance of averting the war which the Truman administration is preparing for. Labor could develop such a program with a good chance of having it heard. The main obstacle preventing this at the present time, however, is its alliance with the majority capitalist party. To break this alliance, to set forth on the path of independent political action and to do this soon, that is the lesson of the last election.

DON CHENOWETH and BILL WITTHOFT

Don Chenoweth and Bill Witthoft are students at the University of Chicago.

What do you think of ANVIL?

Your letters of criticism or support are welcome. They will help us to publish a more effective magazine.

Please note whether part or all of your letters may be published in *Anvil*.

The Cold War Hits the American Campus

Reports Reveal Growing Breach of Academic Freedom

Gideonse Steps Up Drive Against Student Rights

THE FALL SEMESTER at Brooklyn College witnessed an intense and bitter struggle between virtually all the political clubs on campus and the administration of Harry D. Gideonse. The students' fight to defend their rights against a cynical and reactionary administration started on the first day of the fall registration with the arbitrary suspension of the Labor Youth League (LYL), continued unabated throughout the course of the term and ended—only temporarily—with the suspension of Students for Democratic Action (SDA).

The LYL suspension "in view of the United Nations' war in Korea and the world situation in general" produced a protest from the campus clubs. Under the initiation of the Eugene V. Debs Society a coalition of non-Stalinist political clubs was immediately formed to press for the reinstatement of LYL. The coalition wasn't alone in its opposition to the suspension. The college newspaper, *Vanguard*, denounced the action as a case of "perverse patriotism" reminiscent of Stalinist methods. In one of the dirtiest deals the administration has engaged in—and it has seen its day (to which the Fall, 1950, issue of *Anvil and Student Partisan* can testify)—Gideonse counter-attacked by revoking the newspaper's charter. He had manufactured a regulation requiring the editors to provide a pro and con "editorial" on controversial issues. Soon after this regulation was imposed on the editors two pro Gideonse editorials were found to have fewer lines than the corresponding anti-Gideonse editorials.

As prearranged by Gideonse and the two student authors of the pro-Gideonse editorials the complaint was registered that the *Vanguard* editor had cut and "distorted" the meaning of their editorial. One of these students, a member of the Faculty-Student Committee on Publications, introduced a motion there to revoke *Vanguard's* charter. The motion was quickly passed.

Needless to say, the double editorial policy, still on the books, is an ironic joke on campus. The first issue of *Kingsman*, Gideonse's "house organ" which replaced *Vanguard*, blithely ignored the regulation, continues to do so studiously—without being called "Communist" by Gideonse.

The Real Reason for Suppressing *Vanguard*

Materially, the apologists for the administration never refer to the formal reason for suspending *Vanguard*. They come much closer to the real reasons when they complain that *Vanguard* was "too political," that it didn't "play

up social and sports events," opposed Gideonse on ROTC and the LYL issues, made trouble by exposing Gideonse's autocratic intervention into a recent history department election and consistently opposed regulations designed to destroy *Vanguard* as a critical and independent voice on campus. By throttling *Vanguard* Gideonse has rid himself of his most influential critic.

The Campus Coalition to Reinstate *Vanguard* established the Campus News Publishing Association which proceed to publish a weekly opposition newspaper, *Campus News*, dedicated to the reinstatement of *Vanguard*.

With the appearance of *Campus News* and the possibility of a long drawn out struggle, Gideonse's campaign to terrorize the students into submission began in earnest. The most potent pressure technique was the threat of suspension. This can be appreciated when we realize that draft-age students are permitted an induction postponement by virtue of their active student status. The threat of suspension was leveled at individual students, all the coalition clubs and their leaderships. A number of students were suspended, official reprimands on permanent record cards were handed out and even the hostage method of intimidation was used against the former *Vanguard* Editor-in-Chief who was told that he would be held personally responsible should any opposition paper appear.

Squeeze Put on Faculty

Pressure was also exerted on the faculty, not that too much was needed. (Throughout these events the faculty has either actively aided the administration or, as in the case of the overwhelming majority, remained disgracefully silent. Only a small group has spoken up courageously.) It is now obligatory for all leaflets handed out on campus to include the following statement: "Authorized by . . . , faculty advisor" with the name of the particular faculty adviser inserted.

The pressure had a cumulative effect. The Campus Coalition dissolved itself under pressure and is attempting to reorganize on campus with a faculty adviser. Shortly thereafter, *Campus News* ceased publication under administration threats and financial difficulties.

The latest blow has been the suspension of SDA primarily for its sponsorship of *Campus News* after the dissolution of the Campus Committee. SDA was the only member of the coalition whose constitution made specific allowances for the publication of a newspaper. In true Gideonse fashion the suspension of SDA was delayed until the end of the term making an immediate student reaction physically impossible.

Not for many years at Brooklyn College have the socialist and liberal forces been so united in defense of

student rights and in opposition to the reactionary force represented by the administration. Events this term have shattered many an illusion concerning Gideon's brand of totalitarian liberalism. Not only are the students more aware of the issues and forces involved, but they are more eager to defend academic freedom because of this understanding.

MARVIN STONE

Marvin Stone is a student at Brooklyn College.

University of Buffalo Joins Parade: Bans Student Paper

THE UNIVERSITY OF BUFFALO has long been an outstanding example of academic freedom. Guided by Samuel P. Capen, who this past year retired as chancellor, Buffalo was among the most liberal privately endowed schools in this country. There were no bonds restraining political activity by the students on the campus. There were, likewise, no bonds or fetters restraining political activities of the faculty members, which ranged from the extreme right, as might be expected, to the extreme left, as might not be expected.

Student activities are, and have for some time been, controlled by a Board of Managers, composed partly of students, partly faculty, an alumni representative, and an administrator, who is neither a student nor a faculty member. The students on the Board are elected annually by the student body. However, it is virtually impossible for a student to be elected without the support of one or two fraternities and the Newman Club, the Catholic student organization.

There has been a student newspaper, *The Bee*, appearing weekly for twenty six years. This paper was the organ of the fraternities and the sororities, but was financially supported by the University.

Four year ago, a group of students organized an opposition weekly, *The Argus*, which was given financial aid by the Board after several issues appeared. *The Argus* led the fight against discrimination in the fraternities, fought for the right of a campus Stalinist club to distribute literature, etc., consistent with its liberal editorial policy. Under the aegis of complete freedom of expression, *The Argus* printed lively political articles of all shades of the right and of the left, e.g. it opened its columns for the discussion of such timely issues as the Bell strike, the Taft-Hartly Law, and the Wallace campaign. It therefore should not be too difficult to imagine the pressure under which *The Argus* appeared. That it survived this long is a remarkable accomplishment.

This year, *The Argus* printed a satire on the Catholic Church's divorce laws and the divorce laws of New York State. This article aroused a storm of invective from the Catholic Church in the city of Buffalo as well as on the campus. A local priest, at a lecture before an audience of five hundred, denounced *The Argus* for printing the article. The chaplain of the Newman Club demanded that *The Argus* give him space to repudiate the article, which he termed "the reflection of a diseased mind." His reply,

appearing the following week, caused virtually everyone except the fraternities and the Newman Clubbers to rally to the support of *The Argus*.

The Board of Managers, meanwhile, received a recommendation from its financial committee to cut off the funds of *The Argus*. This recommendation, a repetition of every year's procedure, was passed this time.

The Board was not going to allow itself to be placed in such a precarious position, unfortunately. They were well aware of the implications of such an action and of the repercussions that could have been unleashed. To lend an air of respectability to their act, and to ameliorate any and all unsuspecting students, they decided to abolish both newspapers and to establish a new weekly, which would operate under their firm reign. They therefore announced the merger "of the writing staff of *The Argus* with the financial basis and organization of *The Bee*." They then appointed an editorial board which did not even have one former *Argus* staff member. Needless to say, *The Bee* was well represented on the editorial board as well as the staff of the new paper.

So that this would not seem too phony, the Board appointed an editor-in-chief not formerly associated with either weekly.

To insure against the new paper getting out of hand, the Board of Managers proposed setting up a Board of Governors for the express purpose of determining editorial policies, censoring articles, and appointing the top editorial people. When word of this proposal leaked out, student and faculty resentment began "to snowball," compelling the rejection of this plan, which was a major victory for *The Argus* staff. The staff attacked the setting up of this group in a leaflet paid for out of their own pockets. This entire action was without precedent in UB history. The Board of Managers hoped to dispel criticism by abandonment of the proposal, but *The Argus* remained bitterly opposed to the idea of appointing editors, favoring the democratic election of the editors by their staffs. The Board discovered, at this time, an ancient prerogative which gave it the power to remove the officers of official student organizations. This means that the Board of Managers can remove the editors of the new paper if, and when, they disagree with editorial policy. They have assumed the right of censorship unto themselves.

In a second leaflet *The Argus* announced its intention to continue publication in magazine form, supported through selling subscriptions and individual copies, both on and off the campus. *The Argus* staff has also formed a club on campus to serve as a rallying point for liberal students and faculty members.

This defiance of the Board's attempt to abolish *The Argus* has caused a great amount of consternation among the supporters of the board of managers.

The flagrant and totally unconcealed violation of academic freedom has not been commented upon by the administration. Neither have such groups as the Newman Club, or the fraternities made any comment, *because they are in the proverbial driver's seat!*

IRVING HALPERN

Irving Halpern, is a student at the U. of Buffalo.

Wayne Cashiers Student Rights for Buildings

IN 1947 A WITCH-HUNTING State Senate investigating committee and the reactionary press leveled their sights on Wayne University. They found a chapter of the American Youth for Democracy (AYD) on campus and fired away. Both the senate investigating committee and the press demanded that AYD be banned by University president, Dr. David D. Henry. With most of the university's students and faculty behind him, however, Dr. Henry insisted that he would not ban AYD unless the group violated university regulations. Dr. Henry was viewed with admiration for his stand on the issue. And he stood firm—temporarily.

Trading Democracy for Buildings

But then, the senate committee turned the screw tighter. It threatened to have appropriations for Wayne's new building plan cut off. Dr. Henry still maintained his position. He told faculty legislative bodies, "I would rather a thousand times see us teaching our classes in attics where there is freedom than in palaces where there is not." What went by unnoticed at this time, however, was a slight change in Dr. Henry's position. He began to insist that the attack by the senate committee was unjust because he felt that the local chapter of AYD was not subversive. This position meant, of course, that if it was revealed to him that AYD was "subversive" he would willingly suspend the organization. Thus when communications with Washington "proved" the outfit a "recruiting ground for young Communists" Dr. Henry lowered the axe. AYD was banned! A large protest was organized but its forces were soon dissipated. The university community very shortly fell back into a heavy slumber. The administration made a successful trade . . . one Communist front organization for a couple of modern buildings.

Shortly thereafter, Dr. Henry banned all political and social action groups from campus. Since that time there has been a gradual elimination of most liberal and left-wing groups on campus. Two student body referendums, almost three years apart, have shown by votes of almost twenty to one that students want political activity on campus. Yet "liberal," Dr. Henry, and his fellow administrators continue to squelch student political life.

Phillips and Dobbs Banned

The administration didn't take another important step in their macabre dance to the right until the spring of 1950. At that time the Student Council invited Dr. Herbert Phillips to meet a Wayne University professor in debate. Dr. Phillips is a long-time, avowed member of the Communist Party who was recently dismissed from the University of Washington because of his political views. The University Programs Planning Committee, an elected body of students and faculty members, whose jurisdiction covered this area, approved the proposed

debate. But, the administration would hear of no such thing. The administration was negotiating for money to build a new medical school building. And since Dr. Henry was able to trade AYD for a couple of buildings before, it seemed worth his effort to ban the debate in hopes of not offending the state legislature and impairing the chance of getting a new medical school building. Dr. Henry flatly refused to allow the debate to be held on University property.

A group of liberals and socialists along with a handful of Stalinists met off campus to organize a protest meeting. The strategy was to have the debate held in a nearby hall off campus. Due to the fact that pressure was brought to bear on the faculty members who might have been willing to debate Phillips and on proprietors of all the available halls in the area a new plan had to be developed. It was decided that the group sponsor a street corner debate for Phillips with someone not connected with the University. However, because of the naivete of the liberals the Stalinists captured the protest committee and everyone else withdrew. Instead of a debate the Stalinists successfully arranged to have a mass meeting on the lawn of the Public Library with Phillips as the only speaker.

Shortly after Phillips was banned, Farrell Dobbs of the Socialist Workers Party was refused the use of university facilities to address an audience of students who invited him. The reason given for banning Dobbs was that the SWP is on the "subversive list." By this time, however, the forces of resistance had been dissipated in the Phillips issue and the rumblings of discontent barely broke the surface.

The administration swung the axe once again this last fall. A student of Wayne University who was a member of the Young Progressives, was suspended on the technical charge of distributing unauthorized leaflets on campus. In this case the only protest that was at all audible was the weak voice of the Stalinists and a couple of letters to the editor of *The Collegian*, the campus newspaper, by some individual liberals.

Along with these measures the administration has maneuvered cleverly to severely limit the powers of the faculty and student legislative bodies. The final decision on all matters of policy seems to virtually lie in the hands of the university president and the Council of Deans. The Student Council and its faculty counterpart, the University Council, have very little to say in matters of policy unless, of course, they nod their heads in agreement with the administration.

The Dean's Veto Power at Work

When AYD was banned no part of the elaborate network of elected legislative bodies of faculty and students was willing to ban the AYD. Dr. Henry was the one who made the deal with the State Senate investigating committee. The faculty and student legislative committees cannot be blamed for the banning of Dr. Herbert Phillips, either. Again, these bodies, in the interest of academic freedom, had given overwhelming approval of the

debate. It was Dr. Henry who overrode their decisions and forbade the meeting. In the case of Farrell Dobbs the student and faculty legislative bodies gave their approvals again. This time, however, a new technique was introduced. The Dean of Student Affairs asked that these legislative bodies reconsider their decisions. He tried, of course, to have them reverse their decisions and assume responsibility for banning. It didn't work, however, since most of the students and faculty members involved wanted to accept no "responsibility" where they had no "rights." The faculty and student legislative bodies again approved the meeting. Nevertheless, the dean vetoed their decision and banned the meeting. And, in the case of suspension of the YPA student, none of the committees of faculty and students which were set up for such disciplinary purposes were even consulted. The Dean of Student Affairs automatically issued his mandate.

Loyalty Oaths Since the Thirties

But, the administration is not alone in its relentless crusade against academic freedom. Several instances of right-wing reaction have occurred on campus from time to time. When a protest rally was held at the time of the banning of AYD, members of the athletes' club, the Gas House Gang, resorted to strong-arm tactics and heckling techniques in an unsuccessful attempt to break up the meeting. More recently members of the same Gas House Gang mobbed a couple of Stalinists in the campus cafeteria. A Labor Youth League headquarters near the university has been broken into and destroyed by midnight marauders from the university. Stalinists passing out leaflets on a street corner near the university had their leaflets seized and burned by unidentified students. And most recently we have witnessed a former Communist (now an FBI informer) distributing leaflets demanding a purge of all the "reds" from the faculty. No one really takes him seriously, though, since *WAYNE HAS HAD A LOYALTY OATH SINCE THE EARLY THIRTIES*.

The Wayne University's administration, if it is not taking the lead, is certainly way out in front in the political surge toward reaction on the national campus. Not only are Communists prohibited from teaching at the university but they are banned from speaking to university audiences even in debate. Student CP front groups are outlawed from functioning. *And more recently anti-Stalinist "subversives" are banned from speaking on campus.* Most important, the administration has been able to strip the student and faculty legislative bodies of any significant power.

The administration has virtually "cleansed" the university of Communists; it is now in a position which enables it to eliminate any other *ism* that is at all critical of the status quo.

BILL KEMSLEY, Jr.

Bill Kemsley, Jr. is a student at Wayne University.

N. Y. U. Prohibits College Sales of 'Outlook' and 'Anvil'

THE WASHINGTON SQ. COLLEGE of New York University has been for many years, admittedly, one of the nation's more liberal colleges with regard to student rights and privileges. However, the "cold war" and its consequences have placed the Administration's relatively progressive policy under such a severe strain that several "adjustments" have resulted. Under the guise of apparently plausible technical rulings severe blows were struck against student rights.

During the fall semester, *Anvil and Student Partisan* and the Student League for Industrial Democracy's magazine, *Outlook*, were barred from being sold on the campus because they happened to be affected by an administrative ruling prohibiting the sale on University property of publications not produced entirely by N. Y. U. campus organizations. The specious justification was a supposed lack of selling space, despite the fact that N.Y.U.'s publication schedule has been far heavier in the past, when no such ruling was considered necessary. The ruling, it is stated, was passed last spring but was not enforced (both magazines were allowed to be sold) because of a "lack of coordination." The Administration became "coordinated" in August, after the Korean events.

The Socialist Club, SLID, and SDA issued a joint statement which, in assailing the University's action, stated that the "free market-place of ideas has given away to supervision 'for the student's own good'." An editorial in the school paper demanded that "if the Administration finds the content of these magazines objectionable, and desires to restrain them on this basis, let them come out and say so, and allow the measure to be given a thorough hearing. To ban their sale . . . actually because their principles differ with those of the Administration is a bit of hypocrisy which fools no one." However, the Student Council viewed the matter in a different light and rejected a motion to restore selling facilities to the magazines.

Howard Fast Banned

The revocation of selling rights of these student publications was followed by an equally undemocratic act. In December, Howard Fast, the Stalinist novelist, was scheduled to address a meeting of the Young Progressive of America but he was banned from the campus. The chairman of the Committee on Student Affairs stated that Fast happened to be affected by a recent ruling that persons who have served "recent" jail sentences are "undesirable" as speakers before students. The professor was asked how recently the ruling was formulated. He replied, "I made it up this morning."

A protest statement of SLID, SDA, and the Socialist Club pointed out that the basic issue was not whether a speaker had "recently" been in jail, for how long must one be out of jail before one is allowed to speak to a student club? The given reason was nothing but a fig leaf to cover

up the fact that the Administration disagreed with the speaker's point of view. The basic issue is whether recognized student clubs have the right to hear speakers of their own choice, as the college recognized NSA Bill of Rights states they do.

After the banning, Student Council agreed to hold a purely consultative, non-binding referendum on the issue. The Administration-orientated council members urged support of the ban on two main grounds: 1) because "entrance to graduate school depends upon a good school reputation" and 2) because our country, its ideals and beliefs should not be "blasted to hell while our soldiers are fighting and dying in Korea" (the anti-ban forces were accused of pandering to the emotions).

Despite this type of barrage, 59% of the students who voted in the referendum repudiated the Administration's

decision. While the result will probably slow down the tempo of the Administration's undemocratic acts in restricting student rights, only a presently lacking organized student opposition will have a chance to defeat the Administration's currently successful use of the simplest of undemocratic and bureaucratic devices—rulings made up on the spur of the moment. Many other "adjustments" in N.Y.U.'s "liberal" policy are in store, all pointing to a situation, as pictured by the school paper, when "in matters of student affairs—perhaps in what we may read and speak as well as hear—our best interests will be taken care of for us by an all-powerful father who acts first and then calls—if we are lucky—a ready-made body to 'Yes' his decision."

RALPH STILES

Ralph Stiles is a student at New York University.

From the Student's Bookshelf

ACROSS THE RIVER AND INTO THE TREES

by Ernest Hemingway
Charles Scribner's Sons, 1950.

WITH THE EXCEPTION of a small group of enthusiastic critics, who, incidentally, have discovered the symbolism of the Grail legend in Hemingway's *The Sun Also Rises*, it is generally felt that the symbolic and intellectual scope of his works is limited. Hemingway, in his previous novels, save *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, has expressed the belief that man has "things done to him." The Hemingway hero is trapped by fate and stoically accepts that fact; the element of rebelliousness is kept at a minimum and life gains significance in the action of having as good a time as possible. As good a time as possible consists of drinking a fantastic variety of wines, hunting, fishing, bullfighting with skill and fornicating mightily. There is a rejection of the intellectual and the esthetic.

The Hemingway Hero Grown Old

Col. Richard Cantwell possesses all the appurtenances of the Hemingway hero, grown old. He is tough, drinks well and widely, is a good shot and has a "hard flat stomach." He accepts the fact that he will soon die with resignation, a resignation more pronounced than that of Jake Barnes, the impotent hero in *The Sun Also Rises*. While Barnes admits that "it is awfully easy to be hardboiled about everything in the daytime, but at night, it's another thing," for Cantwell, daytime and nighttime, it is all the same. The Colonel goes duck hunting, has a

love affair with an incorporeal young girl of nineteen, drinks and eats with gusto; and then, having performed Hemingway's triadic ritual, dies of a heart attack.

Hemingway possessed the ability for ordering the plainest words so as to endow them with the expressive accent of natural speech. He could, with eloquence, capture both the beauties of nature and the elemental expressions of human feeling. He taught us that mere simplicity, artfully arranged and conscientiously applied could be important features of style.

In *Across the River and Into the Trees*, Hemingway appears to have lost the magic touch. Although there are descriptions of great power which are reminiscent of an earlier Hemingway, most of the narrative is tedious and the dialogue embarrassingly poor. The love scenes are less real than ever before. The emotion to be inferred from the speech and movements of the characters does not filter through, primarily because what they say is so uninteresting and what they do so inartistically recorded. Moreover, there is a redundancy in this novel which leaves one with the feeling that *Across the River and Into the Trees* is a well padded novelle. It is difficult to believe that Hemingway in attempting to record the repetition of elementals in human experience has seen fit to present time and time again unrelated sense impressions, to multiply the number of drinking scenes and subject the reader to a lengthy monosyllabic love affair. Hemingway could, at one time, capture the fluid speech rhythms of the individual. In

this novel all that remains is the boring content.

Hemingway as a Warrior

Of course, Hemingway is Col. Cantwell as he was Frederick Henry in *A Farewell to Arms*. This fact results in a peculiar contradiction. Hemingway (Col. Cantwell), is disgusted with the inefficiency of war. He is disgusted with those generals who conduct campaigns with but half an eye for the military exigencies, and who are primarily interested in press releases and publicity. He is a soldier who plies his trade honestly with a profound awareness of the effects of war upon the men he commands. But this debunking of certain aspects of military operations, by Hemingway, goes hand in hand with the presentation of Cantwell as Hero. And Cantwell is, after all, the military man. He prides himself on being tough, well-disciplined, a good soldier who carries out commands, occupies positions and kills the enemy. There is no expression of the general pacifism of *A Farewell to Arms*, merely a condemnation of military inefficiency at the expense of "our soldiers." And so, there is the paradox of extollation and condemnation of different facets of militarism at the same time.

In order to write *Across the River and Into the Trees*, Hemingway is reported to have interrupted his *magnum opus*. He is said to be engaged in writing a novel, the appearance of which, will prove him a great philosopher, art commentator, etc. Unless there is a drastic reversal in the continuum of his work it seems apparent that this next novel will prove none of these things.

VICTOR KAPLAN

Victor Kaplan is a student at Brooklyn College.

AFTERMATH OF THE KINSEY REPORT

SEX HABITS OF AMERICAN MEN¹

Albert Deutch.

ABOUT THE KINSEY REPORT²

Geddes & Curie.

BOTH THESE BOOKS seem to indicate, as does of course the Kinsey report itself, a greater openness about sexual life. "Sex is becoming safe," as one of the writers has discovered. Thus, professors now spell out "getting laid" (Havighurst) and condone "playful sexual adventures" (Folsom).

But as Paul Goodman cautions us in regard to current attitudes on Freudian investigation "The change is more apparent than real. Now we have learned to repress also our hypocrisy and timidity!" This is well borne out by the implications of the Report that are offered. It is admitted that "the overwhelming evidence from anthropological observation supports the view that it is difficult if not impossible in any society, even through long training backed by heavy sanctions, to restrict human sexual behavior to . . . to activity with a single sex partner" (Ford), yet we are informed "we need to ask ourselves how we can confine sexual activity within the bounds of matrimony" (English).

Everywhere it is stressed that "the finding that the American male is most sexually active in the late teens will force a reconsideration of our attitudes toward premarital intercourse" (e.g. Ashley Montagu). Ploscowe suggests reduction of the age of consent to 14. Llewellyn goes the farthest, "Above all . . . the need is for effective positive institutions to recognize the drive of the young American male into sexual outlet, and provide him with the wherewithal to indulge it with conscience, decency, and . . . social and spiritual aspects . . ." But nevertheless Gilbert's thesis is that "proper information and guidance can help tide the adolescent over the period of delay" and as his alternative climactically offers in italics the startling radical idea that—"College students should be permitted, even encouraged, to marry without discontinuing their studies."

This is "liberal" poppycock. What evidently is needed are not the implications of the Kinsey report but the implications of these implications. Why don't they come out and say that our legal code is absurd, that the phenomena of 20-year-to-death sentences in 47 states for rape is barbarous taboo-clinging; that children should be allowed to play at sex as they do at all other adult activi-

ties (nowhere considered in these papers); that an attack should be launched against the upbringing that produces frigidity and neurotic negativism in women; that adolescent sexuality should be encouraged, by attacking the basis of guilt feelings, by providing physical facilities for privacy and contraceptive information and materiel (nowhere is mentioned this most glaring omission in the Kinsey data, the whole absence of data on contraceptives and their use), by supporting the resort to hygienically organized abortion? This would truly be providing "the wherewithal to indulge with conscience and decency."

Only in Lindner's article on "Sexual Behavior in Penal Institutions" in the

Deutsch volume do we get the feeling of vigor:

. . . behind the gleaming facade of the 'modern' institutions, behind the tiled washrooms, the inlaid flooring, the athletic fields and the gadgetry which has become our civilization's hallmark, still lurk the grim horrors of retributive punishment and the same old time-dishonored evils . . . in the institutions of this land souls are rotting and minds are decaying in a sink of social, psychological and sexual corruption.

SANDER KATZ

Sander Katz is the editor of Complex.

The Film Brought Into Focus

HUMOR AND THE REALITY PRINCIPLE

ONE OF THE MOST striking aspects of Fred Zinneman's *The Men* is the gallows style humor of the paraplegic veterans whose lives furnish the subject of the film. There has been some adverse criticism of the "addition" of jokes to a story on so grim a topic as paraplegia; but we hope to show here that the portions of dialogue carrying droll overtones are in reality integrated expressions of the dramatic situation. Basic attitudes in the film are often more neatly displayed in jokes than anywhere else.

To give a rather general example, as Dr. Brock makes his round of the ward, one of the men inquires of another: "Remember Blood-and-Guts Patton? Well, meet Bladder-and-Bowels Brock!" Here, compressed into one phrase, can be seen the essential elements of the film's "psychological context" — military life as framework and cause of disability, the unrelenting physiological realism of being dead from the waist down, and the peculiar humor through which the men occasionally and partially transcend their condition.

In order to have clearly in mind the structure of *The Men*, let us state in synoptic form the story of Ken and Ellie which largely unifies the film. From a serious state of depression, Ken progresses with Ellie's love and encouragement to a partial acceptance of his role as fiancé; upon marriage Ellie becomes uncertain of her feelings and Ken, his security destroyed, retreats to the hospital world again; however, Ellie comes to realize her full motives and (with the help of Dr. Brock) Ken decides to go back to her in the outside world.

An Interesting Variant

Now, ordinarily we can chart film plots in three stages: (1) Suggestion of goal — often boy-gets-girl; (2) Removal of obstacles to goal — often by luck or the initiative of a woman, in U.S. pictures; (3) achievement of goal. *The Men* is an interesting variant, for here the action is primarily the modification of a goal. Ken's original depression springs mainly from hopelessness about ever achieving his goal of normal life. His progress is not through achieving this goal, however — as would have been the case if he should by some miracle have recovered the use of his legs. On the contrary, his progress occurs through accepting the impossibility of achieving his original goal. Physiological reality forces this change; a "scenic" factor, being wounded by a bullet from an unseen antagonist, furnishes the initial motion of the plot. Further, a part of the body inaccessible to ego demands is indeed part of a man's "scene." So on this high level of generalization, what happens in *The Men* is a shift of purpose, brought about through a transfer of bodily parts away from the control of the agent or character himself into the area of his scene.

It may even be possible to compress this scheme of events into a motto. We need something to express the rejection of easy day-dreams, the realization that the obstacle must be faced, though it cannot be surmounted, and perhaps what Brock tells Ken will serve: "Look, Ken — the legs are gone. Now the head has to take over."

The Bitter Humor

At this point we shall go back to our main concern with the humor of *The Men*. It is mordant throughout, and hardly ever "funny" in the ordinary sense. But it can serve to give us in-

¹ Prentiss-Hall 1948.

² New American Library.

sights into the psychological atmosphere of the film.

The first use of humorous dialogue (so designating statements that may also involve despair) occurs in the opening moments after we have seen Ken receive his wound. We see him in the hospital bed as his voice, in off-screen monologue, carries over from the battlefield. "The war's over, soldier, you're home again — aren't you glad to be half alive?" From this terse sarcasm we can extract Ken's resentment over irreparable loss, his feelings of impotence, and a certain diffuse hostility against the war and the society whose homecoming conventions merely mock the reality of war. The bitterness of the phrase conveys to us Ken's state of mind; but it also seems to serve for him a kind of release-function. He puts off the problem of facing his disability squarely, by a process of "ritually slaying" the hostile elements which brought him so low. In transfixing them with sarcasm he invites our participation; and it is his relief which is communicated to us as the tinge of "humor."

Some Sample Dialogue

Before Ken is taken to the ward with the other men, Brock is making his round. The men banter with him.

Brock: "Well have you decided what you're going to do when you get out?"

Patient: "Sure, doc, I'm going to sell shoelaces."

The reply could have been "pencils." But that would have been a more "real" answer, and real answers are dangerous.

Brock: "Any complaints, Mr. Butler?"

Butler: "Just a slight case of paralysis in both legs, doctor, nothing serious."

Then Ken's bed is wheeled in. "Be nice to the lieutenant, boys," says the nurse, who faces the men's problem too, and can thus joke with them. "He's not a well man." Butler, an intellectual who likes to use quotations, picks it up on the note of what brought them there.

Butler: "The hero is not fed on sweets,

Gaily his own heart he eats—"

Leo: Say, who said that, Norm?

Butler: Emerson.

Leo: Ah, good man!

They move on to speculations about Ken's decorations: "Silver star, doubtless — with oak leaf clusters." At this point Lopez, a kindly sort of guy, puts in "Don't mind Leo, he's a clown." Leo replies, grin gone, "Yeah, I'm a clown." But they continue.

Butler: "You know what's wrong with the lieutenant? He doesn't want to be a paraplegic."

Leo: "He doesn't? Why, everybody wants to be a paraplegic — I wouldn't have missed it for anything. And be-

sides, we all walk eventually — I read it in the papers."

Finally, after more jibes about Ken having pain (**Leo:** "Pain? Why, I never had pain, did you, Norm?") Leo turns his radio on loud. Ken asks him to turn it off, but he raises the volume even higher.

Leo: "It's too loud? Well, lieutenant, why don't you come over and turn it off? What's the matter, you paralyzed or something?"

Ken throws a water-pitcher and silences the set. For it has finally come to dead reality: he is in fact paralyzed.

The Wit of Fortitude

These "humorous" lines constitute caricatures of healthy comments. That is, they have elements of comedy because they display attitudes which are deformed, in light of the actual state of the men's bodies. Otherwise put, they are pretenses — deliberately transparent pretenses to help exercise the agonies of ineffectiveness. This type of humor can convey resentments and disappointments in the self which could not be expressed openly without explicit self-pity and its implications towards psychic breakdown. When they describe paralysis as "nothing serious," or "something that everybody wants," the men make both an admission of defeat and a defiance of it. Their jokes bolster them for the confronting of their own miseries; but they also furnish a screen — to laugh behind.

Ambivalence of Tragic Humor

Another way of seeing this is to consider the jokes as "instead" statements. In this type of schematization the two-sided function of the men's humor should become clearer. Thus, instead of the heroism Emerson thought he saw in war — the bloodiness of it. Instead of everybody walking, sooner or later — "There is no method known to medical science for the regeneration of spinal cord tissue."

We should not feel uneasy about the grisly origins of things we laugh at in **The Men**; humor often springs from unsavory sources. It merely happens that in **The Men** there is a particularly clear-cut relation between humor and the facing of reality. And so, while we are setting up "instead" statements, we might perhaps even construe the Ken-Elle plot as a part of the same pattern. Instead of the expected miracle, the traditional happy ending — a final scene implying only relative stability. No one ever puts this monstrous possibility into words, as a "joke." There are some outrages, we may suppose, which no humor can encompass. So Ken and Elle live out in the course of the film the ambivalences implied in the jokes of the entire ward.

One further point that should be noticed concerns the role of Dr. Brock. In a crucial scene, just after one of his patients has died, Brock loses patience over one of Butler's wisecracks, and berates the entire ward. The conclusion of his outburst is, "You men can either develop a sense of responsibility about yourselves, or get out!" Earlier, he had talked with several men about adjusting to their situations. But in this scene he disavows the father-role asked of him by the men. (It is a role involving condemnation because he can not cure them.) They must take stock themselves, assess their own conditions, act accordingly. What happened to them has just happened ("Can anyone tell you why, Ken?") and they must get used to it. They must transcend their ineffectiveness by coping with it honestly.

A Realistic Treatment

This is unusual because film productions for the most part avoid the posing of problems in terms of immutable reality. We are trained to await the appearance of a "gimmick" which will solve everything.

In "realist" treatments other modes of resolution must be found. Films dealing with basic and important issues in human life can still achieve relative dramatic stability.

The Men, for example, stirs up deep-rooted fears of bodily damage, and indeed presents the entire question of a person's accommodation-to-reality via the metaphor of impotence. In this disturbing image the parallels stand something like this:

"These men are reduced to sexual, economic, and ambulatory impotence; but they can achieve a semblance of potency through realistic behavior. Similarly, although I may sometimes be confronted by obstacles too great for me, I can still achieve partial satisfaction if I behave sanely also."

But no man, probably, can attain a stable, unambiguous attitude of this sort, and the facing of reality is always an incipient grim jest. In this sense man's predicament is essentially "humorous" — for there are inevitably limits to our powers and we all peer, from time to time, into dark areas where we must see comedy even in our own insufficiencies.

ERNEST CALLENBACH

Ernest Callenbach is a student at the University of Chicago.

ANVIL and STUDENT PARTISAN ADVERTISING RATES

\$50.00 for a full page

\$25.00 for a half page

\$12.50 for a quarter page

\$6.25 for an eight page

NEW YORK STUDENT FEDERATION AGAINST WAR

The primary aim of the New York Student Federation Against War is to organize all students opposed to the war drives of Russian and American imperialism which threaten the very existence of world civilization.

We aim to prevent the polarization of the American student into the reactionary war camps of either Russian or American imperialism.

We are irreconcilably opposed to the totalitarian tyranny which rules over such countries as Russia, her Eastern European vassal states, and Fascist Spain. We advocate the overthrow of these regimes by democratic forces from within these countries and enthusiastically endorse all such forces.

Since we function on the American campus most of the planks in our program must of necessity be more directly concerned with the American scene.

I. Against War Preparations

We oppose all social, economic, and political preparations for war on the part of Russian and American imperialism.

Therefore, we oppose:

1. The 41 billion dollar war budget.
2. The use of atomic energy for war purposes.
3. The North Atlantic Pact and the American subsidization of the military machines of Western Europe.
4. The growing militarism of the American government.
5. Conscription, Universal Military Training and the ROTC.
6. The bolstering of reactionary regimes in Spain, Greece, Turkey and the Asiatic puppet regimes.

Therefore, we favor:

1. Repeal of the draft.
2. Withdrawal of all occupation troops throughout the world.
3. Colonial freedom and the right of self-determination for all oppressed people.
4. Letting the people decide; a national referendum on war.
5. Granting amnesty and restoration of full civil rights to all those imprisoned or who lost their civil rights because of their opposition to World War II.

II. Academic Freedom and Civil Liberties

The assault on academic freedom and civil liberties is a part of American imperialism's preparation for war through methods which resemble the totalitarian techniques of the Russian police state.

Therefore, we oppose:

1. The attempt to straight-jacket the American campus through such legislation as the Feinberg Bill.
2. All forms of racial and religious discrimination among students and faculty.
3. Faculty and administration supervision of student organizations.
4. Loyalty Oaths for students or faculty members.
5. The suppression of political minorities through the use of such legislation as the Smith Act.
6. The McCarran Act.

Therefore, we favor:

1. Effective student government of student affairs.
2. Complete freedom of political expression for students and faculty members.
3. The right of students to organize on campus for their political opinions.
4. The abolition of all government subversive lists, loyalty oaths, and such bodies as the House Un-American Activities Committee.
5. Passage of a Civil Rights program and the repeal of the Smith Act and McCarran Act.

III. Education

1. For a free state university.
2. For a universal free college education.
3. For the right of students and faculty to organize and strike.

IV. Labor

1. The NYSFAW seeks to establish close ties with the labor movement and to actively cooperate with all sections of the labor movement in the fight against the drive to war.
2. We oppose all efforts to destroy the independence of the labor movement, and therefore are in favor of the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act and all similar legislation.