

anvil

And Student Partisan

THE ELECTIONS: *Rhetoric and Reality*

Kermit Eby:

Labor's Political Future

Hemingway's Concept of Virility

Revolt in South Africa

The Fate of American Civil Liberties

Shaw and the Social Role of Drama

Spotlighting the National Campus Scene

20¢

F a l l 1 9 5 2

anvil a student anti-war quarterly and student partisan

A Letter to the Reader

Vol. IV - No. 3 (Whole No. 8)  267

Fall Quarter 1952

CONTENTS

Editorial: The Elections — Rhetoric and Reality	3
Bob Bone	
American Labor's Political Future	7
Kermit Eby	
Hemingway and the Concept of Virility	11
Arel Austin	
The Fate of American Civil Liberties	15
Harry Ludd	
The Revolution in South Africa	19
George Houser	
Shaw and the Social Role of Drama	22
Ernest Callenbach	
Spotlighting the National Campus	26
Bill Shirley, Bogdan Denitch, Gerald Carr, Alan Daniels	
Book Review: Irving Howe's "William Faulkner"	29
Fred Samuels	
Book Review: Ralph Ellison's "Invisible Man"	30
Leonard Prager	

EDITORIAL BOARD

Julius Jacobson, <i>Editor</i>	Bob Bone, <i>Man. Editor</i>	Pincus Gross
Abe Victor	Joan Reynolds	Sam Bottone
Robert Mussigman	Leonard Prager	Margaret Levi
John Thompson	David McReynolds	Scott Arden
John Holmes		Bogdan Denitch
	Al Davidson, <i>Business Manager</i>	
	David Senes, <i>Ass't Business Manager</i>	

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
41 West 33rd St. New York, N. Y.

SOCIALIST CLUB OF ROOSEVELT COLLEGE
POLITICS CLUB OF UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
FOCAL POINT OF YALE UNIVERSITY
SOCIALIST STUDY CLUB (UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS)
THE NEW PERSPECTIVES OF ANTIOCH COLLEGE
DETROIT ANVIL CLUB

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA YOUTH FEDERATION AGAINST WAR

Dear Friend:

The Choice is yours!

I know that you appreciate the value of *Anvil and Student Partisan*, both for the quality of its contents in politics and literature, and for its point of view on the war issue. Whether or not you agree with the position of the editorial board, you will usually find *Anvil and Student Partisan* stimulating and provocative. There is a real necessity to see to it that the magazine remains on the scene to do its job.

While the spirit is willing, as business manager I find that the flesh is a bit weak. In our social set-up the reference is of course to money. Without that we can't publish. Unlike you and me, the printer doesn't work without pay.

The current issue of *Anvil and Student Partisan* was delayed by a lack of funds. We don't want it to happen again. The only one who can guarantee against such a recurrence is YOU!

Funds must come from one of two sources: sales or gifts. The choice is yours! Which is it going to be? Are you going to get out and sell copies to your classmates, get your friends to subscribe, put the magazine on newsstands, or would you rather take the money out of your pocket?

I would not like to see that happen. Not that I pity you. If you don't have the good sense and initiative to do a job for such a magazine, you should "pay for it." However it is a much healthier basis for any publication to receive its income from bona-fide sales. So for the sake of your pocketbook and the health of the magazine, let's try to increase sales for this and coming issues.

Fraternally,
Al Davidson, Bus. Mgr.

CONTRACT

The undersigned hereby contracts for page advertisement to appear in the Winter issue of ANVIL & STUDENT PARTISAN at \$.....

Name of Advertiser

Street

City

Paid

Balance

Signed

Solicitor

Please attach copy on separate sheet

Full Page \$50.00

Half Page \$25.00

Quarter Page \$12.50

Eighth Page \$ 6.25

Booster ad \$.50

Editorial

The Elections: Rhetoric and Reality

THE STUDENT LIBERAL approaches the presidential elections equipped with blinders and a magnifying glass. The function of the blinders is to blot from his consciousness the issues which really matter: the bipartisan formula for "peace" — by means of a policeman's club; the construction of a permanent war economy; and the continuing assault upon our vanishing civil liberties. Such issues do not make good campaign material for the practical liberal, for he assumes that it is futile to oppose the main drift toward an American garrison state. He turns instead to "domestic" issues, to the quiet backwater of American politics, relatively untouched by the strong current of the main drift. Here perhaps some genuine differences between the major candidates can be discovered. Here the magnifying glass is an indispensable aid in the search for a lesser evil.

It is the task of a student anti-war publication to approach the presidential elections with a consistent and long-range perspective. We must tenaciously press the questions: "Where do the candidates stand on the major issues of war and civil liberties? Can the traditional 'two-party system' provide voters with an *alternative* to the main drift?" For us, the answer begins with an investigation of the recent history of the American political-economy.

(1) *Toward a Permanent War Economy*

The Great Depression of the thirties dramatically revealed the central problem of American capitalism: the chronic lack of purchasing power, sufficient to absorb the mass product of American industry. The New Deal attacked this problem from both ends: it *reduced* production by destroying wealth, and *increased* purchasing power by pumping it artificially into the economy, through "deficit-spending" by the government. This program ended in failure: the government could not find sufficient outlet for its funds without poaching on the traditional preserves of private enterprise. The country never really emerged from the depression until the period of "national defense" spending, for the only form of deficit-spending ultimately acceptable to private enterprise is armaments. The Roosevelt administration finally accepted war as a means of stabilizing the economy.

By the systematic destruction of wealth, war makes full production and full employment possible, without inducing "surpluses" threatening to the stability of a scarcity economy. A modern war of attrition destroys vast accu-

mulations of commodities and capital, creating a vacuum which cannot be filled until well into the postwar period. This was the economic service which World War II provided for the staggering American economy. These were the circumstances which permitted an increase in the gross national product from \$97 billion in 1940, to \$198 billion in the peak war year of 1944.

When at the end of the war, the government cut back on war orders, withdrawing a large segment of purchasing-power from the economy, the national product fell off to \$171 billion. Had it not been for the backlog of consumer demand, and the continuing astronomical level of military expenditure, a serious slump might have resulted.

The years 1946-48 saw the inauguration of the Marshall Plan, and the beginnings of American military aid abroad. This provided the Fair Deal with a kind of global deficit-spending policy, differing from the domestic spending of the New Deal only in geography, and in "anti-Communist" rationale. It stimulated an increase of the national product to \$202 billion in 1948, but was not sufficient to stabilize the economy. In 1949, the nation experienced unemployment and "recession," and the national product slumped to \$196 billion. The government then resorted to a classic solution for domestic crisis. Preferring a "strong" foreign policy to radical domestic change, the Truman administration embarked on its Korean adventure. This restored the economy to a feverish state of "health," as the national product rose to \$217 billion in 1950, and in the following year, to the hitherto undreamed of heights of \$325 billion.

War and Depression

The recent history of American capitalism indicates that war is the sole technique for staving off depression available to a government committed in advance to the defense of the status quo. For twelve years (1940-1952), American capitalism has "solved" its major dilemma by this means, because it has no alternative. For twelve years, consciously or not, the American people have enjoyed a "prosperity" based on a perpetual blood-letting. It is scarcely to be wondered at that sophisticated conservatives of both parties, confronted with these realities, have come consciously to adopt a perspective of permanent war economy.

Once this perspective is accepted, certain economic measures become unavoidable. A permanent war economy is necessarily an inflationary economy, because a large

proportion of its commodities (war goods) are not available for purchase by private citizens. Yet purchasing-power (wages to war workers) is abundant. These dollars bid against each other for scarce consumer goods, and prices rise. Therefore, any government which runs a permanent war economy must establish economic controls. High taxes must drain off purchasing power; credit controls must reduce the supply of money; wage and price controls must combat the inflationary spiral; scarce materials must be rationed to manufacturers; vital industries like atomic energy must be taken over directly by government monopoly.

Profound political changes likewise become necessary. Certain measures of population control are inescapable: a nation perpetually on the brink of war must be kept in a mood of acquiescent dread by constant reference to the Enemy Without. An outlet for the aggression thus engendered must be provided through witch-hunts directed against the Enemy Within. Universal Military Training, to indoctrinate the citizen in his new role, is sure to be inaugurated.

"National unity" in the face of external danger must be achieved at all costs. This means, above all, that labor unions must be used, not smashed. Through skillful manipulation of the labor leader, unions become in part instruments of discipline over the labor force, preventing wildcats, and serious stoppages in war industry. Concessions (preferably small) must be made to minority groups to assure their loyalty. A modicum of welfare measures like social security must be continued, in return for the citizen's unquestioning loyalty to the State. Finally, the last vestiges of isolationist sentiment must be buried. To operate this system on a world scale, it is necessary to think politically in world terms.

None of these political-economic changes are speculative or prophetic. The Truman administration has accomplished every one of them *in fact*, with the single exception of UMT. The Republican Party, if it should assume power in 1953, would be obliged to follow the same course. Nowhere is the coercive effect of the permanent war economy on American party politics more apparent than in the struggle within the Republican Party, as it prepared to make its bid for power.

(II) The Republican Accommodation

Toward the end of the first political peep-show in Chicago, when it became apparent that the Taft forces would be defeated, Messrs. George Sokolsky and Westbrook Pegler took to singing the blues in their respective syndicated columns. The theme of their song was the ingratitude of Big Business toward one who had served it so long and faithfully. How, they moaned in chorus, could Wall St. ruthlessly foreclose on the man who had mortgaged his political future to them, by engineering the unpopular Taft-Hartley Act? This is a good question, requiring deeper insight than is possessed by either of the gentlemen who ask it. An adequate understanding of Taft's rejection by Big Business involves a knowledge of the social base of the Taft and Eisenhower groups, their contrasting ideologies,

and the relationship of these ideologies to the permanent war economy.

In a pre-convention issue of *The Nation* (July 5), a former financial writer on the New York Stock Exchange, Barrow Lyons, gives an interesting account of the financial backers of both groups. The Ike camp received checks from the top executives of such firms as Chase National Bank, Philadelphia Fidelity National Bank, IBM, General Electric, GM, Ford Motor Co., Standard Oil, Arabian-American Oil, Gulf Oil, Goodrich Rubber and General Foods.

Taft received donations from men connected with Timken-Roller-Bearings, Sears Roebuck, Tompkins Product, Inland Steel, the McCormick publishing interests, and a host of small firms unfamiliar to the public. Roughly we can say that Taft's social base is composed of big farmers and little businessmen, while Ike's strength comes from large manufacturing and financial interests. This division approximates C. Wright Mill's distinction between the "practical" right, concerned only with short-run profit, and the sophisticated conservative, who looks ahead toward preservation of the *system*.

With different roots in the social order, it is natural that the ideologies of the two groups should diverge. The Taftites are primarily interested in the domestic market, and are consequently isolationist in sentiment. They are unfriendly to NATO and the UN, and would cut back on foreign aid. They regard European capitalism as expendable in the cold war. Diplomatically, they belong to the dispatch-a-gunboat school, or to its modern equivalent, the dispatch-MacArthur school. Like MacArthur, Taft Republicans oppose UMT, on the ground that it paves the way for further state regimentation.

Eisenhower Republicans are of course "internationalists." As one would expect of Big Business, they see the world, rather than some sector of it, as an object of profit. They are committed to propping up European capitalism, to support of the Marshall Plan, NATO, the UN, and to the passage of UMT. A listing of Ike's advisers indicates his orientation in the foreign policy sphere. Paul Hoffman, former Marshall Plan director, is on the General's advisory staff, as is General Lucius Clay (now president of Continental Can). Also associated with Ike is William H. Draper, of Dillon, Read & Co., erstwhile financial assistant to General Clay's military government in Germany, — now special representative to the Mutual Security Agency and NATO. Another Ike supporter is Phillip Reed, chairman of General Electric, who, together with Draper, is said to have sabotaged the decartelization of German industry.

Differ on Labor Policy

It is simply untrue that Taft and Ike have the same labor policy. It is not mere demagoguery, when at a press conference Eisenhower hints of consulting Walter Reuther on labor questions. His support comes from a group of industrialists with a record of "enlightened" labor relations. These men intend to integrate the business elite with the military and governmental bureaucracies, and invite

the labor leader to join this alliance as a junior partner. The Taft forces, on the other hand, far from fostering this kind of "national unity", are pure and simple union-busters, and under present conditions of union organization, their anti-labor legislation would precipitate a bitter class struggle.

Taft is opposed equally to Big Unions and to Big Government, because both interfere with unrestrained profit-taking. He has traditionally been for low taxes, against "government spending" (welfare), against economic controls of any kind, and against governmental competition with private industry. The Eisenhower group is more resilient in matters of welfare and economic controls. In the words of Ike's campaign manager, Senator Henry Cabot Lodge (*Harpers*, May 1952):

... today, more than at most times, the issues to be settled are a matter of adjusting necessities. . . . To maintain our alliances without straining our resources, to keep a strong defense without raising taxes to crushing levels, to meet the legitimate expectations in the field of social service. . . . this is a task requiring something more than doctrinaire conceptions. (My emphasis, BB).

It should be clear by now that item for item, the Taft ideology is wholly incompatible with a permanent war economy. The Eisenhower forces, on the other hand, are well prepared for the task of administering a garrison state.

The rejection of Taft by Big Business must be interpreted in this light. Taft was flattened by the permanent war economy, though his followers still don't understand what hit them. The decision of the auto industry to support Eisenhower is typical. The domestic market is glutted with new cars. Either the industry makes tanks, or it goes under. Ike's victory is as simple as that.

The task imposed by history on the Republican Party at its 1952 convention was to slough off its traditional, obsolete ideology, and accommodate itself to the exigencies of a permanent war economy. This it accomplished through the victory of the Eisenhower forces. Had the Taftites won, the Party would have made its bid for power as the instrument of a group of wild-eyed Utopian capitalists, espousing a program utterly irrelevant to the current requirements of American capitalism.

(III) *The Democratic Accommodation*

While the Republicans are merely would-be administrators of a permanent war economy, the Democrats administer it in fact. The Democratic Party exhibits no such dramatic "adjustment to necessities" as occurred at the Republican convention, for the simple reason that the Democratic accommodation to the permanent war economy has been in process for the past twelve years. The evolution from New Deal to Fair Deal represents a shift from welfare to warfare; from WPA to WPB; from temporary economic makeshift to permanent war economy.

Many liberals, in preparing to support the Stevenson-Sparkman ticket, are forced to play little games of self-deception. They pretend, for instance, that the Democratic

Party is still the party of FDR, marching forward with the banner of the common man. The truth is that today New Deal liberalism is an Utopian ideology. Like Taftism, it is a casualty of the permanent war economy.

Nothing illustrates the current irrelevance of old-style liberalism better than the abortive Douglas-for-President movement. Justice Douglas, a Roosevelt appointee to the Supreme Court, is ideologically fixated at the liberal creed of the 1930's. He holds, for instance, the ACLU position on civil liberties. He believes that a democratic foreign policy is possible. These are tenets of the liberal creed to which most liberals still subscribe *in theory*. But no liberal expects the Democratic Party *in power* to act upon these tenets. While most liberals would have welcomed the nomination of Justice Douglas, no liberal took his candidacy seriously. All understood that in the crucial areas of foreign policy and civil liberties, the Douglas position is strictly Utopian.

Today no realistic liberal believes that a democratic foreign policy is possible. The most he hopes for is an *effective* policy of containment. If in the course of being "effective," American foreign policy undertakes the remilitarization (read reNazification) of Germany and Japan; if it props up such totalitarian regimes as those of Chiang, Rhee, or Franco; if, as Nehru has charged, it underwrites European colonialism through NATO; if it participates in a suicidal armaments race; if it conducts strangely interminable truce negotiations in Korea with one hand, while it conducts "Operation Killer" with the other; — these things are simply . . . deplorable. But the reactionary, war-breeding foreign policy of the Democratic Party is not merely a "deplorable mistake." After all, a permanent war economy implies a permanent war.

Abandonment of Civil Liberties

The realistic liberal who prepares to assume power (that is, who rejects Douglas, and accepts Stevenson), must "adjust to necessities" precisely as did the Eisenhower forces. In addition to abandoning any hope of a democratic foreign policy, he must give up obsolete notions about civil liberties. A relentless pursuit of the Enemy Within is forced willy-nilly upon the administrators of a permanent war economy. The party in power is obliged to provide the people with "two-minute hate-sessions," in order to maintain their will to wage war. How else account for the record of the Truman administration in this regard?

How account for the attorney-general's "subversive" list, — the jumping-off point for the current political repression? How account for Truman's instructions to his attorney-general to initiate prosecutions of Communist Party members under the Smith Act? How account for the incredible growth of the American secret police, whose activities have shifted from crime-prevention to political intimidation, all during a Democratic administration? How account for the fact that the most effective member of the Wisconsin-Nevada axis has been not Republican Joe McCarthy, but Democrat Pat McCarran? How account for the vote of *liberal* Congressional Democrats for the Mc-

Carran Subversive Control Act, and for the liberal-sponsored amendment to the Act, which calls for wartime concentration camps for Communists? How account for the Truman-appointed majority of the Supreme Court, which has torn down one judicial bar after another, lest the witch-hunters stumble in their mad chase? A comparison of the record of these Truman appointees with that of Justice Douglas is a clear measure of the coercive effect of the permanent war economy upon the Democratic Party.

If New Deal liberalism is irrelevant in the crucial fields of foreign policy and civil liberties, are there other areas where the paralyzing effects of the permanent war economy is equally apparent? The New Deal position on social services and the Welfare State is a familiar one. It should be perfectly clear that no significant extension of social services is possible within the framework of a permanent war economy. When a crushing burden of armaments weighs down the ship of state, welfare is the first thing to go overboard.

Labor and the Fair Deal

The labor legislation of the New Deal was its proudest accomplishment. The Fair Deal, however, is no longer free to legislate in the tradition of the Wagner Act. For one thing, a cold war requires a wage-freeze, as an anti-inflationary measure. The Democratic Party thus finds itself in the position of imposing an artificial limitation on the bargaining power of the unions, — an antagonism revealed when labor members temporarily withdrew from the Wage Stabilization Board. With a Congress which simultaneously shoots price controls full of holes, a wage-freeze simply dips into the pocket of the workingman. Perhaps more important, in a permanent war economy the executive must have the power to break strikes which “threaten the national security,” — that is, all successful large-scale walk-outs. Campaign rhetoric to the contrary notwithstanding, it is unlikely that this key provision of the Taft-Hartley Act will ever be repealed within the context of a permanent war economy.

If the Republicans have their Utopian capitalists, the Democrats have their Utopian liberals. Each group of Utopians may loyally support the party ticket, but there is no chance that either can thereby realize its goals. The permanent war economy has made a joke of the “two-party system.” It has narrowed the area of free choice confronting the custodians of American capitalism to minor differences over administrative detail. The over-all policy is determined in advance, and the broad outlines of our future are clear.

The choice facing the American people this November is consequently an extremely narrow one. No *alternative* is offered by the major parties to the bi-partisan foreign policy of peace through mutual fright, nor to the equally bi-partisan commitment to a permanent war economy. Our choice is reduced to which of two political machines will be chosen to administer the emerging garrison state.

(IV) The Alternative: A Socialist Protest Vote

At present writing, it seems likely that Governor Stevenson will achieve a campus popularity unprecedented for

presidential candidates in recent years. Unlike the ex-haberdasher, he can quote Shakespeare without affectation, and is therefore “one of us.” The source of Stevenson’s popularity among intellectuals is the conviction that, being literate, he will somehow “make the right choices” in office. The case of Woodrow Wilson should have taught us that literacy is not enough. The role coerces the individual, — especially in a situation where the range of choice has been drastically reduced by the permanent war economy.

His running mate, Senator Sparkman, should receive short shrift from *Anvil* readers. Wrong on civil rights; wrong on labor issues (he voted for the Taft-Hartley Act, and its predecessor, the Smith-Connelly Act, and against the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938); wrong on UMT; wrong on civil liberties (he voted for the McCarran Act); — he is above all a symbol of the abject capitulation by the Democratic Party to its white supremacist wing. This, then, is the slate with which the Democratic Party confronts the student liberal

An Inch and a Mile

We are not arguing to be sure, that there is literally no difference between the Stevenson-Sparkman ticket and that of the Republican Party. One major party is frankly a businessman’s party, while the other must make at least occasional concessions to labor. But we do maintain that on the decisive, over-riding political questions of our time, — on the issues involving the permanent war economy, — the political distance between Stevenson and Eisenhower is an inch, while the distance between Stevenson and an anti-war position is a mile. We urge our readers not to leap over the mile, for the sake of the inch. A vote for the Stevenson-Sparkman ticket is a vote for a permanent war economy. Ultimately, it is a vote for war.

What, then, is the alternative? Is a meaningful protest vote available? *Anvil* readers cannot of course consider the Progressive Party as an acceptable alternative. A vote for the Progressive Party is a sucker vote, not a protest vote. Such a vote aids only the native hucksters of Russian totalitarianism. The Progressive Party, for its own reasons, opposes the main drift in American society, while it whitewashes the Russian prototype of the garrison state.

It is nevertheless possible to register a symbolic protest against the drift toward war on election day, by voting for a socialist party which stands for a clear break with the main drift, — a party willing to undertake radical social change, and to attack the permanent war economy at its roots. A socialist protest vote will not stop the main drift. Only a labor party, and consequent developments which the advent of such a party would make possible, can do that. Meanwhile, a student who is serious in his anti-war views cannot abandon these views one day, and re-assume them the next. He is under obligation to translate his anti-war position into a meaningful act on election day. His only course is to protest the reactionary politics of the two major parties by voting for a socialist candidate.

BOB BONE

American Labor's Political Future

Can Labor Afford to Remain in the Democratic Party?

JACK KROLL, director of CIO's Political Action Committee, and Joseph Keenan, then director of AFL's League for Political Education were members of that select minority which consistently predicted President Truman's victory in 1948. The basis of their faith, as nearly as I can determine, was their intimate knowledge of labor's increased activity in the politics of ward and precinct. Informed observers in labor's ranks tell me that four times as many persons worked at getting out the vote in the 1948 elections as did in former elections in which CIO participated directly.

This grass-roots approach to politics, this increased emphasis on political action in the practical sense, contrasts markedly with Labor's efforts in earlier campaigns when propaganda and pamphleteering received more emphasis than grass-roots organization. The reasons are speculative, but this may be due to the nature of the men who directed the 1948 campaign. Both Messrs. Kroll and Keenan are practical trade unionists with years of organizing experience, men who by nature and experience are more interested in the workers on the organizational and political firing line than in the layouts of pamphlets.

This was not always so. How clearly I recall the early days of PAC when Sidney Hillman was surrounded by college-trained men, the intellectuals on his staff, who thought that elections were won by the manipulations of mass media. Many times, as a member of PAC's editorial committee, I spent hours denying the educational benefit of the more sophisticated *New Yorker* type cartoons in workers' pamphlets, only to lose the argument and later to discover the undistributed pamphlets behind some union office door. The change to a predominant emphasis on political organization under Kroll and Keenan, however, does not mean that education was neglected in the 1948 campaign. It only means that practical trade unionists put leg work before art work, nose-counting before pamphlet distribution.

Labor's efforts in the last weeks of the 1948 campaign are even more amazing when we recall that the top men among its leaders were not particularly enthusiastic about President Truman's candidacy. To most of them F.D.R. was still the President and Harry Truman was an unreliable weakling who promised much and delivered little — a dangerous unpredictable who blew up when the railroad workers went on strike. Hence the consistent efforts on the part of top labor leaders, and many Roosevelt liberals in the Americans for Democratic Action, to draft General Eisenhower to lead the disillusioned and disorganized Democrats to victory.

At this point it must also be remembered that the labor leaders of America, particularly those in the CIO, were

conditioned by twelve years of F.D.R. They grew up with and were nurtured by the Wagner Act. Because of this relationship and this nurturing they developed a Great White Father complex. General Eisenhower, they believed, would develop into another Great White Father. He was born on their side of the tracks and could thus be trusted. They believed too, that Eisenhower's popularity would sweep in a Democratic Congress and the General, elected with labor's help, would understand the necessity of dealing with those lesser leaders who command the legions of American labor. Furthermore, many a leader, proud of his contacts with the White House during the years of the Roosevelts, looked forward to the continuation of similar contacts. Face-to-face settlement of issues by men who had power was a pattern they understood and lived by. Finally, it must never be forgotten that labor leaders who fought long and hard for their places of power in their unions naturally respected men in other fields who excelled them in the art of leadership. Harry Truman, they were quite convinced, was not in the same league with F.D.R. and Ike Eisenhower as a leader. Consequently, General Eisenhower's refusal to run was a blow to their hopes, and Truman's nomination was accepted without much enthusiasm.

As a result, labor strategy was very simple in the early summer of 1948; put all possible emphasis on the Senatorial and Congressional elections; control inflation; wipe out the stigma of Taft-Hartley; and if Harry Truman is accidentally elected as a by-product of labor's political efforts, everyone in its ranks will be most agreeably surprised. Only later, when the crowds coming out to hear Harry Truman as he toured the country grew larger, did their attitude change and their support for Truman increase. However, to the everlasting credit of labor politicians, they sensed the swing in public opinion before many Democratic machine men caught on.

Nevertheless, convinced that Mr. Dewey was going to be elected, more than one caucus and bull session took place in the ranks of labor, up to the very day of the election, on how to get along with Mr. Dewey and the Republicans; and a few, including Mr. McFettridge, felt so sure of a Dewey victory that they decided to climb on his bandwagon.

Lessons from 1948 Campaign

Fortunately for labor, and equally fortunately, perhaps, for the American people as a whole, this emphasis on Senatorial and Congressional elections stimulated local political activity and made victory increasingly dependent on the sergeants, the corporals, and not a few of the privates in labor's ranks. This is a lesson it is devoutly to be hoped will be long remembered by those in the positions

of power in the echelons of labor. If it is understood, the next step in labor's political evolution will witness the same or greater activity in state and local elections as was developed in national ones; for victory at the polls will in the future, it seems to me, be increasingly dependent not only on the independent decisions of the American voters, men and women who listen to the arguments on controversial issues and then make up their own minds on how to vote, but also on the political amateurs who are determined to take a hand in local government. This means that if labor wants to win in future elections, it must develop both a program and an organization; and above all it must understand that in America the people really are sovereign.

If labor leaders analyze the Truman victory they can learn much — they can learn, for example, that Harry Truman's victory was a victory for the little shots who got out the vote, a defeat for the big shots who would rather deal with the leader at the top level of the power structure than trust the people at the bottom, and an indication that Lincoln was right when he wrote to his son Dick, "Keep close to the people, they will not lead you astray."

Truman's election meant the end of any immediate formation of a labor party, be it the Henry Wallace, the Walter Reuther, or even the innocent William Green variety. It gave labor time to bring about the unity in its ranks without which independent political action would be futile. Today even a united labor movement cannot win national or state elections without an alliance with one or more other groups in our body politic. Furthermore, the Truman victory, in spite of the attrition from the left and right, from the Wallaceites, Dixiecrats, etc., meant a resurgence of the Democratic Party. Finally it meant temporarily, at least, the incorporation in the Democratic Party of a considerable part of those liberal elements among the white-collar groups and farmers who would not feel at home in a labor party. Recognizing these facts, the political pragmatists at both the CIO and AFL conventions in 1948 vetoed a labor party for the present.

The relation between organized labor and the Democratic machine varies from state to state, from city to city, and from organization to organization. Among the welter of these relationships, however, two rather consistent and distinct patterns stand out. In the first, labor, the most powerful group in the community in numbers and financial resources, enters into a partnership with the Democratic machine leaders with the understanding that that part of the party program of direct interest to labor, and those appointments which concerns it, will receive favorable consideration after the election. This is a horsetrading relationship, one which rests on the philosophy of "you scratch my back and I'll scratch yours." In the second, labor has greater if not more direct influence. Its spokesmen have considerable voice in the formulation of pre-election platforms, some choice in the selection of candidates, and occasional persons who are an integral part of the political machine on the ward and precinct level. This sort of relationship might lead to an integration of labor and the Democratic machine.

The future of the Democratic Party and of labor's relation to it rests in the perfection of this relationship. Labor, in the years ahead, will have to decide how far it intends to go in taking over, or in being taken over, by the Democratic Party, if it does not want to continue in a position where it does the legwork and picks up the checks. To be specific, labor must find its place in state and city machines, be a part of every state and city central committee, every ward and precinct organization, and particularly must have a choice in the selection of candidates who run for office.

Labor and the Democratic Party

Otherwise, labor will be thought by the American public to have political power and will be judged as if it had, while actually the fundamental political decisions arrived at before election day, which are of the greatest significance, will be in the hands of the machine politicians. If that happens it is even possible that men and women in labor's ranks might lose their enthusiasm for dollar-raising and doorbell-ringing — that is, if they find the same old gang down at the courthouse calling the tune.

Here in Illinois — to be exact in the second Congressional District — I heard some very vigorous gripes from the steel workers who were asked to beat the bushes for votes for a candidate they had no voice in choosing. Other steel workers, more sophisticated than their brethren, told me — and perhaps rightfully so — that the machine Democrats of Chicago felt the chance for victory was hopeless in 1948, and therefore refused in the early part of the campaign to carry the lead in dollars and doorbell-ringing. A few even insisted that one of the contributing factors in the nomination of Paul Douglas, Adlai Stevenson, and John Boyle was the conviction on the part of the machine that they had no chance to win anyway. "Let's kill the radicals off," the machine said to themselves, "by letting them run when they have no chance of victory."

This attitude of the machine bosses is dangerous to labor's interests. It can best be overcome, I believe by a determined effort on the part of labor to develop able men for local offices on every level. School boards, city councils, and state legislatures are also important in the American political scene; and it is in such offices that future Congressmen and Senators serve their apprenticeships. Organized labor, in a word, should not neglect local elections, for local politics is the training school for national leadership.

There is little new in labor's program. It is based on the New Deal; and nothing in it attacks the fundamental structure of our economy, with the possible exception of the President's statement that the government might have to build steel plants if Big Steel continued to refuse to expand production. Very little in the program indicates any long-range economic thinking, either on the part of labor economists or of the economists who are advisers to the President. Nor is this unexpected. Today our economy is riding high: a 320 billion dollar national product, a 280 billion dollar income in wages and salaries, and 61 mil-

lion employed. The little softening up which has taken place in textiles, shoes, and certain items of consumer durables has not materially affected the thinking of top labor leaders. Furthermore, steel and auto, the most powerful unions in the policy formation of CIO, are enjoying maximum prosperity in their respective industries. Labor, as a part of the Truman administration, enjoys with the Administration the fruits of a high-level full-employment economy; and labor, like the Administration, wants to maintain the economy at its present level. Consequently, Mr. Murray, like Mr. Truman, assures the American businessman of his continued support of free enterprise.

War Economy

However, everyone in labor's ranks is not oblivious to the dilemma of the present moment. A few understand that our economy is geared to 45 billion dollars of direct defense expenditures; and more than once those worried ones ask themselves, "What would happen to our economy if Uncle Joe should wage a peace offensive and America no longer had an international crisis to justify its subsidized exports and rearmament program?"

There are many men in the labor movement who recall that even the best efforts of the New Deal did not wipe out unemployment, and that as late as 1938-39 nine million Americans were without jobs. They also know that the economic stimulus of the coming war was the only source of rescue for those idle Americans who could not find employment in peacetime. Lend-lease was the first stimulus; it was followed by the war; the war by UNRRA, and UNRRA by ECA; and then we were told we must rearm Western Europe.

Yes, indeed, the devil has led the leaders of labor to the top of a high mountain and has told them, "All these things — prosperity, full employment, high wages, steady per capita — are yours, if you do not question what makes them possible!"

The last election, as was said before, witnessed the repudiation of both the Dixiecrats and the Wallaceites. The victory in November, 1948, which labor believes it was responsible for, also saw the political triumph within CIO's ranks of the anti-Communists. I rejoice in their triumph; but I am not one who believes that a labor movement or a government can consistently receive its impetus from uniting against someone or something. Negations, it seems to me, are not the best of historical stimuli. Nor is it enough to accept the shot in the economic arm which defense expenditures give, if labor would serve this hour in history. It is a labor responsibility to do that hard thinking necessary to formulate an economic program which will give the American people the continuing economic stability which we now enjoy from defense expenditures. Today labor must try to project the position it will be in after its program of social legislation is enacted into law. Exactly what will it do, what will it offer its members, what will

be its program for labor and the American public, should deflation and unemployment come? These are the questions which need immediate attention.

National Prosperity Budget

The election of Truman did not provide the economic program the country needs in the long run. It is my conviction that we must implement the Full Employment Act of 1946, must plan for peace by developing a "national prosperity budget" in order to draw up a broad appraisal of the general condition of our whole economy and its outlook for the future. It would set forth, for a period of a few years ahead, the national output that this level of employment could generate, and break this down into broad categories such as agricultural output, steel output, foreign trade, etc. It would apply the tools of economic analysis to the task of defining the kind of balance among the various lines of production and consumption which would be most likely to maintain an expanding economy in equilibrium. It would thus furnish better guides to the voluntary agencies in our economic system than any which they now possess.

"This national prosperity budget would not have the aspects of a national plan, would not be compulsory, would not be thrust upon anyone; but it would be an attempt to do in peacetime what we do in wartime — an attempt to plan for the national interests, an attempt to anticipate the national need."

Labor should take the initiative in setting up a commission of the best economists in labor, liberal business, and universities; a completely free commission which would meet for the purpose of thinking through the economic problems of contemporary America, developing a program and supplying the labor propagandists with the body of economic content they have so long lacked. Such a commission, naturally, should be beyond influence by immediate political considerations. Its purpose could best be served by long-range considerations.

Lest I be misunderstood, at this point I wish to make it very clear that this argument for peacetime planning, this escape from an economy tied to war, is not an argument for unilateral disarmament and weakening of America. It is, on the other hand, an argument for the creation of a radical, dynamic program for economic stability which would take the play away from our Communist brethren in the economic field. I am tired of looking under the bed for Communists — in the future, I would like to see a labor movement so democratically aggressive that the Communists would seem conservative by contrast.

And this insistence on aggressive democracy must carry over into the international sphere. It is not enough for organized labor to support E.C.A., reciprocal trade, and other efforts for economic recovery as outlined by the President.

Organized labor has a responsibility to insist, in season and out of season, that reaction and militarism are not America's allies. Just because the Communists take a moral position against exploitation and imperialism does not mean we should take an opposite one. It is up to us to beat the

Communists to the punch in every country seeking its freedom. Russia and America are not all the world.

Lest my labor and liberal friends misunderstand me, permit me to reassure them that I have not forgotten labor's magnificent emphasis on the relation between economic recovery and political freedom in Europe and elsewhere. However the World Federation of Trade Unions is — for all practical purposes — dead. The hatred for Communism and totalitarianism is intense; the temptation to war is constant; and for Americans who were not bombed and who were fully employed the memories of war are not too unpleasant.

This, then; is a time for democratic advance in economic democracy, a time when we dare not flout the wills of people who believe capitalism no longer meets their needs, who want to socialize their resources and industries and who sometimes fear capitalistic America as much as Communistic Russia. Nor do we dare forget that the peoples of the world, the workers, never benefit from war. They only fight and die.

Toward a Labor Party

Once labor arrives at the decision that our democratic future, and the world's, is dependent upon planning and economic decisions based on the most valid information, we automatically bring up the most complicated question which American labor must face. The question is this: can labor continue to insist on power without responsibility? Dare labor go on as a pressure group even though that pressure is exercised through the Democratic Party? Or should American labor united with the American liberals, form an independent political party like the British Labour Party?

Whenever I think about this question I conclude it would be good for labor to have a political vehicle to implement its program. Then, if it comes to power it will also come to judgment, and the American public will have a chance to weigh and accept or repudiate its program. Now, it has no such chance. Within the amalgam which is the Democratic Party, labor can always blame the Southerners or the farmers for its failures. Reasoning thus, I accept the necessity for an independent labor party. At the same time, I am not without doubt, because I have experienced European parties organized along class lines. Thinking about the European experience makes me prefer the American two-party system which reconciles its conflicting parts.

Perhaps, then, all that I am asking for as I conclude is that those leaders who are responsible for labor's future should face the decisions which are theirs before they are forced into decisions by economic and political necessity. This is a lot to expect, I know, for labor leaders are on the whole activists, men who meet problems as they arise, not philosophers. And since this is true, perhaps the economists and educators in the unions and other circles must be willing to supply the facts and philosophy, as they did in Britain through the Fabians.

Finally, as a person who has lived 12 years in the labor movement, 6 in the AFL, 6 in the CIO, I always come

to the same conclusion when I think about labor's political future. Labor needs, in the years that lie ahead, men who understand the world in which they live and of which they are a part. These men must understand our democratic heritage, the contribution of labor to that heritage, and above all they must have an understanding of the ideologies which are everywhere struggling for the souls of men. Out of this study must come men with a democratic temper, a personal maturity, and a philosophy of history. These individuals must encourage the development within the labor movement of an open caucus and a two-party system, — putting an end to the charge of factionalism against anyone who dares oppose the persons in power. Likewise, to further democracy in its ranks labor needs to have more rotation in office, new blood in positions of responsibility. In other words, labor must support the same things in labor politics which it demands in political democracy. Labor leaders whose power rests on a one-party system or power pattern are not enough. The making of decisions must be dispersed in union politics as in party politics, and in turn must rest upon an educated and informed membership.

Labor's political future, therefore, demands that labor get over its fear of democracy, look around and clean its own house before demanding power over others. All around us there are evidences that the day of the political boss and the regimented voter are waning. The American people are beginning to make their decisions on the basis of issues. Labor holds the key to this evolution. If it contributes to the education, not indoctrination, of its rank and file, the future holds great promise. If on the other hand, it insists on power without democratic decision, on leadership without criticism, we can expect only a loss of democratic institutions to this new elite. Labor's political future is of interest not only to those in the ranks of labor: its development concerns us all.

KERMIT EBY

Kermit Eby has been active in the U.S. labor movement for many years. He organized the first teachers' union in Ann Arbor, Mich., and later helped to organize the auto workers in that state. From 1937-42 he was Executive Secretary of the Chicago Teachers' Union. From 1943-48 he was Asst. Director, and then Director, of Education and Research for national CIO. Since 1948 he has been on the faculty of 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*.

Hemingway and the Concept of Virility

A Critical Examination of the Author's Major Novels

IF IT WERE POSSIBLE to sum up all themes in Hemingway's fiction, the total would probably result in the word "virility." The lonely courage which is the great virtue of his heroes, is part of it. The sexual potency and sometimes the impotence of his characters is directly related to it. The background of war and death, almost invariable for his fiction, is the testing ground for it. One might, at times, find it obsessional, physically intrusive in all of his situations were it not for the fact that in each instance, even where it is casually mentioned, it is never superfluous, but always serves some function of characterization, or development.

Hemingway's Anti-intellectualism

The very attitude, one might even call it "pose" which Hemingway adopts with critics might be said to stem from the concept that killing, fighting, feeling are all pure and good; but that thought, analysis and criticism are false, distorting, unreal attitudes toward life. When Hemingway is told by one of his admirers that he is to be the subject of an article, he invariably replies that he is not responsible for any inaccuracies or legendary accomplishments which might be attributed to him, that he would be delighted if the statements about his writing or his life should eventually be disproved. At times, he comments about criticism of his work, using words appropriate for describing a boxing match or a baseball game as if he were showing his disdain for the language of the intellectual and contempt for any enterprise which is "explanatory."

Such an attitude is hardly new. Contended by philosophers, discussed by poets and silently debated by men for centuries, it is best expressed, perhaps, by Faust in the early scenes of Goethe's dramatic poem and given there a romantic stress which is quite appropriate for discussing a romantic such as Hemingway:

I drag my life through learned bric-a-brac.
And shall I here discover what I lack,
And learn, by reading countless volumes through,
That mortals mostly live on misery's rack, I aspire.
To rise to spheres of pure activity.

*

'Tis writ, 'In the beginning was the Word.'
The Word I cannot set supremely high:
A new translation I will try.

*

I write, 'In the beginning was the Deed.'

(Faust Act I, Scenes 1 and 2)

The translation emasculates, somewhat, the vigor of the German; but the conclusion is clear. Pure activity, the *deed*, is everything. The word is but a pale reflection in a tarnished mirror. Hemingway has carried this to the point of feeling that, in fiction, it is the hero's deed which must evoke feelings of pity, of terror, and of tragedy. To com-

ment on the emotion is to destroy it. To state barely simply, even curtly is the art of control, the discipline in writing. To the extent that the reader identifies with the situation and with the characters, he will *feel* the emotion implied by bare detail, and felt by the writer. But first, he must make an effort to understand the situation, just as the writer must strive to choose that sequence of events which best dramatizes the emotion, and just as the reader must, himself, strive to understand events when they occur in his own life. Perhaps understanding is an impossibility; but then so is comment, analysis, and explanation. Virility is, among other things, the capacity for *action*.

The Word and the Deed

If we take one or two paragraphs from some of Hemingway's stories we will find a richer source, and a greater number of implications in his point of view, than we could possibly get from mere restatement:

The first is from *The Snows of Kilimanjaro*, in which the dying man has been trying to destroy his wife's love for him in order to save her the pain of his death, and has failed.

"You don't have to destroy me. Do you? I'm only a middle-aged woman who loves you and wants to do what you want to do. I've been destroyed two or three times already. You wouldn't want to destroy me again would you?"

"I'd like to destroy you a few times in bed," he said.

"Yes. That's the good destruction. That's the way we're made to be destroyed. The plane will be here tomorrow."

"... Then, in town, they will fix up your leg and then we will have some good destruction. Not that dreadful talking kind."

In the same story, several paragraphs further on, the dying man recalls an episode of death during the war, which he had always wanted to write about:

That was the day he'd first seen dead men wearing white ballet skirts and upturned shoes with pompoms on them. The Turks had come steadily and lumpily and he had seen the skirted men running and the officers shooting into them and running then themselves and he and the British observer had run too until his lungs ached and his mouth was full of the taste of pennies and they stopped behind some rocks and there were the Turks coming as lumpily as ever. Later he had seen the things that he could never think of and later still he had seen much worse. So when he got back to Paris that time he could not talk about it or stand to have it mentioned. And there in the cafe as he passed was that American poet with a pile of saucers in front of him and a stupid look on his potato face talking about the Dada movement with a Roumanian who said his name was Tristan Tzara, who always wore a monocle and had a headache.

Here, then, is the simple juxtaposition: in the first scene the woman tells us that destruction of the "talking kind" is "dreadful" but that sex is the "good destruction." In the

other scene, the dying man, reminiscing, thinks about the soldiers in skirts and pom-pom shoes, dying, running . . . (in action). He tells us in the next sentence that he saw worse things, things he couldn't stand to have mentioned (talked about) and then in the very next sentence that he recalled an expatriate poet from America talking about the Dada movement in a cafe with a Roumanian who called himself Tristan Tzara, "always wore a monocle and had a headache"

The irony in this comparison between "talking" and "acting" is obvious. But why is the poet talking about the "Dada movement" and why does the Roumanian wear a monocle? Tristan Tzara was evidently one of the leaders of the Dada movement which was the most extreme and ridiculous theory of art which Hemingway could think of at the moment and the monocle and the constant headache, probably a consequence of the monocle, seemed to Hemingway very false. Was the author trying to tell us that death is "real" but that the expatriate poet is as phony as the theory he is talking about and the man whom he is talking with? Perhaps such an interpretation implies too much from a simple contrast. But more probably, given Hemingway's general notions, that is exactly what he wished to imply.

Implications of the Theory

The full implication of Hemingway's theory, is not merely that life and death are real, but that to be alive, virile, to have courage is to invite destruction. Nowhere is this quite so clearly or directly stated as in *A Farewell To Arms*:

If people bring so much courage to this world the world has to kill them or break them, so of course it kills them. The world breaks everyone and afterwards many are strong at the broken places. But those that will not break it kills. It kills the very good and the very brave and the very gentle impartially. If you are none of these you can be sure it will kill you too but there will be no special hurry. (p. 267).

This, then, adds another element to the Hemingway hero. He is, in some way, already partly broken. The courageous men, who become the main focus of his novels, are "strong at the broken places"; the rest are merely broken and many have been killed or are being killed in the life process with "no special hurry" because they had no real courage from the beginning.

Who, then, are "the very good, the very brave and the very gentle"? They are the ones who have managed, somehow to salvage something out of their defeat in the practical world. And this is perhaps, the root of Hemingway's fundamental interest in the circumstances of war, revolution, bullfighting, hunting and all the other situations in which death is the ever-present possibility for his heroes. "They are not defeated except upon their own terms; some of them have courted defeat; certainly they have maintained even in the practical defeat, an ideal of themselves, formulated or unformulated, by which they have lived." (Brooks and Warren)

Robert Louis Stevenson described this code in even better terms ". . . an ideal of decency, to which (one)

would rise if it were possible; a limit of shame, below which, if it be possible, he will not stoop . . .

"It matters not where we look, under what climate we observe him, in what stage of society, in what depth of ignorance, burthened with what erroneous morality; by campfires in Assiniboia, the snow powdering his shoulders, the wind plucking his blanket, as he sits, passing the ceremonial calumet and uttering his grave opinions like a Roman senator; in ships at sea, a man inured to hardship and vile pleasures, his brightest hope a fiddle in a tavern and a bedizened trull who sells herself to rob him, and he for all that simple, innocent, cheerful, kindly like a child, constant to toil, brave to drown for others; . . . in the brothel, the discard of society, living mainly on strong drink, fed with affronts, a fool, a thief, the comrade of thieves, and even here keeping the point of honor and the touch of pity, often repaying the world's scorn with service, often standing firm upon a scruple, and at a certain cost, rejecting riches."

The Defeated Romantic

This concept that nobility may exist among the defeated has been a characteristic of romantic heroes from *Don Quixote* to *Cyrano*. The American tradition, however, has been strongly dusted over, since the civil war, with the glorification of success, with a strong positivism and its allied emotions, sometimes vulgarized, but occasionally put with great delicacy. Only from the defeated south, and from some of the great tragic writers, such as Fitzgerald, Anderson, and Willa Cather have we had any survival of the true romanticism of defeat carried off by the aristocratic spirit. Some of the left-wing writers and some writers in the Jewish tradition have saved it for us intact from the tragic defeats of their ancestors. But otherwise it has been generally besmirched by the great American need for victory at all costs.

That it should have survived in Stevenson is not too surprising. Its triumphant return to American fiction in the works of Hemingway, however, was a token of the times. Hemingway may never have read Stevenson. The spirit of the defeated romantic does not need literary lessons to survive, however. It grows readily upon the fertile soil of any success bought at the expense of the spirit. The triumph of American industrialism was purchased at just such a price. What better words are available to describe the Hemingway hero than ". . . simple, innocent . . . kindly like a child . . . brave to drown, for others . . . living mainly on strong drink . . . a thief, the comrade of thieves, and even here keeping the point of honor and the touch of pity, . . . often standing firm upon a scruple, and at a certain cost, rejecting riches; — everywhere some virtue cherished or affected . . .", the words of Stevenson's essay?

The Sun Also Rises

The first significant novel by Hemingway takes up the theme of the defeated hero, courageous, living mainly on strong drink, keeping the point of honor and the touch of pity etc. and adds to it the concept that a man's virility is the cornerstone of his ability to be all the other things.

For the irony of the theme, the hero is physically impotent and salvages his virility by his courageous attempt to cope with his impotence. The novel is *The Sun Also Rises*, published in 1926.

For added effect, we are treated to an associate of the hero who is physically intact, but, since, he violates the Hemingway code continuously, is in reality quite impotent and ineffectual in spirit. His name is Robert Cohn. He is Jewish, a graduate of Princeton, a writer and naturally a man who thinks of himself as an intellectual. His defect, consistently enough, is that he cannot suffer defeat, pain and the spectacle of death in controlled silence, but feels impelled to talk about it all the time. No greater sin could any man commit, than this one. He relates his emotions at great length. He will not admit his failure with Lady Ashley, whom he loves. And his love is itself abject and not proud. Unlike Jake, the impotent hero, Cohn is unable to submerge his feelings in drinking sport, or any real form of action. Even his skill as a boxer is analyzed away as a defence mechanism. When Lady Ashley states that Cohn is "not one of us" she merely states what Jake and Hemingway already feel.

But Lady Ashley is herself one of the "impotent" in the sense that she cannot love. She is frightfully in love with Jake, but there are moments when he suspects that it is merely because she cannot have him. During the course of the novel she falls in love with a bullfighter, a young boy called Romero who is pure, courageous and is able to offer her a genuine sexuality. He wants very much to marry her and for a time her feeling changes her. But she realizes, after a brief time, that she cannot really change and returns to live with Mike, an ineffectual, incomplete man and a drunkard. "He's so damned nice and he's so awful. He's my sort of thing," she says. She retains, however, the nobility for which Hemingway's characters are noted because, when she realizes how unable she is to give anything to Romero, she gives him up.

While it is one of Hemingway's more skillful novels, *The Sun Also Rises*, falls short of being tragic and is really quite depressing in its total impact.

Hero Politically Naive

A Farewell To Arms which appeared in 1929 comes much closer to being a simple and rather beautiful tragedy. It is Hemingway's first long piece of fiction to reveal the element of human integrity amid the chaos of war. The following passage is quoted from an episode which takes place on the Italian front while the army is awaiting an Austrian barrage. Lieutenant Henry, the hero, is speaking:

"I believe we should get the war over," I said. "It would not finish it if one side stopped fighting. It would only be worse if we stopped fighting."

"It could not be worse," Passini said respectfully. "There is nothing worse than war."

"Defeat is worse."

"I do not believe it," Passini said still respectfully. "What is defeat? You go home."

"They come after you. They take your home. They take your sisters."

"I don't believe it," Passini said. "They can't do that to everybody. Let everybody defend his home. . . ."

"I know it is bad but we must finish it."

"It doesn't finish. There is no finish to a war."

"Yes there is."

Passini shook his head.

"War is not won by victory. . . . We think. We read. We are not peasants. We are mechanics. But even the peasants know better than to believe in a war. Everybody hates this war."

"There is a class that controls a country that is stupid and does not realize anything and never can. That is why we have this war."

* *

"We must shut up," said Manera, "We talk too much even for the Tenente."

"He likes it," said Passini. "We will convert him."

"But now we will shut up," Manera said.

"Do we eat yet Tenente?"

Perhaps the first thing which is clear from reading this passage is that the point of view of the Lieutenant is politically naive and that the Italians sense it. They sense it enough to believe that their point of view is stronger and that they can convert the American Lieutenant. Perhaps they feel that his argument lacks subtlety. He wants merely to get the war over with. The war seems to have no meaning for him in terms of "democracy" or any of the other slogans which his own country later used when it went to war. Face to face with the more complex sense of politics of the Italian mechanics, Lieutenant Henry is, as Stevenson says, ". . . simple, innocent . . . like a child . . ." In a sense, he exemplifies the traditional American isolation from the concern of the European worker and peasant with radical politics. He has not been "initiated," as have the Europeans since their youth, into the complexity of anti-war socialism.

Yet he is able to find a certain kind of rapport with the soldiers who serve under him. If it is not because of political agreement, we are justified in looking for some other motive. Upon closer examination, the reader will discover that both the American and the Italians live by a code. It is not exactly the same code; but it involves the same elements, the ones previously mentioned of personal honesty, courage and a private or social discipline.

Because of his private discipline, then, Lieutenant Henry is a virile man and his love affair with Miss Barkley is sexually fulfilling and, in the end, tragic but not hopeless as is the love affair in the previous novel.

His next novel states the case more definitely. Using Donne's words for his dedication and his title, the novel tells us: "No man is an island, entire of itself; every man is a piece of the continent. a part of the main . . . any man's death diminishes me, because I am involved in mankind: and therefore never send to know for whom the bell tolls; it tolls for thee." *For Whom The Bell Tolls*, published in 1940, is the logical and artistic culmination of Hemingway's attempt to define the virile hero.

If one can overcome an incipient distaste at the physical signs of the hero's manliness, which are given in great detail even to noting each moment when a drop of sweat falls from his armpit, the novel can be a rewarding study of the romantic spirit.

Anselmo, the older, more experienced version of the virile hero, first states the theme in his quarrel with *Pablo*:

"Now we come for something of consummate importance and thee, with thy dwelling place to be undisturbed, puts thy foxhole before the interests of humanity."

Notice how the medieval English forms "thee" and "thou" translate the Spanish better and also serve to carry the spirit of Donne's "The bell . . . tolls for thee."

Pablo, the older, broken man, who is not strong in the broken places, and Pilar, the woman of towering strength, the confidante, the protector of courageous men and of young women, are among the better Hemingway characterizations. As always this is very simply put:

"Que va, God and the Virgin," (Pilar rebukes Pablo)

"Is that any way to talk?"

"I am afraid to die, Pilar," he said. "Tengo miedo de morir. Dost thou understand?"

Pilar is herself given the function of carrying Hemingway's romantic concept of sensuality and beauty. Her recital of the bullfights and her toreador lover in Valencia, her listing of the pavilions in the sand, the parties, the paella, the eels, the white wine, the beer sweating in its coldness in pitchers, is one of the memorable passages in the novel. It is also a remarkable tribute to Hemingway's love for Spain.

In part it is the characterization of Anselmo. Pablo, Pilar, and the Spanish peasants and fighters with all of their simplicity and complexity, and the remarkable scenes of the Spanish villages and cities in war and peace, of the food, the drink, the landscape, the traditions of love, the religion, the fear, which make this novel one of Hemingway's unsurpassed efforts. That and the ethics of the sexual act, stated by Pilar, reiterated sweetly and timidly by Maria, and practised in all his quiet strength by Robert Jordan. But the personalities of the two young lovers are again too simply drawn and the novel quietly suffers from this weakness, so that as a love affair, pure and simple, without the tapestry of the Spanish scene to enrich it, the relationship between Maria and Roberto might not be superior to that of Lieutenant Henry and his English nurse.

With his latest piece of fiction, however, Hemingway has reasserted some of his previous power. *The Old Man And The Sea*, which has very recently appeared, is really a novelle and its structure, similar in brevity and intensity to a very long short story such as Conrad's *Heart of Darkness*, allows the writer to state the most elementary of themes in one dramatic episode of exactly appropriate length. Hemingway's favorite character is here once again. ". . . an old man who fished alone in a skiff in the Gulf Stream and he had gone eighty-four days now without taking a fish."

Here is another Anselmo, full of courage, though old, and full of faith in the sea, the fish, and the honor and integrity of sport. On the eighty-fifth day, he catches a marlin eighteen feet long from nose to tail. With only a tiny skiff and none of the equipment used by deep sea fishermen except a line and his back upon which

he winds the line to hold the fish, he battles the marlin for several days and nights and succeeds in pulling him in and killing him, only to fight a running battle with the sharks when he is pulling the carcass in and to have the sharks eat the entire fifteen hundred pounds of fish away before he succeeds in getting to shore.

Here is defeat on a grand scale. The entire energy and ebbing strength of the old man is pitted against a worthy opponent, for the eighteen foot fish here has all the courage and beauty of a fighting bull from one of Hemingway's previous stories. But the old man survives his defeat and the pathos of it is seen only in the crying of a young boy.

Hemingway's Style

Together with William Faulkner, Hemingway received his early impetus toward fiction from Sherwood Anderson. Very early in their careers, however, both men began to experiment, and fruitfully so, with the prose fiction tradition. Faulkner moved toward a thickly textured prose which creates mood and atmosphere by the use of layer upon layer of feeling interlaced with imagery. Hemingway decided upon a hard, spare, simple line in which even the connectives are the repetitive "and", "then", or "now" of common speech. There are moments in Hemingway when the emotional power of this style surpasses anything in the American idiom for immediate effect. Yet *The Sound And The Fury*, in its total impact, is superior to any novel Hemingway has written. It is probably not a matter of whether one style is superior to the other.

The spare, hard, almost journalistic vividness of Hemingway's style is completely suited to the simplicity of his romantic concept of sexual virility and its determining effect upon all things. Even his most romantic characters take on added realism in Hemingway, because of their speech, which is completely convincing to the ear. Many of us who have tried writing have paid indirect homage to his style by the qualities which we have learned from his dialogue and from his descriptive ability. And yet, were we to see life as reduced to the basic elements in a Hemingway story, we would fail not only to repeat his performance, but even to turn in a creditable performance of our own. The failure, indeed, of the "tough prose" writers, of O'Hara, for example, is their inability to feel with the moral earnestness, or with the romantic heroism of the man whom they chose as one of their teachers.

Of the three or four outstanding novelists since 1900 who are Americans, Hemingway is second only to Faulkner and probably first as an artist in the short story. The simplicity of his subject-matter, since he extracted the ultimate quality of it, and matched it with a completely appropriate style, proved to be his greatest strength. This is the kind of power which is generated by someone who knows how to work within his own limitations.

AVEL AUSTIN

Avel Austin is a graduate student at Columbia University.

The Fate of American Civil Liberties

Can Civil Liberties Survive the Decline of Laissez-Faire?

IT WILL no longer do to regard the current decline in American civil liberties as episodic. While it is true that there are many precedents for the details that enter into this decline, it is more important to emphasize that the general picture is far worse than any which existed in the past. Comparisons are difficult to draw for the present generation of American youth, which has been "acclimated" to abuses — even horrors — that in earlier days would have evoked wide public protests. The years before the first World War, when men moved across a relatively passportless world, when the right to asylum had a modicum of reality, when a Dreyfuss Trial or a Kishenev massacre raised the passions of millions in Europe and America, seem to belong to a legendary world.

Today, the statutes — federal, state and local — that inhibit civil liberties are legion. They are supplemented by agencies, oaths and even machines like the polygraph which decide in a perfectly arbitrary way whether individuals are "loyal," whether they are to hold jobs not only with the government but industries completely unrelated to military and political interests. For the first time in American history, two individuals have been sentenced to death for peace-time espionage, and are awaiting execution at this writing. In another case, a Stalinist, Steve Nelson, recently received the incredible sentence of twenty years imprisonment for violation of the Pennsylvania "subversive" statute. The press reports indicate that this unheard of sentence may be increased if a Federal indictment against Nelson is obtained.

One does not have to share Nelson's support of Russian totalitarianism to recognize what is involved. The laws which have been enacted over the past decade are part of a lasting, decisive trend away from the democratic traditions in American life. Their effect has been to create a profound sense of uneasiness and fear in the public, a paralysis in the expression of unorthodox opinions and ideas.

Civil Liberties Not Irrevocable

Let there be no mistake about the irrevocability of democratic rights in the United States — at least, so far as American officialdom is concerned. The distinctions which remain relatively clear in the traditions of British democracy have been too firm here. Indeed, the first modern concentration camps were not organized by the English during the Boer War; they appeared as early as 1897 in Idaho, when thousands of striking miners were imprisoned in mass "bull pens" by Federal and State troops.

Cynicism toward the constitutional rights of the people runs like a red thread through the behavior of the very authorities entrusted to protect these rights. When the Colorado state government was criticized fifty years ago for

its high-handed, unconstitutional treatment of the Cripple Creek strikers, the Judge-Advocate of the state replied: "To hell with the constitution; we are not following the Constitution." Here, too, "bull pens" were organized, habeas corpus suspended by the military, censorship established over the local press, and local property arbitrarily commandeered by the militia. This occurred not in wartime or "national emergency," but in response to a limited strike action conducted by Haywood's Western Federation of Miners. Neither the Judge-Advocate nor the military commanders were brought to trial for "subversion."

In part, this sort of behaviour can be attributed to the permeation of nearly every aspect of America by a hard and competitive industrial spirit. Perhaps no country in the world has made the conduct of government a "business" like the United States, with the concomitant use of "businessmen" and "business methods." Government resembles a commercial enterprise; it is bitten by a distinctly commercial spirit, with few serious traditions beyond those which have been cultivated in trade and industry. Even the jargon of government translates into civics what characteristically belongs to commerce. We speak of election "ballyhoo," of "trading votes," "advantages" and even political "positions." Party conventions parallel the conventions of salesmen on the loose, with hotel amours, snake-dances, card parties and whoopee.

The French politicians are noted for their classical rhetoric — everyone tries to be a Cicero; the English are distinguished by a decorous respectability and a traditional susceptibility to public opinion; American politicians are rightly characterized as "party bosses," with no traditions to support them other than those engendered in commerce. The result has been neither efficiency nor administrative superiority, but all the predatory attributes of bourgeois competition.

Decline of Capitalism

It should not be too surprising, therefore, that overall trends in civil liberties closely follow those in business. While American capitalism was an expanding system, the abuses and episodes of the past were cancelled out by political as well as economic gains. The democratic spirit celebrated in the poetry of Whitman and the prose of Mark Twain belongs to a period when the economy was moving forward in giant strides at home and to a leading position abroad. America was completing her laissez-faire development; the economic and social paralysis of a monopolistic economy was not, as yet, directly felt.

The first World War marks a turning point in this direction, perhaps less so in the United States than in Europe. Nonetheless, even in America the war pointed to an

overall decline. Economic primacy, which was distributed in the laissez-faire era among countless, atomized enterprises — each of which was not strong enough to dominate other enterprises — conclusively fell to giant domestic monopolies and international cartels. These monopolies and cartels, standing in the way of each other, began to block any further economic development. From an expanding system, capitalism slipped into stagnation. The basis for a development disappeared, and with it the old framework of civil liberties.

It cannot be too strongly emphasized how much the basis of American political life has changed from the “classical,” laissez-faire era. Today, the aim of the United States, indeed, of bourgeois society as a whole, has shifted from a pursuit of markets to one of control and “stabilization.” This is all the more the case because capital is now highly centralized and all the forces of economic and political coercion have been collected into relatively few hands. To permit a further expansion of the world economy is not only impossible on the premises of monopoly . . . it is meaningless. To do so would simply mean to strengthen capitalist rivals for supremacy abroad and upset all the social relations at home.

The tendencies which now appear are decisively antithetical to those which existed in the past. Advanced capitalist countries are annexed (Germany and Japan) by America; their economies are directly or indirectly circumscribed (dismantlings, Schuman plans); “surplus,” populations which were once labor reserves indispensable to the expansion of industry, face planned destruction (genocide, neo-Malthusianism, slave labor camps.) The old democratic framework no longer conforms to the new direction of capitalism. Civil-liberties violations, which were once compensated for by the over-all political and economic upswing, have formed a pattern that is pointed toward totalitarianism.

Indeed, the very fact that America has the industry and abundance to resolve the economic difficulties of our time, tends to require repressive techniques of unparalleled ferocity; the fuel is supplied by the contrast between what exists and what *could* exist under a rational organization of society. Although repression has still to complete most of its development in the United States, the “peculiarities” of our background, its cult of business and even its racial and cultural anomosities — in a word, the incompleteness and unevenness of social life in America, combine to suggest the picture of an infant playing with an atom bomb.

Rise of the FBI

It is characteristic of this unevenness that the kernel of everything contains its opposite; that America, the country least threatened militarily in the first World War, had the most totalitarian industrial mobilization and, now, with the most democratic pretensions, celebrates one of the largest secret police agencies in the West; the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Again, it is characteristic that this agency, which dedicates itself to preserving the laws of the land, started as an *illegal* body and throughout its career has consistently violated the laws it claims to protect.

Like the Gestapo and MVD, the FBI has assumed an autonomy and initiative of its own, going beyond the immediate exigencies that are said to require its existence. It appears where it isn't wanted; it acts where it isn't needed; it creates situations where none actually exist; it performs activities outside its legal jurisdiction; it conceals or invents data according to its own requirements — in short, it leads the corroding life of a cancer in the democratic life of the country. The FBI has grown to such dimensions that a special culture, including radio programs and motion pictures, surrounds its activities. From a modest annual budget of 2 to 3 million dollars during the early years of its existence, the appropriations for this agency have swelled to 53 million dollars in 1950. The greatest absolute increase in funds occurred after the second World War.

The very existence of a centralized Federal police force is antithetical to the premises of American democratic theory. When the Bureau was first opened in 1907 by Attorney C. J. Bonaparte, the proposal met with a storm of protest in Congress. “No general system of spying upon and espionage of the people, such as has prevailed in Russia, in France under the Empire, and at one time in Ireland,” warned Congressman Smith of Iowa, “should be allowed to grow up.” As Max Lowenthal observes in *The Federal Bureau of Investigation*, (William Sloane Assoc. 1950):

The views of Congress were summarized in a Chicago news article published some time before and reprinted in the Congressional Record during the debates: “There is no desire for a general detective service or national police organization in connection with the Federal Government. On the contrary, there is in Congress an utter abhorrence of such a scheme. . . It is considered absolutely contradictory to the democratic principles of government.”

The proposal was not only rejected, but to emphasize its hostility Congress undertook an investigation of existing police agencies under Federal jurisdiction. Nonetheless, against the wishes of the legislators and behind their backs, Bonaparte created the Bureau of Investigation and presented the following Congress with a fait accompli. At the outset, therefore, the agency was an illegal body. It was created over Congressional protest by an appointed Executive officer; funds for its existence were originally allocated from reserves which were never appropriated with a Federal police force in mind. Its existence was finally acknowledged on the supposition that it would remain a very modest body, confining its attention to a marginal area of criminal activity.

Despite all of these qualifications, the debate continued and threatened to result in the dissolution of the Bureau. Partly to assure its acceptance and partly to buttress the Administration, the new Federal detectives were assigned to shadow opposition Congressmen, rifle their mail and prepare embarrassing personal dossiers. When this scandalous behaviour came to the attention of the press, “. . . the President denied this, insisting that detectives whose job it was to ferret out criminals would not themselves violate the law by opening other people's mail packages. “But sometimes,” he added, “though the accidental breaking of such package the contents are exposed.” With this explana-

tion, he published the private correspondence of Senator Tillman of South Carolina, who had been especially fiery in his opposition to the Administration."

Thus, with Theodore Roosevelt for its Sire and Charles J. Bonaparte at its Mid-wife, the Bureau came into existence.

Clear It With J. Edgar

Space does not make it possible to suggest the devastating wealth of detail in Lowenthal's discussion of the FBI. The origins of this agency are of interest, however, because they point up the logic in such examples. From very modest although unsavory beginnings, the FBI has now acquired the authority for preparing much of the ideological fabric of social rights in the United States. It submits an official interpretation of socialist theory; it digests the meaning and extent of "subversion" for legislators; it opens new crevices in the crumbling edifice of civil liberties. A police framework of discussion has been created, to which many individuals are increasingly compelled to adapt themselves. Indeed, a new experience has appeared in American life: "clearance" with the FBI.

The very concept of "clearance," like the practice of "loyalty oaths," is juridically unique. As one writer on the subject suggests, the entire American people are regarded as suspect until they are "cleared and pledged." The State of California presumably had this in mind when it sought to impose loyalty oaths not only on its officialdom, but also on anyone who applies for a state license. Hollywood, radio networks, and corporations, by following suit, are no longer testing the overt actions of their employees; they are challenging their intellectual orientation. The issue is writ large and encroaches on the population as a whole. If a licensed plumber is not qualified to practice his trade because of his political reservations, there is not much in principle that keeps a tramp out of an Arizona concentration camp. A scrupulous division of labor prepares this direction. While the government pretends to be reluctant about enacting "oaths," "clearances" and using concentration camps (for which regular budgetary allotments are still being made), civic organizations, the American Legion and certain legislators heckle vigorously on the side-lines for more stringent measures. After a certain amount of time, the government yields and then goes into mourning for a decent amount of time . . . until it "gives way" again. It would be a grave mistake to regard a Senator McCarthy as a "crackpot"; he is a *pioneer*, with the privilege of usually *saying* what Messrs Truman, Eisenhower and/or Stevenson will *do*.

This is illustrated by the progress of the Federal Loyalty Program over the past two years. When the question of oaths, pledges, investigations and dismissals came its way, the Administration struck several contradictory postures, simultaneously and consecutively. Truman was not adverse to a Loyalty Program of some sort; no — he did not find it objectionable that Communists should be removed from the Federal payroll; yes — he did feel that subversives were a danger to the security of the United States. His objections centered on the militancy of McCarthy's

endeavors and particularly on the anti-Administration character of attacks. The result was a "compromise," which created the Inter-Departmental Committee on Internal Security and the various departmental loyalty boards. The essential reaction of the Administration was that it was yielding to exigencies, that the pressure of Congressional and public criticism obliged Truman to go against his own sound and very democratic judgment.

Once accepted, however, the Program was literally galvanized into action. Executive officers, like the Attorney-General began to formulate standards of subversion in such a high-handed manner that court rulings were soon obtained against the arbitrary criteria employed. It is not a tribute to the judicial division of the government that these techniques were impossible to sustain; it remains a sinister commentary on the Administration's duplicity that it condemned McCarthy on Mondays and zealously executed his demands on Tuesdays. The Passport Division of the State Department, in particular, established a formidable precedent by arbitrarily denying many citizens the practical possibility of traveling abroad. While hearings, appeals and the most elementary requests for defense against rulings were being turned down by this bureaucratic agency, Truman continued to affront public intelligence by deploring the rhetorical excesses of McCarthy.

The latest reports now indicate that the Loyalty Program is to be reorganized. More precisely, Truman has instructed the Civil Service Commission to plan the coordination of all existing programs into a unified system. The apparent aim of this directive is to render the Loyalty Program more efficient, uniform and, consequently, more effective. The program is not only being taken for granted; it is being rendered symmetrical and cohesive. A hierarchy is growing up within the hierarchy of the State, a government to supervise the government, with no adequate standing in legislation or judicial review. Terms like "re-organization" conceal a systematic knitting together of the loose-strands which existed when the pretense of "reluctance" was still before the public eye.

Witch-hunt from Below

Techniques which the Administration is still obliged to forego or conceal, assume a characteristically exaggerated form in lower echelons of authority. While Truman was parading his qualms before the public, municipalities, movie producers and corporations followed the logic of the situation that was being created in more "responsible" quarters. In several communities (Birmingham, Macon and Jacksonville), Communists were summarily ordered to leave town regardless of the property or jobs they held. Other towns ordered the immediate registration of all Communists and fellow-travelers, which often meant anyone of heterodox persuasions. In Detroit, the chief of police was dignified with the warrant to decide what type of literature was "subversive" and to prohibit its distribution. The mayor of Los Angeles publicly advised the people of the city to report all politically suspicious individuals and promised to conceal the identity of the accusers from the accused. The General Foods Corporation withdrew its

sponsorship of Jean Muir as television's "Mother Aldrich" because a number of individuals protested she had belonged to fellow-traveling movements. In fact, one Hollywood producer was so frightened by the hysteria whipped up that he abandoned a projected film on the legend of Hiawatha. He was afraid that movie-goers would associate a peace-pipe scene with the Stockholm Peace Petition.

The behavior of many leading American universities reached scandalous proportions. An epidemic of loyalty oaths, investigations, recriminations and firings swept the country. Textbooks were re-examined for subversion and criticism reached out to encompass such semi-classics as Beard's *Rise of American Civilization*. In Georgia, the State Board of Education temporarily suspended the use of Frank Magruder's *American Government* (an absurdly conformist book) and, what is more indicative, the New York State Board appointed a commission to investigate subversive school texts.

Veterans organizations joined forces to demand, in one case, the execution of all subversives, and in another, their incarceration in concentration camps. They may have been pleased to learn that the government continues at fairly high expense to maintain such camps (as yet unoccupied) in Nevada and Arizona. The Smith Act, as a matter of course, enjoyed a new vogue since its application against the Trotskyists ten years ago. Stalinist leaders, who once applauded its enforcement against the latter, were placed on trial and various states undertook to try and imprison Stalinists of local importance. When a new immigration law came to the attention of Congress, it was cast to conform to the prevailing atmosphere. Not only are some of the worst features of the earlier bill retained, but immigrants as well as all aliens are now required to register annually with the government.

The responsibility for this behavior must be placed *in toto* at the door of the administration, which had to know that any opening of the dykes on top would threaten a flood below.

The Liberals and the Labor Movement

The significance of the "Loyalty Program" can be measured not only in terms of the Administration's initiative, but also in terms of the unprecedented collapse of liberal and labor opposition to its execution. Virtually all the organized bodies like the union federations, liberal civil-liberties groups, legal agencies and parliamentary committees, which checked many civil-liberty violations in the past, have surrendered in one way or another, directly or indirectly, to the Administration. Again, the division of labor comes into play. Attacks upon McCarthy and McCarran have raised a smoke screen behind which the Administration has been able to impose the essentials of the very program these Senators advocate. An integral part of this smokescreen is the clique of liberal and labor "democrats," who, while reviling McCarthy and McCarran, decorate the landscape of the policies so assiduously followed by Truman.

The microscopic debate on civil liberties, which the liberals have been carrying on in parlor magazines like

Commentary, is illustrative. Unimaginative questions such as; "Do We Defend Our Rights By Defending Communists?" have indeed given a defensive coloration to the entire issue. Even to this type of question it is impossible to collect a unified, still less militant, opinion. In almost every case, the fabric of civil liberties has not been handled on its own merits, but is carefully embroidered into American foreign policy. Civil liberties, so far as these people are concerned, is a detail of the so-called "cold war," and the liberals have been reduced to the role of undignified handmaidens of the State Department.

What of the Labor movement? Well, it may be a trifle vulgar although not too unexpected for a labor leader to tour steel-plants with a corporation president, but it may be regarded as remarkable for entire labor federations to turn their backside on an unprecedented decline in civil liberties. Yet this, in substance, is what is happening. The American labor movement has delivered its capacities for struggle to the corporations, to the Democratic Party, to the government — to anyone you please, but not to the opponents of an American Gleichschaltung.

The American labor movement, as a defender of civil liberties, has been tried and found wanting. This does not diminish the importance of class conflicts today or in the past, or of class interests behind civil liberties' violations. The social pattern, however, is not as neat as some people think and in America it has been considerably reshuffled. If American fascism comes of age, it will be "cold" not "warm." It will rely less on a mass movement and more on bureaucratic connections, with repressive techniques that may well make the Stalinists look like novices. The labor movement is not excluded from these connections; in fact, it is currently contributing to the tapestry of social control.

It is of pressing necessity to re-group the traditional picture that exists about civil liberties and freedom in the United States. On such a re-grouping depends a meaningful view of civil liberties and the allegiances which will mobilize forces in an intelligent struggle. The first element of the past that must find its way into the dust-bin is the framework of the *real politiker*, which casts political action only in terms of given "power" elements like the Democratic or Liberal parties. For millions of Americans, an overturn in consciousness is being prepared by the problems of our time. The mass media is losing its influence; a submerged revulsion against the techniques of manipulation is taking place; a profound hatred for the Korean War, the "emergency" war of nerves, is widespread. A successful defense and extension of our civil liberties will find its roots not in the mechanism of existing political relationships, but only in the organization of these growing, although as yet diffuse, sentiments in the population. And whoever or whatever organization presumes to reach the population with a message of democracy must answer for the independence of his person and the seriousness of his purpose.

HARRY LUDD

Harry Ludd is a writer on the American political-economy and an editor of *Contemporary Issues*.

The Revolution in South Africa

Civil Disobedience Against Government's Racist Laws

I SPENT MOST of a morning with the late Canada Lee shortly after he had returned from South Africa, where the movie, "Cry the Beloved Country," had been filmed. I asked him how conditions in South Africa compared with the Southern part of the United States. He replied very quickly: "Compared with South Africa, the South is heaven!" Even Canada Lee had to gain entrance to South Africa through the fiction that he was a bonded servant.

Probably the most hopeful sign of a democratic upsurging in the world today is the non-violent resistance movement against racial laws in South Africa. It was in this same South Africa at the turn of the century that Mohandas Gandhi, then an unknown young attorney, got his start. Here he first conceived of the technique of disciplined non-violent action as an effective method for a seemingly defenseless people to resist injustices. Here he gained the valuable experience which made it possible for him to return to India to make the Indian National Congress into an effective instrument for the ultimate independence of his country. But in South Africa no movement comparable to the Indian Congress came into being. Anyone who has read books such as *Cry the Beloved Country* or *Black Hamlet* should realize that the conditions were ripe for a non-cooperation campaign, but the people did not seem to be ready. It has been reported that as many as 100,000 native Africans a year were found guilty of violating such laws as those demanding that all non-Europeans be off the street by 11:00 p.m., and yet it was not planned action, not part of a campaign. The people who were fined or given twenty days of hard labor for this transgression of the law were innocent violators not knowing and self-conscious resisters.

Initial Skepticism

Perhaps the non-existence of any strong organized effort for resistance to the apartheid (segregation) laws is the main reason why the announcement last December by the African National Congress of plans for a civil disobedience campaign was not taken very seriously. The leader of a group calling itself the African Democratic Party, spoken of as a "more forthright" organization than the African National Congress by Alan Paton in his Public Affairs pamphlet *South Africa Today*, wrote me: "They (the African National Congress) have committed themselves to something they are not able to carry out. Such an ill-considered campaign must result in frustration and disillusionment for the mass of the people. Both sections of the herrenvolk know this. That is why their press boosted the campaign far beyond its importance."

Others with whom I was in correspondence were skepti-

cal that the nonviolent character of the movement could be maintained. Liberal-minded white people indicated they were in sympathy with the aims of the campaign, but certain that much more evil than good would come from it because it was premature. The South African Institute of Race Relations, a predominantly white educational organization, passed a resolution stating in part: "The Institute would be failing in its duty if it did not state that the present racial situation in the Union is so tense that such demonstrations are likely to get out of hand . . . The Institute appeals to African leaders to defer their plans. . ."

But now the movement is taken seriously. The latest report (end of August) is that more than 3,000 volunteers have been arrested. A white friend wrote recently saying that he had been doubtful of the campaign originally, but that he was amazed how the volunteers had maintained their nonviolent discipline. Then he added: "Perhaps my doubt simply reveals my own lack of courage to participate in the movement." A most significant clipping from the *Daily Dispatch*, an English publication from East London, South Africa, was sent to me a few days ago. The article compared the terrorism of the French Revolution with the uprising in South Africa. It said: "We hope not to see a guillotine erected in Church Square, Capetown, or Pretoria, but scenes such as those witnessed outside the Magistrate's Court on Monday — scenes which are being duplicated all over the country — should serve as a warning to the Government. South Africa's *boi polloi* is becoming restive . . . At the moment it is a mild form of revolution . . . The Government may continue to ignore that warning and put the offenders in gaol, but it will do so at its own peril."

The first announcement of plans for the current civil disobedience movement was made following the conference of the African National Congress last December. At that time this Congress committed itself to join with the South African Indian Congress and the Franchise Action Council (representing the so-called colored group of European-African mixed blood) in a non-cooperative campaign. A Joint Planning Council of these groups was formed to prepare for the movement. This in itself was significant, for this was the first time organizations representing these groups had ever cooperated in a joint effort.

The Joint Planning Council named April 6th, the 300th anniversary of the coming of the white man to South Africa, as the date for action to begin. Later April 6th was used only as a day for demonstration, and June 26th was the actual start of civil disobedience. The high note on which the planning was done is indicated by this section from the Manifesto: "The struggle which the national organizations of the non-European people are conducting is not directed against any race or national group. It is against

the unjust laws which keep in perpetual subjection and misery vast sections of the population. It is for the transformation of conditions which will restore human dignity, equality, and freedom to every South African."

Malan's Racism

Copies of this manifesto together with fully explanatory letters were sent to the Prime Minister, Dr. D. F. Malan. He responded by saying that "The Government will make full use of the machinery at its disposal to quell any disturbances . . ." He indicated the government had no intention of abolishing any of the racist laws. He stated the full racist doctrine of his government when he said: "It is self-contradictory to claim as an inherent right of the Bantu, who differ in many ways from the Europeans, that they should be regarded as not different, especially when it is borne in mind that these differences are permanent and non man-made."

The Joint Planning Council had given the government until the end of February, 1952. (about two months) to indicate that some action would be taken toward abolishing the following laws:

1. The pass laws which require evidence of employment and permission to be in certain areas at certain times;
2. Group Areas Act, which stipulates that each racial group (Africans, Indians, Coloured, and Europeans) live and do business in its own area only;
3. Separate Registration of Voters Act, which put all non-whites into one category and disfranchised one million coloured voters;
4. Bantu Authorities Act, which perpetuates the fiction that Africans are still organized as tribes, and gives consequent powers to chiefs, ignoring the fact that in African society urbanization is displacing the previous rural organization of the people;
6. General apartheid-laws which demand segregation in public places, stations, trains, etc., such as in the Southern part of the United States.

Greatest responsibility for this movement obviously fell to the African National Congress. Although its membership was small compared to the 8,000,000 Africans who potentially could affiliate, the brunt of the injustice has always been borne by the African native. There are only about 250,000 Indians in South Africa, and about one million colored people.

Various reports reached us in this country about the demonstrations on April 6th. Our newspapers and British publications such as the *New Statesman and Nation* indicated the meetings were small and uninspired. However, I have recently talked with Professor Z. K. Matthews, who is in this country for one year and who is the president of the Cape Province African National Congress. He indicates that the April 6th meetings were attended all told by close to 100,000 people, and successful beyond the hopes of the Congress leaders.

The campaign is divided into three stages:

1. Commencement of the struggle by calling upon selected

and trained persons to go into action in big centers such as Johannesburg, Cape Town, Bloemfontein, Port Elizabeth, and Durban.

2. The number of volunteer corps to be increased as well as the number of centers of operation.
3. Mass action during which the struggle will broaden out on a country-wide scale.

I assume from the reports which have been received that the first stage has been ended and the second has begun. The major leaders of the movement have been arrested, including the general secretaries, W. M. Sisulu and Y. A. Cachalia, and the president of the African National Congress, Dr. J. S. Moroka. The movement is spreading. Ten thousand volunteers have been called for who are willing to be arrested and suffer imprisonment at hard labor or public caning (whipping). Week after week more people continue to volunteer.

Each volunteer takes a pledge: "We, the oppressed people of South Africa, hereby solemnly pledge ourselves to carry on a relentless struggle to repeal the unjust laws as laid down in the plan for action . . . We shall do all in our power, to the utmost limits of endurance and sacrifice, to carry out the Congress call against the unjust laws which subject our people to political servility, economic misery, and social degradation. From this day forward we, as disciplined men and women, dedicate our lives to the struggle for freedom and fundamental rights."

The original plan was that there should be in the neighborhood of 200 offenses committed each week. So far there have been considerably more. It was reported in a Reuters dispatch in the *New York Times* that 426 persons had been arrested on August 26th alone. On the opening day of the campaign (June 26th) about 170 were arrested in Port Elizabeth and Johannesburg. In Port Elizabeth the defiance took the form of crossing the railway bridge reserved for Europeans at 7 a.m. A band of police was there to meet the demonstrators. A brief discussion with the police took place, followed by the singing of the national hymn, "Come Back Africa." Then the demonstrators marched past the police to the other side of the bridge. Police cans were waiting for them there and all were arrested.

Near Johannesburg a group of fifty volunteers led by W. M. Sisulu attempted to defy the Urban Areas Act by entering the Boksburg location without a permit. The municipal authorities had the gates shut just as the demonstrators were about to enter. Waiting police arrested the volunteers, who sang Congress songs as they were driven off to the police station.

A second group of 54 was arrested in Johannesburg at 11:30 p.m. on June 26th for defying the Curfew Regulations. When accosted by police Mr. Boshielo, chairman of the Central Johannesburg Congress Branch, replied: "We are nonviolent fighters for freedom. We are going to defy regulations that have kept our fathers in bondage."

That the volunteers mean to keep the movement non-violent is attested to by the fact that in spite of the more than 3,000 arrests, no violent outbreak has occurred. In the *New York Times* of June 27th, Dr. Moroka is quoted

as saying: "I hope the police won't do anything to provoke trouble and will merely keep order, because our people will submit to anything that will be done to them without restraint."

At the trial of twenty top leaders of the movement on August 26th a huge crowd gathered outside the court. Their singing and cheering was making so much noise that the hearing could not start for fifteen minutes. According to the *New York Times* of August 27th, Dr. Moroka, finally went outside the court and asked for silence. Immediately a hush went over the whole gathering and the proceedings inside began. Although no document I have yet seen outlines specifically what is involved in a non-violent discipline, nor is there anyone near the stature of a Gandhi on the horizon, the importance of nonviolence is implied in numerous statements. A statement issued at a joint meeting of the African and Indian Congresses on May 31st in Port Elizabeth ends: "The inner citadel of our strength and the foundations for a free South Africa lie along the path of a well-disciplined and nonviolent struggle for the removal of the unjust laws."

Police Intimidation

The police have been much less restrained, but as yet there has been remarkably little violence even from this source. The Minister of Justice has laid the way open for more police violence, however, in a public statement in which he said: "If the policemen go slightly beyond the limits of their powers . . . they should not be condemned in view of their difficult tasks," and that "while it is possible that innocent people had been struck by police batons it was just too bad if such people got hurt." Early in August the police raided the offices of the groups sponsoring the campaign as well as the homes of leaders of the movement. They seized papers and documents which are being used to try twenty leaders under the Suppression of Communism Act .

The sentences imposed on volunteers have ranged from 15 days' hard labor or two pounds fine to 40 days' labor or ten pounds fine. All volunteers have refused to pay fines. Youth under 21 years of age have been sentenced to caning. Interestingly enough 73 volunteers who defied post office apartheid were acquitted because, although partitions to establish segregation in post offices had been erected, there was found to be nothing in the postal regulations to enforce apartheid.

The question may well be asked if the movement is Communist inspired or if there are Communists active in it. According to information gained from correspondence with persons like Manilal Gandhi, the son of Mohandas Gandhi, and talks with South Africans in this country as well as Americans who have been in South Africa recently, there are some Communists in the movement. Especially in the leadership of the South African Indian Congress, the Communists are represented. The statement which A. T. Steele made in a dispatch to the *New York Herald Tribune* of August 14th probably sizes up the situation pretty accurately. He said: "There is little doubt that some Com-

munist have infiltrated the passive resistance movement, though identifying them is no simple matter. In any case it is apparent that the great majority of those participating in the movement have no Communist connections."

Two brief comments should be made on this problem. First, we should expect Communists to be involved in this kind of campaign precisely because they are anxious to seize upon any revolutionary movement to turn it to their own ends. But this is not a movement which they have created. It has roots deep in the injustices of the white man and his civilization to the African. For anti-Communists to argue that they should get out of the movement because some Communists are in it would be to abandon the field. This would be a tragic mistake. This is not the same issue at all as united front activity with the Communists in a fairly stable situation as in the United States.

The other comment is that the movement has been maintaining its nonviolent approach. This is not to say that non-violence goes deep necessarily. But the non-violent tactic is official policy. It is hoped that the number in the movement who believe in this approach on principle, many of them as followers of Gandhi, will grow as the effectiveness of the movement grows.

Of course the South African government makes a terrible mistake in trying the leaders of the campaign under the Suppression of Communism Act. The statement which the Magistrate made in denying the "not guilty" plea of these leaders is revealing of the government's position. He said: "It is common knowledge that one of the aims of Communism is to break down race barriers and strive for equal rights for all sections of the people, and to do without any discrimination of race, colour, or creed. The Union of South Africa is fertile ground for the dissemination of Communist propaganda. This would endanger the survival of Europeans, and therefore legislation must be pursued with the object of suppressing Communism."

I have not spent any space in this article touching on the major political situation of Malan's Nationalist Party versus the British United Party. This has been discussed in the daily press in this country. In spite of the fact that this political crisis was brought about by the narrowly nationalist and high-handed tactics of the Malan forces, this issue is really irrelevant to the movement of civil disobedience. A representative of the United Party was quoted in the *New York Times* a few days ago to the effect that if the natives continued with their campaign, the whites would be forced to join in suppressing the movement. The supremacy of the European must be maintained, he said. The non-whites know this. That is why their movement is revolutionary and should be so. For, as the Manifesto of the movement says: "It is for the transformation of conditions which will restore human dignity, equality, and freedom to every South African."

GEORGE HOUSER

George Houser is executive secretary of the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE), and of Americans for South African Resistance, and is on the staff of the Fellowship of Reconciliation.

Shaw and the Social Role of Drama

Moral Considerations at the Heart of Shaw's Art

In order to gain a hearing it was necessary for me to attain the footing of a privileged lunatic, with the licence of a jester. My method has therefore been to take the utmost trouble to find the right thing to say and then say it with the utmost levity. And all the time the real joke is that I am in earnest.

Bernard Shaw

DESPITE HIS OCCASIONAL airs, it is a reckless absurdity to think of Shaw as a Man of Letters and then expect him to behave like one. Dixon Scott, for instance, did this in his otherwise perceptive essay "The Innocence of Bernard Shaw."¹ His fundamental point boils down to a wistful regret that Shaw stuck to those ideas of his, instead of "outgrowing" them and becoming an artist with more "gentleness" (both figuratively and literal) in his outlook. Needless to say, Scott's estimate of Shaw was thus warped; he tried to judge Shaw in terms of "pure" art, and though he probably understood Shaw's mind better than anybody who has written on Shaw, his comments show an obstinate refusal to cope with Shaw's work in Shaw's own terms. He even goes so far as to recommend that Shaw should have admitted that "Tout comprendre, c'est tout pardonner" — a doctrine whose perniciousness was to Shaw without limits.

The Social Importance of Art

Shaw made no bones about his ideas on art in general; he wrote as a critic of London music, drama, and painting for many years, and wrote three major essays putting forward his views on artistic activity (*The Perfect Wagnerite*, *The Quintessence of Ibsenism*, and *The Sanity of Art*). Yet critics have persistently neglected these declarations; even so sophisticated a writer as T. S. Eliot has fallen into cavilling at Shaw because his work did not conform to Eliot's ideas about the function of art. Of course not: but the real question is whether Shaw was better or worse than the type of artist Eliot would have preferred him to be. Here Shaw and Eliot stand utterly opposed.²

Shaw had, to begin with, a healthy (perhaps exaggerated) respect for the social importance of art:

The valid point is that our artistic institutions are vital social organs, and that the advance of civilization tends constantly to make them, especially in the presence of democratic institutions and compulsory schooling, more important than the political and ecclesiastical institutions whose traditional prestige is so much greater.³

¹ In *Men of Letters*, London, 1916.

² It is worth noting that Eliot once declared, "The potent ju-ju of the Life Force is a gross superstition," yet went on (in *The Cocktail Party* especially) to produce a great amount of ju-ju of his own.

³ Aylmer Maude, "Tolstoi on Art" and its Critics, London, 1925, p. 10.

Harsh words indeed for Mr. Eliot. Furthermore,

Art is socially important. . . only in so far as it wields that power of propagating feeling which he [Tolstoi] adopts as his criterion of true art. It is hard to knock this truth into the heads of the English nation. We admit the importance of public opinion, which in a country without intellectual habits (our own, for example) depends altogether on public feeling. Yet instead of perceiving the gigantic importance which this gives to the theater, the concert-room and the bookshop as forcing-houses of feeling, we slight them as mere places of amusement.⁴

Shaw was one of the first thus to perceive the social role of art; and since in his plays he constantly examined life for its social meanings he was constantly misunderstood and attacked both by those who wished he would have concerned himself with more familiar meanings, and by those who abhorred his interpretation of what he saw. It is commonplace that men who refuse to work within an established tradition become suspect — even when, as in Shaw's case, there is no strong established tradition in Eliot's sense. Shaw was trying to establish a new tradition, not utilize the old one; in fact, he exerted himself to the utmost to destroy what was left of the old one. Shaw often emphasized effect more than expressive form; he was, again, something either better or worse than an artist working in a solid tradition. He himself once said that an Ibsen play, though it will be dead in the future when *Midsummer Night's Dream* is still lively, will have been far more useful. In brief, he was more concerned with the transformation of society than with "pure" esthetics — though his critical writings bear ample testimony to his taste and perception, and his plays are by no means mere dramatized tracts.

Socialism a "Dramatic Illusion"

A good way to get a perspective on Shaw's thought about drama (he had a writing career of seventy years, and such a perspective is not easy to get) is to examine an essay written in 1896, "The Illusion of Socialism." In this essay Shaw considered socialism under its dual aspects of science and propaganda, using the term "illusion" in a fairly technical sense and not always dyslogistically. He began by indicating his conception of the nature of socialism as a doctrine and movement. Turning to the central question, he continued:

The dramatic illusion of Socialism is that which presents the working-class as a virtuous hero and heroine in the toils of a villain called "the capitalist," suffering terribly and struggling nobly, but with a happy ending for them, and a fearful retribution for the villain, in full view before the fall of the curtain on a future of undisturbed bliss. . . .

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

Closely allied to the dramatic illusion, and indeed at bottom the same thing, is the religious illusion. This presents Socialism as consummating itself by a great day of wrath, called "The Revolution" in which capitalism, commercialism, competition, and all the lusts of the Exchange, shall be brought to judgment and cast out, leaving the earth free for the kingdom of heaven on earth, all of which is revealed in an infallible book by a great prophet and leader. . . . The working-man who has been detached from the Established Church or the sects by the Secularist propaganda, and who . . . strenuously denies or contemptuously ridicules the current beliefs in heavens and devils and bibles, will, with the greatest relief and avidity, go back to his old habits of thought and imagination when they appear in this secular form.⁶

The scientific side of socialism displays the same sort of process:

Socialism has for its economic basis two theories, the theory of Rent and the theory of Value. The first of these seems simple to those who have mastered it; but it is neither obvious nor easy to the average sympathetic man: indeed, men of first-rate ability, among them Adam Smith, Marx, and Ruskin, have blundered over it. . . . The theory of value has a different history. . . . It began by being simple enough for the most unsophisticated audience, and ended by becoming so subtle that its popularization is out of the question, especially as the old theory is helped by the sentiments of approbation it excites. . . . The result is that the old theory is the only one available for general use among Socialists. It has accordingly been adopted by them in the form. . . laid down in the first volume of Karl Marx's "Capital." It is erroneous and obsolete; it has been modified out of existence by Marx himself in his third volume; it would, if it were valid, disprove the existence of "surplus value" instead of proving it. . . .⁷

But in his conclusion Shaw said:

Please remember, still in the true Jevonian spirit, that the question is not whether illusions are useful or not, but exactly how useful they are.⁸

In the light of these comments we can see that Shaw's ordinary plays were by no means intended as didactic in the ordinary socialist sense: they did not present messages for the daily guidance of agitators, nor did they pretend to address the proletariat. Shaw's entire dramatic activity lay within the confines of the British bourgeois world — though in his early Fabian days he was an active lecturer and speaker to labor groups. He was essentially a borer-from-within:⁹ his effect in helping to loosen the grip of the Victorian age was greater than his effect in producing anything new. As Dmitri Mirsky put it,

The combination. . . of Fabian socialism and an ethical individualism turned all the 19th century notions of the bourgeoisie upside down. . . . It was just this reversal of the conception of human conduct which was still ruling that made Shaw into the professional paradox-maker the British see in him.¹⁰

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 159.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 164.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 171. The tactical spirit of this is quite pervasive in Shaw, but rarely commented upon by critics compelled to simplify Shaw for purposes of discussion.

⁹ Though he played in a different league, Shaw shows certain resemblances to two of our own borers-from-within, H. L. Mencken and Philip Wylie.

¹⁰ *The Intelligentsia of Great Britain*, London, 1935.

Nevertheless, it is incorrect to charge Shaw with being a simple individualist; he incessantly proclaimed the need for "responsibility" and was sharp in his criticism of rank individualism: release from moral obligations, he noted acridly, is the "indispensable condition which appears to lie at the back of the popular conception of Paradise in all countries."¹¹

What was the change that took place in British drama in Shaw's day? Speaking primarily of Ibsen, Shaw thus described the New Drama:¹²

Now an interesting play cannot in the nature of things mean anything but a play in which problems of conduct and character of personal importance to the audience are raised and suggestively discussed (p. 217). . . . In the new plays, the drama arises through a conflict of unsettled ideas rather than through vulgar attachments, rapacities, generousities, resentments, ambitions, misunderstandings, oddities, and so forth as to which no moral question is raised. The conflict is not between right and wrong: the villain is as conscientious as the hero, if not more so: in fact, the question which makes the play interesting (when it is interesting) is which is the villain and which the hero. Or, to put it another way, there are no villains and no heroes. . . (p. 221).

But Shaw was no advocate of the puppet-play theory, though he is said to have been called a "ventriloquist"; his plays were intended as drama-of-the-people-with-ideas, not simply as drama-of-ideas:

There is only one way of dramatizing an idea; and that is by putting on the stage a human being possessed by that idea, yet none the less a human being with all the human impulses which make him akin and therefore interesting to us.¹³

But. . . the new technique is new only on the modern stage. It has been used by preachers and orators ever since speech was invented. It is the technique of playing upon the human conscience; and it has been practiced whenever the playwright has been capable of it. . . . In the theatre of Ibsen, we are. . . 'guilty creatures sitting at a play'; and the technique of pastime is no more applicable than at a murder trial.¹⁴

The Heart of Shaw's Art

Thus we arrive at the heart of Shaw's role as a propagandist: his *moral* function. He was prepared to sacrifice himself to it — and perhaps he did. He saw the theatrical world as a place where a deadly warfare went on: "each play is a battle."¹⁵ "It really matters very little," he said, "whether Ibsen was a great man or not: what does matter is his message and the need for it."¹⁶ This streak of devotion to his task is of course coupled with an enormous cocksureness — part of his pose as a jester to the ruling bourgeoisie. (Given his talents, it is not fair to arraign Shaw for not becoming a trade union organizer; actually, he saw his work and went to it with remarkable directness.)

It is well worth considering Shaw's notion of morals in the context of his dramatic thought. For example, an

¹¹ *Dramatic Opinions*, Vol. I, New York, 1907, p. xxiii.

¹² *Quintessence of Ibsenism*, New York, 1928.

¹³ *The Perfect Wagnerite*, New York, 1929, pp. 30-31.

¹⁴ *Quintessence of Ibsenism*, p. 133.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. x.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. x.

examination of the occurrence of the term *will* in his references to practical political problems demonstrates that will was often an extremely immediate phenomenon for Shaw; later he elaborated his notion of will into a vitalist theory coordinated with — but sometimes obscuring — his socialism; *will* became roughly equivalent to *life* or *life force*, the metaphysical ground upon which Shaw chose to rest his moral thought. The basic generative proposition for Shaw in morals seems to be this: "Men are to some extent conscious agents, and therefore morals, and the moral side of political science and art, are to some extent a matter of conscious debate and decision." The aspects which were *not* conscious, Shaw tended to neglect; his activities were primarily propagandistic, *i.e.*, as closely related to action as he could manage, contrary to the view of Caudwell and others.¹⁷

Like any socialist propagandist, he believed that propaganda and leadership could hasten and direct social change, given certain conditions to work with; but as he got older he concentrated his attention increasingly on leadership and decreasingly on its social prerequisites. It is idle to pretend, on this score, that Shaw did not issue some suspicious statements in the latter years of his life. His actual statements about Mussolini and Stalin, however, were much more seriously qualified than they are usually given out to be. His remarks on the Communist Party as a replica of the Catholic Church, for instance, have been put up as some sort of damning evidence; whereas actually they are a choice example of what made A. Lunacharsky uneasy on the occasion of Shaw's visit to the U.S.S.R.: "People like Bernard Shaw, brilliant representatives of the intelligentsia, show themselves to be 'too' free . . . they begin to indulge in irony." (He attributed to Shaw a "sympathy that is mingled with humor, because it seems to him that these fighters [the Russians] are rather ponderous, dogmatically credulous people."¹⁸

Shaw as Iconoclast

Now although Shaw worked within (and upon) the British middle class, he had by no means an easy time of it.

Every step in morals is made by challenging the validity of the existing conception of perfect propriety of conduct; and when a man does that, he must look out for a very different reception from the painter who has ventured to paint a shadow brilliant lilac, or the composer who ends his symphony with an unresolved discord. Heterodoxy in art is at worst rated as eccentricity or folly; heterodoxy in morals is at once rated as scoundrelism, and, what is worse, propagandist scoundrelism.¹⁹

He was attacked on both counts. Yet he took a comprehensive and businesslike view of the general problem involved:

I know no harder practical question than how much selfishness one ought to stand from a gifted person for the

¹⁷ Christopher Caudwell, *Studies in a Dying Culture*, London, 1938.

¹⁸ *Izvestia*, July 21, 1931, tr. in *Labour Monthly*, XIII, pp. 580-582.

¹⁹ *Sanity of Art*, London, 1908, p. 39.

sake of his gifts or on the chance of his being right in the long run.²⁰

In short, then, Shaw was fully conscious of his strategic position, and had few delusions about it. He had undertaken to revolutionize the British theater; even his reviews were "not a series of judgments aiming at impartiality, but a siege laid to the theatre of the XIXth century by an author who had cut his own way into it at the point of the pen, and thrown some of its defenders into the moat."²¹ He succeeded in his immediate aim — establishing firmly on the London and indeed world stage the "drama which is polemical rather than instinctive in its poignancy."²² And his secondary influence on the course of drama during the last half century has certainly been large, though it is difficult to assess. As Edmund Wilson said (after a devastating account of Shaw's later political utterances), "Of his educative and stimulative influence it is not necessary today to speak. The very methods we use to check him have partly been learned in his school."²³

Misinterpretations of Shaw

One of the most interesting aspects of Shaw criticism lies in the way he has been misunderstood. Not only was he sometimes thought to be joking when he was serious, but vice versa. Moreover, the Shavian reversals of many middle-class values made him downright incomprehensible to many; and as in Ibsen's case, his meaning was sometimes "obscured by its very obviousness."

A rather grotesque misinterpretation, for instance, occurred in the case of the preface to *Major Barbara*, where he declared that "the greatest of our evils, and the worst of our crimes is poverty."²⁴ Shaw was talking in a social context, as his readers should have been aware from the beginning; and he went on with a delicious sketch of the ways in which poverty *is* a basic crime — not only individually, but socially. Andrew Undershaft, who has been taken as a sign that Shaw was going soft toward the capitalists, understands the responsibility (on the individual level — the dramatic level) which this truth imposes. Critics, unable to escape from the context in which poverty and riches are necessary correlates, take it that Shaw was saying simply that it is better to be rich than poor. In a sense this is true; but Shaw did not mean that it is good to be rich by making other people poor. In fact, the cardinal point in Shaw's indictment of capitalist society was that it rests upon and perpetuates economic and therefore general inequality — as he said over and over.

Thus, when he said "Money is the most important thing in the world," he continued: "It is only when it is cheapened to worthlessness for some and made impossibly dear to others, that it becomes a curse. In short, it is a curse only in such foolish social conditions that life itself is a curse. . . . The first duty of every citizen is to insist on having money on reasonable terms; and this demand is

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 12.

²¹ *Dramatic Opinions*, Vol. 1, p. xxi.

²² *Ibid.*, in "G.B.S. on Clement Scott."

²³ *The Triple Thinkers*, London, 1938, p. 196.

²⁴ Penguin edition, Baltimore, 1951, p. vii.

not complied with by giving four men a few shillings each for ten or twelve hours' drudgery and one man a thousand pounds for nothing"²⁵ His original "paradoxical" statement turns out, in other words, to be a variation on an ancient and respectable socialist theme — the demand for abolition of inequality in income.

Humor and Propaganda

Now it may have been somewhat coy for Shaw to indulge in such displays of wit; but through them he succeeded in doing two important things: (1) he retained the ear of the middle class long enough to say something into it, and (2) he provoked a certain amount of reflection aimed at "figuring out what he meant," which always tended to backlash into some real thought about the matter, even when the audience was by no means inclined to such thought. Speaking of Ibsen, Shaw said, "All very serious revolutionary propositions begin as huge jokes. Otherwise they would be stamped out by the lynching of their first exponents."²⁶ He projected this observation into a full-scale propagandistic method. With it he achieved a "name for remorseless common sense . . . prevailing on men and artists to regard his gift of lightning logic with an uneasy twilight reverence and awe."²⁷

This technique is seen not only in his plays, where it is too complex to treat here (except for the warnings that Shaw can almost never be said to speak through any individual character, and can rarely be said to write plays with "solutions" — as is particularly clear in *St. Joan*) but also in his superb music criticism, which as he said consisted in the "combination of a laborious criticism with a recklessly flippant manner."²⁸

The Real Joke

There has been no attempt in this article to give a comprehensive overview of Shaw's opinions, except in the area marked off by the title. Even here, it is an exceedingly difficult task to achieve a fair representation of his views and procedures. One of the hardest things for commentators to realize, incidentally, has been that Shaw (for all his buffoonery) was by no means a simpleton. Indeed, perhaps the greatest single obstacle to understanding Shaw's general position has been the reluctance of interpreters to cope with the complexity and immediacy of his views. Shaw was for the most part uncompromisingly hard-headed, and rightly requires more detailed attention than can be given here even in discussing only one aspect of his work. His disdain for what he considered amateurism in public life is sobering:

Yet Wagner, like Marx, was too inexperienced in technical government and administration and too melodramatic in his hero-contra-villain conception of the class struggle, to foresee the actual process by which his generalization would work out, or the part to be played in it by the classes involved.²⁹

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. xii.

²⁶ *Quintessence of Ibsenism*, p. 198.

²⁷ Dixon Scott, *op. cit.*, p. 23.

²⁸ "Some Other Critics" in *London Music*, 1889-90, New York, 1937.

²⁹ *The Perfect Wagnerite*, p. 103.

In conclusion, however, perhaps we could take one of Shaw's own comments and apply it as a standard to his work:

The claim of art to our respect must stand or fall with the validity of its pretension to cultivate and refine our senses and faculties. . . Further, art should refine our sense of character and conduct, of justice and sympathy, greatly heightening our self-knowledge, self control, precision of action, and considerateness, and making us intolerant of baseness, cruelty, injustice and intellectual superficiality or vulgarity.

It is customary for bourgeois critics to prophesy that Shaw will be remembered, in the end, for the "pure" artistry of his plays, not for their social functions. The likelihood is, however, almost the opposite — for Shaw was probably the most talented and certainly the most widely known figure in the socialist movement that marked the beginning of the end for British capitalism. The "real joke," it seems, may turn out to be on his audience after all.

ERNEST CALLENBACH

Ernest Callenbach, a student at the University of Chicago, is a member of the *Anvil* editorial board.

Announcing a serious thought publication that is
Dynamic — Progressive — Challenging

World Frontiers

America's Newest Voice of Youth

Articles on world government — civil liberties — discrimination — the Cold War — colonialism — world economic development

"World Frontiers is an attractive and interesting publication and I wish it. . . all success."

Justice William O. Douglas

"I was quite impressed by your publication enterprise. What you are doing is precisely what our student generation badly needs."

Albert Einstein

WORLD FRONTIERS, c/o Manúmit School,
RFD No. 2, Bristol, Pa.

I wish to subscribe for 4 issues at \$1.00

Name

Address

Spotlighting the National Campus Scene

New England Students Hold Anti-War School

EARLY THIS SEPTEMBER, in the rolling countryside of eastern Massachusetts, an exciting experiment occurred in student anti-war education. Anti-war students from a dozen different campuses, and as many diverse ideological backgrounds, participated in this unique experiment, — studying, discussing, and living together for a week at a Quaker farm outside of Boston. Forty-five students attended the school, coming from as far west as Pittsburg, Kansas, and Chicago, as well as the New England area. Their backgrounds ranged from radical religious pacifism to militant Marxian socialism, while to many of the younger students these anti-war ideologies were a new intellectual experience.

The motivating force behind the summer school was Focal Point, a student anti-war organization at Yale University, which this year enters its third active year on campus. Focal Point bases its approach on more than pious horror at the ravages of war. We have attempted to examine the social and economic causes of war, to attack the problem at its roots. Anti-Stalinism and anti-imperialism became basic plans in our anti-war program. We found that pacifists, liberals, socialists, and independent radicals all could work together in a politically harmonious fashion within the framework of a broad anti-war coalition. Functioning in truly democratic fashion, welcoming the challenge of diverse views, we have achieved both programmatic and organizational unity.

The summer school was an attempt to do on a larger scale what has already been accomplished on the Yale campus. In undertaking this broader project, we secured the sponsorship and aid of such organizations as the Fellowship of Reconciliation, the War Resisters League, the American Friends Service Committee, the Socialist Youth League, and the Young Socialists. The faculty consisted of A. J. Muste of the FOR, Hal Draper, editor of *Labor Action*, Dr. Eddy Asirvatham, professor at Boston University, and a labor economist formerly active in the European socialist movement. Bill Perry of the Washington chapter of CORE (Congress of Racial Equality) presented the program of that organization.

The curriculum centered around four main areas: war and the economic order, war and the colonial revolution, the nature of Stalinism, and non-violence as a revolutionary strategy. The faculty lectured in these areas, after which the student body broke up into smaller discussion groups. Even more important than these formally structured discussions were the informal bull sessions which ran until the small hours of every morning. Not to go unreported were the hot volleyball and soft ball games, interspersed with

swimming in which the more revolutionary elements engaged in rearranging the locations of the rafts in the lake.

At the end of the week, an evaluation session was conducted by A. J. Muste, who acted as dean of the school. "A.J." observed that the most important job which the school had accomplished was to introduce the revolutionary pacifist and the democratic Marxist socialist to each other. Each had quite frankly come to the school with certain stereotypes about the other. These were definitely challenged and radically revised. While many issues of difference between the two tendencies were not even raised, let alone discussed, nevertheless the summer school was a real pioneering experiment which was just a beginning. The next step is that of cooperating in joint organizational activity on campus, guided by a recognition that on the campus today these two anti-war tendencies are being forced by the logic of the situation to joint activity, if only to stay alive. One of the hoped-for results of the summer school is that this collaboration will be based upon a sounder basis of real understanding and appreciation for each other's position.

Along such lines, the organizational institute held at the end of the school emphasized the use of *Anvil* as the instrumentality specifically designed to provide something around which such collaboration could be built, being by its nature the result of socialist-pacifist cooperation on the national level. The institute also dealt with other specific organizational techniques such as film series, public meetings, study groups, etc., and the various publications which are usable in campus anti-war activity.

Also discussed was the possibility of a regional conference during the school year, and a strong feeling that such a summer school again next year would be most desirable. These last two points seemed to be real concrete evidence that the summer school had done its job of providing the starting point for some kind of fruitful, cooperative anti-war activity by pacifists, socialists, and the fringes of the liberal movement which are still concerned with the drift toward war. The job now remains to make this cooperation a reality on the campuses to which the students at the summer school return this fall.

BILL SHIRLEY •

Students for Hoopes

YOUNG SOCIALISTS (previously called the YPSL) have recently laid plans for the formation of independent student committees, for the purpose of mobilizing the protest vote on the campuses behind the Socialist Party ticket. These groups will capitalize on the political interest generated by the presidential elections, to bring a socialist anti-war position before large student audiences. Specifically, the independent student committees will at-

tempt to (1) illustrate the bankruptcy of the major parties in the field of foreign-policy; (2) focus the anti-war sentiment on the campuses in the form of a protest vote; (3) show the connection between the needs of the cold war and the drive toward conformity on the campus; and (4) emphasize the need for a farmer-labor party as an alternative to the two major parties.

Many anti-war students are understandably critical of the past record of the Socialist Party, primarily because of the Party's support of the United Nations in Korea, and its lack of a clearcut opposition to Western imperialism. Nevertheless, there will be considerable sentiment on campus for critical support of the Socialist Party candidates as *protest* candidates. Furthermore, the program of the Independent Students for Hoopes and Friedman will be based on the following sections of the Socialist Party's 1952 platform:

A fourth and basic obstacle to peace is capitalism, which by its nature is centered on profit rather than on human welfare. In its international dealings, capitalism results in exploitation and injustice to the weak in every country. . . In the long view the greatest single contribution the American people can make to peace is to replace an economic system dealing with the world on the basis of selfishness and conflict with a cooperative economy which can build the basic structure of interdependence and mutuality among ourselves and the people of the world.

The threat that Soviet aggression has hurled against the world is tragic. But just as tragic is the inability of the present government to understand its nature and to prepare to meet it with any degree of success. If we are to have permanent peace, there are some basic things which must be understood. The most important of these is that capitalism is a root cause of war, and that capitalism keeps its creaking economy going through preparation for and participation in war. Therefore the very existence of capitalism constantly threatens the world with war.

These are the points that the independent student committees will hammer at: the inability of the present government, or any capitalist government to cope with Stalinism and avoid war. A protest movement basing itself on such an approach can have major potentialities on the American campus today.

On the domestic scene, the committees can raise a number of relevant issues that cannot be squarely faced by the liberals campaigning for the major party nominees. Even a liberal member of Students for Democratic Action cannot honestly oppose the anti-radical hysteria if at the same time he supports the very administration that began the whole process of loyalty oaths and subversive lists. Nor can he talk convincingly of the need for an FEPC when his own candidates include a member of the present "majority party of Congress," the DixieGOPs, which has been effectively blocking action on this measure. Both parties have such a miserable record in the field of minority rights and civil liberties that an argument as to which is the lesser evil becomes meaningless. Basic of course is the point that the "liberals" are the staunchest supporters of the permanent war economy. The needs of that economy, rather than the pious wishes of its critical supporters, will determine the rate at which America drifts into the garrison state.

The initial activities of the Students-for-Hoopes com-

mittees will get under way at such campuses as City College, University of Chicago, Antioch College, UCLA, University of Wisconsin, Boston U., and Roosevelt College. The coordination of the national campaign will begin with a series of speaking tours, which will cover most of the large campuses in the East and the Mid West.

The student committees will need help in getting their speakers on the campuses, under the auspices of various campus organizations, or through invitations to debate. The temporary headquarters of the Independent Committee for Hoopes and Friedman is in New York, at 48 Bond St. Pincus Gross of the E.V. Debs Society of CCNY is the coordinating secretary. For more information, or offers of aid, communicate directly with the secretary.

BOGDAN DENITCH

Bogdan Denitch is a member of the National Executive Committee of the Young Socialists, and a member of the *Anvil* editorial board.

L. A. and Kansas Cops All-Out for ANVIL

THE POLICE of various university towns are apparently becoming avid readers of *Anvil*. Two parallel events of the past semester provide instructive examples of police intimidation techniques.

On March 18, a motorcycle cop from the University station of the Los Angeles police department halted sales of *Anvil* in front of the University of Southern California administration building. The officer maintained it was illegal to sell periodicals without a "peddler's permit," and, hinting at possible student violence, also offered the unlikely story of a student having protested against the sales. Hauled off to the station, the *Anvil* salesman, a former USC student, was held for over an hour and a half while the cop, a sergeant, a lieutenant, and a captain searched through the "books" for an ordinance they couldn't find. The *Anvil* salesman asked if he could call the American Civil Liberties Union, but was not allowed to make this or any other call. He was held without charge while the police scanned *Anvil* for "subversive lines." One cop insinuated that *Anvil* was the same magazine they had taken away from "some Red a while ago on the streets," but a series of calls to headquarters and perhaps to L.A.'s notorious Red Squad, seemed to prove disappointing. However, the mention of socialism and socialist clubs in the magazine convinced them they had stumbled on "something hot."

"What I can't understand," said the motorcycle cop, "is why anyone would waste time selling such things unless he got something out of it." They wanted to know who sponsored the magazine. They found the organizations listed inside. They wished to know the local outlet in L.A. for *Anvil*. "Where is your office?" The fact that there was no office, just a few students and anti-war peo-

ple who received bundle orders on consignment, only increased their suspicions. "What is your attitude toward Russia? . . . Are you against the social order in America? . . . What is your aim?", they asked.

Reading *Anvil* Like Taking Dope

"No phone calls until the lieutenant returns," said the sergeant. The lieutenant didn't return. The sergeant then had a conference with the captain. Finally, "The captain wants to see you," he said. In the captain's office there followed another hour of waiting. Finally, the motorcycle cop came back and whispered something to the captain. They both smiled pleasantly. "There is no ordinance against selling that literature," said the captain. "We're sorry we kept you waiting so long. We just got our call through. You're free to go. But first, would you mind rolling up your sleeves?" They examined the young man's arms. "What do you think of those eyes?", asked the captain. "I was struck a while ago by the fact that his eyes dilate, just like marijuana users. But he assures me he never used the stuff. And he claims he hasn't been drinking today or last night. Very strange."

"Show him out," said the captain. "Don't stop selling that literature on our account. But we're thinking of your own good. Many students here hate radicals, and they might beat you up." "Why only a while back," said the cop confidentially, "I had to stop a riot against a guy with literature." "You know how it is," said the captain. "We have to watch out for Reds around these colleges. Some of the students might think you're selling subversive literature. We're thinking of your own good."

The other arrest occurred at Lawrence, Kansas, where the University of Kansas (KU) is located. On May 14, a young man and a girl, students at KU and members of its Socialist Study Club, were picked up while selling the spring issue of *Anvil*. The two policemen who carried out the arrest, when questioned as to the right of arrest without charges, mumbled something about a peddler's license, then said, "Right or no right, you are going to come along." Inside the station, the police refused to explain the charges on which the two students were being held, and in return met a refusal to answer any questions at all. The *Anvil* salesmen were then searched, relieved of the contents of their pockets, and placed in separate but adjoining cells. Approximately half an hour later they were released for questioning. During the questioning they were kept in separate rooms and were unable to communicate.

Although the students were dealt with separately, the pattern was similar in each case. First came an indecisive interview with the Chief of Police. Here the students tried to accomplish two objectives: (1) to establish the status of the "case" at this point. The Chief of Police declared that there were no charges as yet, and that "as far as I'm concerned you've done nothing wrong," but nevertheless he held them for questioning by the assistant county attorney (2) To secure legal counsel. The Chief of Police stated that the decision on legal counsel was his and the county attorney's until the event of charges being pressed,

when it would become a matter of law. Legal counsel was repeatedly asked for, and refused in every instance.

"Questions of Common Knowledge"

Both students refused at first to answer questions in the absence of the other, but this position had to be abandoned, under threat by the assistant county attorney that he would press charges, unless they cooperated by answering "questions of common knowledge," such as name, address, student identification, etc. In each case, however, these questions were expanded to include such matters as the students' connections with the Socialist Study Club, whether they were making money by selling *Anvil*, whether they were now, or had ever been, members of the CP, and if they believed in overthrowing the government by force and violence. Following this political inquisition, both students were forced to submit to "printing and mugging," as a condition of prompt release, — again backed by the threat of pressing charges if they refused.

Two "political" discussions which occurred during the course of the interrogation are worth reproducing as an index to the police mentality. At one point the girl defended her refusal to answer questions before she knew the nature of the charges against her, as a matter of principle. The assistant county attorney thereupon launched into a heated and sarcastic tirade against principles, stating that people who insisted on sticking by their principles always ended up in the gutter, lived wretched lives, and in general came to no good end. The student suggested that it was precisely the people who refused to stand by their principles who were responsible for the rise of fascism. The attorney answered that she was young, and would learn in time that there were principles not worth sticking by!

In his interview with the other student, the assistant county attorney made a little patriotic speech, which consisted of praising American democracy and commenting on the ineffectiveness of minority groups. The student pointed out that to carry out socialist ideas, and to maintain the possibility of spreading them, was the best way to preserve and extend American democracy.

Trying to prove the ineffectuality of minority groups, the attorney pointed out to the editorial, "The Feinberg Law — a Bitter Defeat," and asked: "Now this article here was probably written by a Jew, wasn't it?", to which the student replied sharply that he didn't see what this had to do with the matter. The assistant county attorney hastily asserted that he didn't mean to imply "that there was anything wrong with Jews," but explained that "they were an embittered minority, due to the persecutions, and tended to have a distorted view of things." In any case, he went on, it didn't pay to associate oneself with embittered minority groups. He again brought up the smallness of the Socialist Study Club and expressed disbelief that it could accomplish anything. The student then asked, "If we are so small and ineffectual, why are you so worried about us?" The assistant county attorney gave no coherent reply for a few seconds, then curtly stated "I am not worried about you."

An interesting facet of the incident is to note that intimidation was not restricted to the local police alone. The university administration was called and informed of the students' political activities. It happened in this case that the administration took a "friendly" view of the matter, confirmed the status of the Socialist Study Club as a legitimate student organization, and apparently advised the police to release the prisoners without pressing charges. Under different circumstances, however, the false arrests might have resulted in the students getting in hot water with school authorities.

At one point in the proceedings, the ubiquitous FBI was also called in. During the questioning of the girl, an FBI agent entered the room briefly. He later left, saying he had no interest in the case: "You weren't selling any Communist literature, were you?" — "No" — "You don't advocate overthrow of the government by force and violence, do you?" — "No" — "Okay."

There are definite lessons to be drawn from these experiences. To begin with, in both cases the police had no basis whatsoever for the arrests. Ordinances against peddlers, even where they exist, don't apply to the sale of periodicals in the streets — as long as the sales don't involve "obstruction of traffic," or the violation of some other ordinance. In the Lawrence case, the Socialist Study Club availed itself of legal advice and determined that this was a case of false arrest and false imprisonment, and that the police officers involved could be sued. The club contented itself however with a public apology. It is unlikely that in a similar situation the case of the police would be stronger. There are Supreme Court rulings to the effect that it is unconstitutional to inhibit the sales of any political or religious publication on a public street. All local ordinances to the contrary are invalid and will not stand up under test.

In both cases the conduct of the police was based on intimidation techniques and bluffing. In Lawrence the two students involved called the bluff and achieved something in the nature of a success. In retrospect the SSC decided, however, that their conduct should have been more uncompromising, since there was no basis whatsoever for the arrest, since compromise of any kind implies recognition of the validity of the police's arbitrary conduct, and since

complete non-cooperation would have further strengthened their position.

Future Course to Follow

It was decided that the course to be followed in the future should run more or less along these lines: refusal to answer any questions as long as charges are not made clear, and as long as no explanations for the arrest are given; when charges are made, refuse to answer any questions until contact with legal counsel is established; if no charges exist, demand to be released immediately and refuse to answer any questions while formally under arrest. It is true that in most places the police can hold anyone for 24 hours *on suspicion*, but if no ordinance exists which could apply to the case, there cannot be suspicion on these grounds, and the case is one of false arrest. As far as the FBI is concerned, nobody is under a legal obligation to answer any questions at all to its representatives, unless the latter hold a warrant for arrest.

These incidents also point up the great importance of the organization involved keeping track of its sellers, and being ready to mobilize liberal support and secure legal aid in case of emergency. In the case of the Lawrence arrests, the effects of the intransigent stand of its members were definitely positive for the SSC. Energetic faculty support made itself felt soon after the arrest, and later, liberal opinion was rallied in support of the club. The club's position in the university was considerably strengthened, and the assurance was gained from city and university authorities that no such thing would be allowed to happen again to anyone.

From this experience the KU students concluded that determined opposition is the best method to defend themselves against arbitrary intimidation. It is essential, of course, that in all cases ordinances be carefully checked with the city clerk. Once the legal basis is clear, however, any attempt at intimidation should be firmly opposed. In tense situations, the ACLU or a lawyer should be informed beforehand, and perhaps be asked to remind the police department that they, as well as the average citizen, can be subjected to public pressures, and can be held legally responsible for their actions.

GERALD CARR and ALAN DANIELS

BOOKS IN REVIEW

WILLIAM FAULKNER

by Irving Howe

Random House, 1952.

RANDOM HOUSE has recently published an excellent critical study of William Faulkner by Irving Howe. Mr. Howe has submitted a major critical estimate of Faulkner's novels which is superior in conception to any work currently available.

William Faulkner is a much maligned and misunderstood American writer. Earlier appraisals of his books leave one in doubt as to whether the critics troubled to read his novels. They have dubbed him a Southern regionalist, a wilful obscurantist, and, not infrequently, a charlatan. His style of writing has provoked a score of satirical imitations in the *New Yorker* and other semi-literate periodicals. Some "leftist" critics are fond of revealing their sociological

acumen by labelling Faulkner a spokesman for Southern fascism.

Mr. Howe's study is distinguished by an ability to point out the changes in Faulkner's outlook on a number of themes basic to his novels. Most of Faulkner's writing has been concerned with the Negro, the Civil War and its aftermath, and the corruption of what he thinks of as the Southern traditions. Howe states that while Faulkner's initial exploration of these traditions led him to an acceptance and perpetuation of them, his later works reflect a testing and subsequent rejection:

The myth appears in its simplest form

in the *Unvanquished*, — a few of the stories in that book are hardly distinguishable from the romancing of popular Southern fiction. By *Intruder in the Dust* Faulkner has almost broken away from the Southern myth.

It is this development which provides much of the tension in Faulkner's prose and leaves so many of his characters in a dramatic suspension.

Howe undertakes a very satisfactory examination of Faulkner's treatment of the Negro, in which he illustrates a substantial movement from the presentation of the Negro as a clown or victim to the point of writing of the Negro as a credible human being. It is fruitless to look for a neat definition of Faulkner's attitude toward the Negro, for it is a welter of contradictions, composed both of warm tribute for his ability to endure, and a hysterical fear of miscegenation. The Negro has customarily been a passive observer in Faulkner's works. Even Lucas, at his more active moments, is little more than a reluctant motivator. It is encouraging, incidentally, to find one critic who does not consider Joe Christmas a villain.

This study serves both as an introduction and a stimulus to the reading of Faulkner. For Faulkner presents a number of problems to the casual reader who enters Yoknapatawpha County at the suggestion of a friend, or by selecting one of Faulkner's novels by chance. If *Sanctuary* happens to be his first glimpse of Faulkner, he is hardly likely to pursue him further. Other works currently available in the pocket book editions are equally discouraging, not because of their thematic weakness, but because of their difficult prose, which seems to bear out Faulkner's jest that he never fully realizes that others will read what he has written. Howe's book is valuable in that it concentrates on a clear exposition of the themes of Faulkner's novels, where more emphasis has been laid on a foot-noted exegesis of the symbolic content of his books. Howe contributes notably to a lucid reading of Faulkner's in his discussion of the sections of *The Sound and the Fury* which have previously baffled and frustrated many Faulkner readers.

Stylistic Range

There are important stylistic differences among Faulkner's novels. No other living author has been so willing to experiment with such a variety of literary forms. The range is from the flat bitterness of *Soldier's Pay*, to the incredible complexity of Benjy's reflections, which are presented in a sustained stream of consciousness, — to brilliant culmination in the dramatic structure of his most recent work, *Requiem for a Nun*.

Perhaps the most neglected element in Faulknerian criticism has been the recognition of his genuinely comic ability. This is not to say that he will ever replace Joe Miller, for much of his humor has an underlying savageness, as in Jason's raging against the Western Union Telegraph Service, which he blames for his losses in stock speculation. There is a long section in *The Hamlet* that tells of the efforts of a Texas horse trader to dispose of his stock to a group of unwilling buyers. The Texan himself bears a facial scar as a result of a recent encounter with the horses who are extremely wild and aggressive. The following is a part of the dialogue:

"Who says that pony ain't worth fifteen dollars? You couldn't buy that much dynamite for just fifteen dollars. There ain't one of them that can't do a mile in three minutes; turn them into pasture and they will board themselves; work them like hell all day, and every time you think about it, lay them over the head with a singletree, and after a couple of days every jack rabbit of them will be so tame you will have to put them out of the house at night like a cat."

"Come on Eck," he said. "Start her off. How about ten dollars for that horse, Eck?"

"What need I got for a horse I would need a bear-trap to catch?," Eck said.

"Didn't you just see me catch him?"

"I seen you," Eck said. "And I dont want nothing as big as a horse if I got to wrestle with it every time i finds me on the same side of the fence it's on."

Faulkner's Isolation

Howe was more successful in relating the personal life of Anderson to his literary output, but Faulkner eludes him, and it is no wonder. For this is the man whom *Life* magazine quotes as saying (when his picture was taken in connection with the publicity for the movie of *Intruder*) 'It's like bullets, after the first one the shock isn't so great.' William Faulkner is a magnificently aloof person who delights in confounding others by living the kind of life that suits him best. One of the acknowledged literary greats, he is not easily available for discussions of his works; he seldom leaves Jefferson, correction, Oxford, and is like as not apt to come forth with the most ill-informed statement about our immigration policies, or about the number of persons benefitting from the social security laws, — a person who on occasion can sound more like Jason than Jason himself.

Faulkner is a complex contradictory, and creative man, whose books merit wide reading, with no better introduction than Mr. Howe's recent work.

FRED SAMUELS

INVISIBLE MAN

by Ralph Ellison

"Who knows but that, on the lower frequencies, I speak for you?"

WERE RALPH ELLISON'S *Invisible Man* but another "race novel" as the middleclass Negro absorbed in the general American middle-class culture is apt to view all novels dealing with Negro life, its interest would be somewhat circumscribed. Rarely has the novelist of Negro life been able to rise from the particular to the universal; rarely has he been able to write a novel of symbolic force whose meaning radiates beyond the topical matter which is its crude substance. Novels of such scope generally are most common. *Invisible Man* is a work of this magnitude, and is perhaps the most ambitious novel of Negro life in America which has yet appeared.

Theme of the Novel

Alienated man as Negro is the theme and substance of Ralph Ellison's semi-autobiographical novel. A well-mannered, readily compliant, cautiously respectful young high-school valedictorian, whose graduation day oration propounds humility as the essence of progress, goes off to a model Negro college, one of those islands of an aspiring Negro middle-class patronized by Northern white philanthropists, and dedicated to "Negro betterment." Enthralled with the vision of "The Founder," — the hope of freedom within segregation, — life at college, its genial atmosphere, its sophistication, its optimism subsumes the hero's consciousness, and makes him wish to emulate the successful, powerful college head.

Expelled from college for accidentally chauffeuring a wealthy Northern white patron beyond the "redeemed" environs of the college, and for leading him to the real South of poverty and degradation, the young hero is hurled Northwards, into the tantalizing freedom of Harlem. Here he comes to join the Brotherhood, a Stalinist organization, not out of a developed social consciousness, but rather impelled by the same success drive bred on the campus in the shadow of the mythic Founder's statue. Not necessarily a success drive in the narrow sense of personal aggrandizement, devoid of idealism and scruples; but success drive as a value, based on the illusion of limitless potential for individual achievement:

Here was a way that didn't lead through the back door, a way not limited by black and white, but a way which, if one lived long enough and worked hard enough, could lead to the highest possible rewards.

The hero becomes wholly enrapt in the Brotherhood, identifies himself with its aims, is enriched with its dignity-conferring powers, rises to the local prominence for which he has been groomed and then, the slow, painful disenchantment, the wavering over the abyss, and final plunge into . . . invisibility.

Brotherhood to the hero had meant an opportunity to "define" himself. Outside of Brotherhood meant outside of time, of history. The crushing experience of a party-line shift, abandoning the Negro struggle for "national issues," the realization of his own and his people's expendability, of their having been used, shatter the hero's attempt at any meaningful integration into society.

Nature of Invisibility

Invisibility comes as the awareness of never having been seen. The autocratic Negro college head who sacrificed him in the interest of "policy," the Northern white philanthropist who holds Negro progress his peculiar "destiny," the grotesque one-eyed Brotherhood commissar who consults History like a prophet, but never the hero's own thoughts and feelings — none of these men have ever seen him, all of them have used him.

The experience of donning dark glasses in order to pass unrecognized by hostile black nationalists, and being mistaken for a nihilistic character who combines the professions of pimp, numbers racketeer, extortionist and fake spiritual healer, forces a further awareness of the nature of invisibility. Mistaken for Rinehart, he is almost forced to fight a friend — the role coerces him despite his own inclinations. The subsequent flight into himself is an uncritical rejection of role-playing. He must find himself, by himself, first if not last for himself.

Ellison's impressionistic style of writing, perhaps overlaid with surrealistic effects, creates a tone which supports the hero's discovery of his non-identity. The hero's attempt to understand the relationship between experience and identity forces a spiritual crisis posed as choice between the nihilistic exploitation of chaos as defined in "Rinehartism," and the plunge outside of society into "invisibility." Negative as the hero's choice of the latter first appears, it emerges as an affirmation of self stronger than any heard in recent American fiction. Had the resolution been less complex, it would have sounded almost strident, clashing with the simple yet powerful truth that "Life is to be lived, not controlled."

Ellison's hero rejects the soul-sickness of modern Negro life — the inevitable internalization of the dominant cultural values — and asks, "Must I strive toward colorlessness?" His slave grand-

father "never had any doubt about his humanity — that was left to his 'free' offspring." The plight of the Negro people is seen as inextricably interwoven with the fate of all Americans. Braced by a perhaps too defensive irony, the hero finds the "cream of the joke" in the question: "Weren't we part of them as well as apart from them and subject to die when they died?"

Affirmation of Self

Invisibility or self-entrenchment leads to self-affirmation, to awareness of individuality, but the hero, confronted with the social and political facts of increasing conformity and regimentation, senses the anachronism of his discovery. He is a century too late, and isn't at all certain that he's in the avant-garde of history. The rank individualist, however, loses patience with the "laws of history," with the impersonal business of politics. Ellison's hero, rejecting both capitalism (Bledsoe the college head, and Norton the philanthropist, and Sta-

linism, Jack the Brotherhood commissar) is faced with a void which he can only begin to fill through his own reality and worth as an individual.

As a record of a spiritual progress, the novel has a disarmingly candid effect — the kind of impact peculiar to only the most honest writing. Ellison's hero sheds many illusions and achieves a significant victory in his struggle to define himself. But he can only intimate emergence from the underground. He is certain that he can't remain "invisible" forever, but the problem of integration into society remains unsolved. And how could it be otherwise, since alienated man as Negro is but the radical type of our common fate. The articulate today are all semi-denizens of the underground, and that man's a fool that doesn't know the hole he's in.

LEONARD PRAGER

Leonard Prager is Chairman of Focal Point at Yale University, where he is a graduate student.

Contemporary Issues

— A Magazine for a Democracy of Content

Contents No. 11

Persian Oil: America Defeats Britain

Andrew Maxwell

America's Garrison Economy

Nathan Davidson

**The Society for Social Responsibility
in Science: A Follow Up**

PM

Crime and Competition in America

Thomas Cranmer

Contents No. 12

The Problem of Chemicals in Food

L. Herber

The Crisis of Europe

Joseph Ramai

Quarterly, at \$1.60 per year

Write

CONTEMPORARY PRESS

545 Fifth Avenue

New York City 17, N. Y.

PROGRAM of the 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 body into either of these reactionary war camps.

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. At the same time we do not accept the rationalization and apology for the war drives of American imperialism on the basis of militarily stopping Stalinism.

In the United States, today, all of our democratic rights are seriously menaced. Above all, local and national government and big business have reached a political affinity in their attempts to stifle labor and radical organizations, and to virtually outlaw the Stalinist movement. This political reaction has its parallel in the academic world where one university administration after another has initiated campus witch hunts.

Racial and religious discrimination and persecution remains the shame of the nation. Jim Crow, in particular, remains largely unabated. The murder of Negroes in the South, their discrimination in Northern industry, the segregation policy in academic institutions have, by now, become characteristic of the social psychology of America's industrial and political leaders. It is the aim of the New York Student Federation Against War to conduct militant struggles for the complete social, political and economic equality of the Negro people.

The growing political reaction at home finds its counterpart in America's foreign policy: bolstering reactionary regimes in Spain, Greece and Turkey; the North Atlantic Pact and the subsidization of the military machines of Western Europe and support of German rearmament.

The New York Student Federation Against War

does not believe that war is inevitable. We are convinced that the drive toward war can be eliminated by building democratic political and social structures in place of America's growing garrison state and Russia's rapacious imperialism. It is to this end that we are dedicated.

As a student organization in the United States we have the following special and immediate role to play in building a just and democratic world:

1. Education: *As students we will make every effort to stimulate political and social thought on campus; to attempt to instill among the student body a sense of responsibility and self-confidence; to encourage discussion and debate of political issues and local campus political problems.*

2. Organization: *To present the particular views of the New York Student Federation Against War we urge all sympathetic students to make every effort to organize recognized college clubs; and, similarly, we urge all existing clubs sympathetic to the views of the Federation, and not already affiliated to it, to take immediate steps to join the Federation.*

3. Activities: *In addition to general political education the Federation proposes to its constituent clubs that they participate actively in daily campus political activity; to enter all struggles for the defense of student rights, to guarantee the right to organize on campus and to hear speakers of a club's own choosing; to fight against faculty or administrative supervision of student activities; to fight for an end to racial and religious discrimination on campus and in fraternities.*

4. Federation Activities: *In addition to local campus activities the Federation proposes intercollegiate campaigns to fight for democracy and peace through meetings, petition campaigns, education, etc. The Federation will conduct city wide actions in behalf of the fight to end Jim-Crow and to turn back the increasing assault on civil and academic liberties. The Federation will also seek out other student groups in an effort to conduct joint campaigns on such issues.*

BUSINESS OFFICE NOTICE

Individual students or clubs which wish to order bundles of ANVIL AND STUDENT PARTISAN to sell on campus should write the magazine's business manager for rates and conditions. All correspondence concerning business should be sent to the following address:

ANVIL AND THE STUDENT PARTISAN
NEW YORK 1, N. Y.

SUBSCRIPTION

Enclosed find \$1.00 for a 5 issue subscription to ANVIL AND STUDENT PARTISAN.

Name

Address

School

41 WEST 33rd STREET