

A Student Anti-War Quarterly

anvil

And Student Partisan

PRO AND CON ON AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

Irving Howe:

Southern Myth and William Faulkner

Can Asia Avert Totalitarianism?

Sartre, the Devil and God Almighty

Conformity, Inequality and Fraternity

The Feinberg Law -- A Bitter Defeat

Resistance to the Garrison State

20¢

S u m m e r 1 9 5 2

anvil a student anti-war quarterly and student partisan

Vol. IV - No. 2



Summer Quarter 1952

CONTENTS

Editorial: The Feinberg Law -- A Bitter Defeat	3
Editorial: Resistance to the Garrison State	5
Editorial: ANVIL Support Continues to Grow	5
Spotlighting the National Campus	6
Can Asia Avert Totalitarianism?	10
Dr. Eddy Asirvatham	
Southern Myth and William Faulkner	13
Irving Howe	
Conformity, Inequality and Fraternity	16
Alan Daniels	
Sartre, the Devil and God Almighty	19
Stanley Plastrik	
American Foreign Policy: Two Views	25
Gabriel Gersh and Julius Jacobson	
Film Review: The Red Badge of Courage	31
Ernest Callenbach	

EDITORIAL BOARD

Julius Jacobson, <i>Editor</i>	Bob Bone, <i>Man. Editor</i>	Sam Bottone
Abe Victor	Irving Stern	Margaret Levi
Robert Mussigman	Joan Reynolds	Scott Arden
John Thompson	Pincus Gross	Bogdan Denitch
John Holmes		Charles Doehrer
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
247 Lexington Avenue 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

MANAGER'S MEMO

Dear Friend,

The achievement of Anvil and Student Partisan in becoming the largest selling serious student magazine is due to the attractiveness of its message, its contents and, to a large extent, to your loyal and devoted support. In addition to reading and distributing the magazine, however, there is something else you can do to help us increase our financial stability.

The business office is launching a special campaign to obtain advertisements for the next issue. If we are to have ads in our Fall issue we simply have to do the leg work now. The Spring semester is also "short selling season" and in order to equal the income received in the Fall the difference must be made up in paid ads.

Who should be approached for an ad?

1. Your local bookstore, stationer, luncheonette etc. Usually these enterprises have a fund set aside for this purpose and it helps to get there first.

2. Campus clubs and off-campus organizations can be contracted even if they don't agree with everything in Anvil's program.

3. Individuals should be persuaded to give at least a booster ad for 50 cents.

Below is an ad blank for advertisers to fill out. Please collect at least 50% of the ad cost now.

Fraternally,

Al Davidson, Bus. Mgr.

CONTRACT

The undersigned hereby contracts for page advertisement to appear in the Fall 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

Editorials:

The Feinberg Law -- A Bitter Defeat

EARLY IN MARCH, the Nine Old Men sat in judgment on the future of academic freedom in the State of New York. They concluded their deliberations by upholding, 6-3, the constitutionality of the notorious Feinberg Act. Abandoning the principle of freedom of inquiry in the public schools, the Truman-appointed majority of the Court valiantly resolved, in its own words, "to protect the schools from pollution." Justice Douglas, in a resounding dissent, charged that "What happens under this law is typical of what happens in a police state."

The Feinberg Act is technically intended to implement legislation already on the books of New York State. By a law of 1917, "treasonable or seditious utterances or acts" barred employment in the public schools. By the Civil Service Law of 1939, public employment was denied to those who advocate overthrow of the Government "by force, violence, or any unlawful means." *No proceedings have ever been taken under these laws.* The motivation of the New York State Legislature in passing the Feinberg Act is significant in this context.

The preamble of the Feinberg Act presents a "legislative finding" to the effect that members of subversive groups, especially the Communist Party, have been infiltrating the public schools, in spite of the existing legislation. Furthermore, members of these groups have been using their position to propagate subversive ideas. This propaganda, however, "is sufficiently subtle to escape detection in the classroom." It therefore becomes necessary to enact restrictive legislation based on a teacher's activities and associations *outside* the classroom, regardless of considerations of competence, or of actual conduct in the school. The case of the New York State Legislature, in short, rests explicitly on the principle of guilt-by-association, and its point of view has now been given official sanction by the highest court in the land.

In its instructions to the Board of Regents, the Feinberg Act initiates three procedures not embodied in previous law. (1) It sets up a reporting system, requiring the Regents to report annually to the Legislature on the state of loyalty in the schools. (2) It instructs the Regents to draw up a State "subversive list" for the purposes of the Act. In so doing, the Regents "may utilize any similar listings . . . authorized by Federal law, regulation, or executive order." (Not mentioning any names.) (3) Finally it declares that membership in any organization so listed is *prima facie* evidence for denial of employment.

One further point should be made. The preamble of the Feinberg Act, as well as the majority opinion of the Supreme Court, imply that the Act is solely concerned with protecting the "immature minds" of small children. If this were so, it would be bad enough. The fact is that the jurisdiction of the Act extends to the *college level*. Section 12A of the Civil Service Law, which the Feinberg Act implements, reads in part: "nor shall any persons be employed . . . as superintendents, principals, or teachers in a public school or academy or in a state normal school or college. . ." The minds of students in the New York City colleges are no doubt regarded by the sponsors of the law as particularly tender and unformed.

"No Constitutional Infirmity"

Since its enactment in 1949, the Feinberg Act has had a checkered career in the courts. It was first declared unconstitutional by the New York Supreme Court, but this decision was later reversed by the New York Court of Appeals. When it finally reached the Supreme Court, the law was attacked on two grounds: (1) that it violated the First Amendment, by abridging the teacher's right to freedom of speech and assembly. The appellants argued that the teacher, like other citizens, has the right to join political organizations of his own choosing, without being penalized for the *organized* expression of his political convictions. (2) that it violated the Fifth Amendment, because the making of mere membership in an organization an automatic ground for dismissal deprived the teacher of "due process."

The majority opinion on these two points of law was delivered by Justice Minton. He found no limitation on the teacher's freedom of speech or assembly: "His freedom of choice between membership in the [subversive] organization and employment in the school system might be limited, but not his freedom of speech or assembly. . . He is at liberty to retain his beliefs and associations and go elsewhere." (The learned Justice might have added that he is particularly at liberty to go straight to jail under the Smith Act.) Nor could Justice Minton find any denial of due process in the provisions of the law for guilt-by-association. "One's associates, past and present . . . may properly be considered in determining fitness and loyalty. From time immemorial, [a weighty precedent — B.B.] one's reputation has been determined in part by the company he keeps." Justice Minton also found a guarantee of due process in the

hearing provided for an accused teacher, — an argument which the Douglas dissent demolishes.

In his dissent, Justice Douglas initially addresses himself to the points of law at issue. He first challenges the power of a state government to place its employees in the category of second-class citizens: "The Constitution guarantees freedom of thought and expression to everyone in our society, and none needs it more than the teacher." Then, attacking guilt-by-association as "a principal repugnant to our society," he points out the fraudulent nature of the "hearing" provided in the act: "In that hearing, the finding as to the 'subversive' character of the organization apparently may not be reopened in order to allow [the teacher] to show the truth of the matter." The irrefutable charge that the organization is "subversive" becomes even more of a weapon for the state when it is recalled that the state "subversive" list is to be modeled, in all likelihood, on the US Attorney-general's list, which was compiled without the slightest recourse or appeal by the organizations listed.

The Real Issue

So much for the Constitutional question. Justice Douglas by no means limits himself to this sphere, but attacks the law as a thought-control measure, spelling out the effect of regular loyalty reports on the teacher's classroom performance: "The law inevitably turns the school system into a spying project. . . The principals become detectives, the students, the parents, the community becomes informers. . . The prejudices of the community come into play . . . [as it seeks] for hidden meanings in a teacher's utterances." The very threat of such a procedure plays havoc with academic freedom: "Fearing condemnation, [the teacher] will tend to shrink from any association that stirs controversy. . . A problem can no longer be pursued with impunity to its edges. . . Discussion often leaves off where it should begin. . . A 'party line' lays hold. . . It is the 'party line' of the orthodox view, of the conventional thought, of the accepted approach."

It is just such a narrow orthodoxy which motivates the sinister theory of public-school education elaborated by Justice Minton: "A teacher works in a sensitive area in a schoolroom. There he shapes the attitude of young minds toward the society in which they live. In this, the State has a vital concern. . . It must maintain the integrity of the schools as a part of ordered society." The function of the schools, in plain language, is to buttress the status quo, by indoctrinating young minds with the proper attitudes toward established social institutions. In such a school system, not merely Stalinist opinion, but *all* opinion critical of the present order of things must be proscribed. And this, to be sure, is what the Feinberg Act is all about. Its real purpose is to terrorize teachers into ideological conformity. It employs fear as a weapon against free thought, because it was itself conceived in fear — in that hysterical panic which is associated historically with dying civilizations.

Relation of School State

It is that same panic which accounts for the revolutionary departure from the traditional American attitude

toward school and State, contained in the majority opinion of the Court. When a democratic society is secure, it adopts a laissez-faire attitude toward the schools. It encourages varied intellectual views, in the belief that the best will prevail. Justice Black expresses this laissez-faire view at its best, in his dissent on the Feinberg Act: "Basically this law rests on the belief that Government should supervise the flow of ideas into the minds of men. Quite a different governmental policy rests on the belief that Government should leave the mind and spirit of man absolutely free."

When on the other hand a society is threatened with annihilation; when the world-system of which it is a part is shaken to its foundations; when small men become panic-stricken; — then a certain rigidity appears in the society, and the State tightens its grip on the educational system. Then, in the words of Justice Minton, "the State may exercise its police power to protect the schools from pollution, and thereby defend its own existence."

Then, instead of pursuing the truth to its edges, *though the State be found in error*, the schools become the supine servant of the State. When bold thinking is most required, only stifling orthodoxy is permitted. The functional *separation* of school and State is abandoned. Instead of maintaining intellectual independence, in order best to perform its unique function, the school system becomes integrated into the State apparatus. The Nazis had a word for this process: *Gleichschaltung* — a procedure by which all important social institutions were absorbed into the total State and utilized for its ends.

The Feinberg Act is one more instance of the abandonment of the best traditions of the American republic, and of the institutional shift toward a garrison state. West Point is the prototype of the educational institution required by the garrison state. It is characterized by rote learning, a student spy system, almost no study of the humanities, and complete regimentation of student life. The Feinberg Act inaugurates a major departure from our free public school system in this direction.

BOB BONE

Bob Bone is managing editor of *Anvil and Student Partisan*.

Interest and Membership

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

I Want to Join

I Want More Information

Name

Address

School

Resistance to the Garrison State

UNIVERSAL MILITARY training has been shelved for this session of Congress. The Truman administration's drive for a permanent conscription law to succeed Selective Service was halted by a House vote of 236 to 162, which sent the bill back to committee for "further study." This vote followed a complicated series of parliamentary maneuvers, and climaxed a bitter six-hour battle in which it appeared that UMT proponents might succeed in carrying a watered-down version of the bill. An analysis of the final vote reveals political trends of interest to those who oppose the evolution of American society into some form of garrison state.

Because of traditional American resistance to any proposal for permanent militarization, UMT is an especially sensitive political barometer. The reception accorded to UMT by Congress is a good indication of how far the winds of public opinion have veered from traditional republican forms in the direction of a garrison state. It seems reasonable, therefore, to read between the lines of the vote on UMT, and to examine various political tendencies for their deeper attitudes toward the garrison state.

Political Motivations Behind Vote

Three facts stand out in the vote: most Republicans opposed UMT; a good many Dixiecrats opposed it; and most liberals supported it. The Republicans voted five to one to kill UMT. The clue to Republican opposition can be found in the remarks of Representative Shafer of Michigan, inserted in the Congressional Record:

There has been repeated and unmistakable evidence that the schemes of the "social planners" are completely tied in with UMT, and that UMT is only the vestibule, the front hallway, leading into their larger plans for regimentation.

As for House Democrats, 131 voted with the Truman administration, while only 81 voted to kill UMT. But of these latter, 47 were Southerners. The Mississippi delegation in particular, led by John Rankin, was vocal in its opposition to the bill. The reason why this staunch upholder of white supremacy opposes UMT is no secret. He finds the sight of Negroes in military uniform offensive. He does not trust the military to maintain watertight segregation between white and colored troops. He is afraid that a few months' experience beyond the borders of God's own country might make returning Negro soldiers "uppity." Military effectiveness — not white supremacy — is the supreme value in the garrison state.

In contrast to the Dixiecrats, Congressional liberals overwhelmingly supported the administration forces. Of a list of twenty Congressmen, selected by an ADA member as the creme-de-la-creme of the 82nd Congress, — the twenty who nearly always vote "right," — only 5 voted to shelve UMT, while 15 voted with the administration! (With liberals, it's the garrison state, three to one.)

It is not that the liberal temporarily accepts the dangers of UMT (like the Korean War) as a "calculated risk." This argument can be used to defend selective service, but

not *permanent peacetime* conscription. It is rather that the liberal's sensibilities have become so dulled where the State is concerned that he does not even recognize UMT as a threat to democracy. He cannot achieve any perspective on the Leviathan he has helped to create. President Roosevelt, let us remember first asked for permanent peacetime conscription in his "State of the Union" address in January 1945, during the period of "Big Three Unity." Henceforth, in fair years or foul, in the halcyon days of the United Nations, or under the blackest shadows of the Korean war, Roosevelt's successor has persistently followed his example. UMT, and the Fair Deal's "permanent war prosperity," fit hand-in-glove.

The Congressional line-up on UMT confronts us with a paradox. Republicans and Dixiecrats — each for their own reasons — have balked at taking a major step toward the garrison state. Yet this opposition to UMT represents in part a loyalty to traditional values no longer relevant from Washington's point of view in a world permanently at war. Paradoxically, it is the old-line conservative (literally) who opposes the emergence of a garrison state, while the more flexible liberal is willing to experiment with political forms that he finds more suitable to the atomic age.

In tracing these political undercurrents, we should not lose perspective of what actually took place on Capitol Hill. There is a more obvious level of pressure-group politics through which these underlying forces assert themselves. On this level, the Truman administration, the Pentagon, and the American Legion battled it out with labor, farm, religious, and educational groups, — *and lost*. It was a victory for democracy, and especially for American youth.

BOB BONE

ANVIL Support Continues to Grow

THE EDITORS OF *Anvil and Student Partisan* welcome the endorsement of our magazine made by the Young People's Socialist League at its recent national convention. In addition to endorsing the magazine, the youth section of the Socialist Party adopted a vigorous third camp, anti-war position. The YPSL support of the magazine will go a long way in broadening the base of the magazine and in winning further support for our efforts to re-create a powerful student anti-war movement. Since its convention, members of the YPSL on campus have been selling *Anvil and Student Partisan*, are urging clubs in which they participate to sponsor the magazine and are attempting to organize a number of new anti-war student clubs.

In addition to YPSL endorsement, we are proud to announce the formation of a new broad, anti-war club at Antioch College, in Ohio, called *The News Perspectives*, which voted in favor of sponsoring *Anvil and Student Partisan*.

Spotlighting the National Campus Scene

Utah Students Defend Academic Freedom

THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF University Students for Academic Freedom is a very young organization, in the first stage of its development. It was founded by students at the University of Utah in January of this year as an answer to the recent growth of coercive practices against political dissenters — practices which have unhappily cast a shadow of fear over many college campuses in the United States. The founders believe that the association can provide valuable assistance to students and educators who are anxious to defend their academic liberties and their intellectual honesty against the rising tide of intimidation.

The portentous development of this basically un-American trend was previously indicated by the famous series of articles in the *New York Times* last May. Since then there have been several unrelated cases which appear to raise the issue of academic freedom. Among the more widely publicized are the case of a philosophy instructor at the University of Minnesota who seems to have been fired for his socialist leanings, and the restraints which have been imposed upon the highly regarded daily newspaper at the University of California as the result of two articles which were objectionable to the Board of Regents. These are representative of the coercive tactics which threaten to become the order of the day. They do not evidence an appreciation for freedom of thought in education, but spring from an attribution of evil to people with unpopular ideas. If this attitude persists unchallenged, academic integrity will be replaced by fear and suspicion.

Realizing this, the students of America must stand together in the first line of defense against political attacks on education. Undoubtedly they have the most to lose if our institutions of learning stifle under a blanket of enforced orthodoxy. Evidently they are not exposed to the same economic pressures which are frequently used to whip faculty members into line. The fact that most colleges are financially dependent upon their students while most students are financially independent of their colleges identifies the student as the most strategically situated guardian of academic freedom.

However, attempted violations of student and faculty rights tend to be successful because the offenders invariably enjoy an overwhelming preponderance of power over isolated victims. Although every violation has grave implications for the country at large, the responsible authority is usually secure in his own locality. It follows that the most effective way to resist isolated violations of academic freedom is through the effective coordination of national student support. This is the theory which produced the AAUSAF. It explains the function that the AAUSAF is prepared to assume, namely the distribution of academic freedom information by means of a newsletter to affiliates throughout the country. The *Academic Freedom Newsletter* will carry first hand information concerning alleged violations so that, when an incident occurs, students everywhere will know about it, will be able to correspond with one another, consider the facts and take joint action as may be necessary to meet the situation. It may be expected that the prospective glare of national student opinion will cause potential offenders to think twice before embarking upon a course of action which involves the abridgment of academic freedom.

On January 13th of this year, Justice William O. Douglas threw down the gauntlet to American students. In an article in the *New York Times*, he accused the present generation of "holding its tongue," and of abandoning its traditional role of revolt against orthodoxy. A few days later, a group of students at the University of Utah responded to his challenge, by launching the American Association of University Students for Academic Freedom, described by its founders in the accompanying article.

Two aspects of the new organization are worthy of comment: first, its spontaneous character. It has been initiated not from a traditional center of student militancy, but on a campus which, up to now, has been relatively inconspicuous in national student affairs. This augurs well for the broadest possible student support of the movement.

Secondly, the Utah students rest their defense of academic freedom on the firmest possible basis, from a student point of view. They appeal to American student not simply to defend this or that professor's right to teach, but in so doing, to defend the student's own right "to explore unorthodox ideas and express divergent opinions." Take away this right, and the student is literally deprived of a liberal education. Nothing less is at stake. With such a strong appeal to fundamental student values, the AAUSAF should experience rapid growth.

Anvil welcomes the advent of this new organization, in a crucial area of student concern. We urge our sponsoring groups to participate in the AAUSAF's "committees of correspondence," and our readers to cooperate to the utmost with its activities on behalf of academic freedom.

THE EDITORS

Since the time the original correspondence was sent to students at more than seven hundred colleges, the association has received a good deal of encouragement and student support. While the central office is set up to function in the capacity of an information service for its affiliates, local chapters of AAUSAF are presently being formed at many colleges. All such local units will naturally operate with complete autonomy.

Additional printed information and membership forms may be obtained by writing to:

American Association of University Students for Academic Freedom

1140 Kensington Avenue
Salt Lake City 5, Utah

JOHN H. NAISBITT
(President of the student body, University of Utah)

RICHARD L SKLAT
(Editor of College Forum, weekly journal of student opinion.)

Witch-Hunt Hysteria Hits Wayne University As Students Rally to Defend Rights

AN INTENDED COUP de grace was dealt the tortured residue of student rights at Wayne University when the House Un-American Activities Committee conducted its investigations in Detroit last February and March. This latest blow at Wayne's academic freedom, which was one of the most alarming consequences of the Detroit witch hunt, took the form of an arbitrary and unprecedented suspension of a student by Wayne president, Dr. David D. Henry. The student, Mrs. Lorraine Faxon Meisner, who was subpoenaed to testify before the committee because she allegedly attended the East Berlin Youth Rally, in the pattern of most other witnesses refused to answer many questions. Like other witnesses, she invoked the fifth amendment as the constitutional basis for her refusal. The Detroit press made special note of the fact that she giggled throughout her testimony. In a telegram sent after her appearance before the committee Dr. Henry announced her suspension, stating that her behavior was inconsistent with her obligations as a student and was "either unreasonable or prima facie evidence of criminal action." Two weeks later the Council of Deans upheld the president's move by expelling Mrs. Meisner.

As the most recent and most audacious violation of student rights at Wayne, this suspension of a student because of her political convictions was the culmination of a series of efforts to stifle freedom at the university. The administration's motivation in this instance was the same as in previous violations i.e., the appeasement of the state legislature from which Wayne seeks appropriations for new buildings. The first action of this kind occurred in 1947 when an AYD chapter was banned from Wayne's campus. Shortly after, all political and social action groups were tabooed. In 1950, Dr. Herbert Phillips, an avowed Communist and former professor at Washington University, dismissed because of his political opinions, was invited by the Student Council to deate a Wayne professor. Although Phillip's appearance on campus had been approved by the University Programs Planning Committee, an elected body of students and faculty members, a last-minute edict by President Henry prevented the debate from materializing. A few months later, Farrell Dobbs of the Socialist Workers Party was refused the use of university facilities after he had been invited to speak by a group of students.

Student Body Brought Back to Life

After each of the earlier violations since the banning of AYD there had been some opposition on the part of students to the autocratic policy of the administration. But it was not until the Meisner issue that a sufficient number

of students were roused from their apathy to make a resounding and meaningful roar of protest.

The protest acquired organization after a large initial group of liberals and socialists met off-campus and formed the Committee for Student Rights. At first there was indecision among the liberals concerning the question of Stalinist participation. Some thought it was undemocratic or irrelevant to exclude any political tendency. Gradually, however, enough members became aware of the need for clearly differentiating the group from the Stalinists for the committee to pass a resolution to that effect. The action by the committee was in vivid contrast to the handling of the Phillips case when a few Stalinists had captured the protest group, assuring its failure.

It was recognized from the beginning by most committee members that the suspended student would probably not be re-instated. However, it was also realized that unless a protest was made, there would be no limit to the gradual but persistent destruction of student rights.

After formulating its statement of purpose the committee proceeded to ask for statements from faculty members and well-known liberals throughout the nation. Telegrams were sent to Albert Einstein, John Dewey and others. The Student Council and the Detroit Federation of Teachers joined in the condemnation of the suspension. Flyers were distributed and petitions circulated.

A large street corner meeting held by the Stalinists and featuring two men who had testified before the Un-American Activities Committee, served only to create hostility among many students who failed to make a distinction between principled opposition to the suspension and the hypocritical indignation of the Stalinists.

Although the intentions of the Committee for Student Rights were good, its effectiveness suffered from organizational ineptness and a hesitancy which contrasted with the bold determination of the Administration. Having learned from its mistakes, the committee as a recognized campus organization, is now prepared to swing into militant and rapid action if and when a future violation occurs.

Despite the success of the administration in sustaining the suspension, this struggle for student rights at Wayne has significance since it should tend to prevent the recurrence of such outrages. It also has importance as still another reminder that students are unwilling to stand by while their rights are usurped one by one amidst the hysteria of a growing garrison state.

DON O'FARRELL

Don O'Farrell is a student at Wayne University.

Workers in Strike at Columbia Must Have Student Support

FOR THE PAST FEW weeks a "labor situation" has hit a New York campus, an Ivy League school, at that. The food and maintenance workers at Columbia University, organized by the Transport Workers Union have gone on strike for higher wages. The pay of these workers has averaged no more than \$40 per week. But the Columbia University administration evidently feels that any increase over this munificent sum would have a demoralizing effect on the institution as a whole.

The administration is giving the student body a lesson in scabbing and strikebreaking that can vie with the best courses it offers in Labor-Management Relations. A propaganda barrage has been unleashed against the strikers by the administration, and it has been discovered that unionism and education are not compatible institutions. The administration has gone to the extreme of hiring some miserable student scabs and paying them more than the prevailing wage rates!

We are certain that the majority of Columbia students sympathize with the strikers, despite the odious action of Student Council in condemning the attempt to unionize the workers. But mere sympathy is not enough. The students must be more vocal and organizationally active in their support of the underpaid cafeteria and maintenance workers. The Columbia *Spectator* has already shown the way with its pro-union editorials. The paper and the student body should follow through. It is okay to beat Harvard, to slaughter Princeton, to run through Yale, but there can be no honor in whipping the union.

JULIUS JACOBSON

News from the West Coast

UCLA Lifts *Anvil* Ban

In December, 1951, Dean Hahn at the University of California at Los Angeles placed a ban on the proposed sale of *Anvil* in the student bookstore. The ban followed two months negotiations on the part of the UCLA cell of the Fellowship of Reconciliation to get *Anvil* in the bookstore. The FOR group then took its fight to the campus

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*.

as a whole and to Student Council, which set up a committee to study the matter. In the midst of the growing fight, in which one student had pledged to test the ban by selling *Anvil* on campus and being expelled for doing so in order to get a court case, the administration reversed itself and lifted the ban.

UCLA Forms Civil Liberties Committee

A numbers of student organizations have formed an all-campus "Civil Liberties Committee" to work for the rights of political and religious groups to be decognized on campus. At the first meeting, a small Stalinist group attempted to gain a dominant role, but the liberals and radicals touned out in large numbers at the second meeting and carried all the seats on the steering committee. The first project of the group is to get a Student Commission set up to investiage alleged violations of student rights. The Berkeley campus, under the leadership of the SDA, is also forming such a group. The ACLU has expressed an interest in a possible court test of Regulation 17 which prohibits political and religious groups on either of the two state university campuses.

California Issues Student Paper

The Southwest Youth Section of the FOR is issuing a regular mimeographed paper — FOR-CAST — which will be sent to any interested student in the U.S. If you would like to learn more about the pacifist position and radical activities in Southern California, write to: FOR-CAST, 132½ Ashland Ave., Ocean Park, Calif.

Censorship at Iowa

EARLY THIS WINTER, a typical Greek-letter incident occurred at the State University of Iowa. Phi Gamma Nu, a sorority for professional women, refused to pledge a Negro girl. This refusal was admittedly based on racial prejudice, since the girls voted specifically to uphold an old policy of discrimination. After the vote, the president of the sorority resigned in protest; several "pledges" declined to join the organization; and one girl wrote a letter of protest to the campus paper, the *Daily Iowan*.

The *Iowan* promptly pigeon-holed the letter, refusing not once, but twice to carry it. The second refusal followed a visit made to the *Iowan* offices by a group of students who requested publication and queried the editor on his reasons for suppressing the news. The editor excused himself in terms of avoiding "irresponsible journalism," claiming that more time was needed to check the facts. He also expressed a fear of causing trouble, citing the Cicero riots in support of his fears.

The students responded by printing a handbill at their own expense, attacking the twin evils of racial disscrimination and censorship. Before permission for distributing the handbill could be obtained, the Associated Press got the

story about the sorority, and it was broadcast over the Cedar Rapids station. The next day, the story was carried by the newspapers, including the *Daily Iowan*, which also ran a reproduction of the handbill. The *Iowan* had suddenly discovered "new facts in the case"; they denied that the appearance of the story on their own AP wire had forced their hand. Simultaneously, President Hancher issued a statement to the press describing the university as "a salient in the battle lines against racial discrimination," but defending the right of groups and individuals to associate freely, — thus exhibiting the main talent required of a successful college president.

Students Unite Against Discrimination

The next line of action was to call a joint meeting of various student organizations, which was attended by unofficial representatives from the Young Republicans, Young Democrats, Young Progressives, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Committee on Racial Equality of the YMCA, United World Federalists, Student Christian Council, Peace Group of the YMCA, Town Men, and Applications Committee. At this meeting, several people verified the facts of the case, and evidence was presented which indicated that faculty pressure was largely responsible for the suppression of the story. In fact, this pressure had caused a shake-up on the *Iowan* staff some weeks earlier. The meeting voted to bring the matter up at the next official meeting of Student Council. Some of the individual organizations adopted resolutions, most of them weakly chiding the *Iowan* and the sorority. The NAACP was the most vigorous, calling for a university ban on all campus organizations that discriminate on racial grounds.

In mid-December the Student Council met, and after listening to arguments on both sides, defeated a motion to censure the *Iowan*. A second motion then carried which "cleared" the paper of the charge of censorship, but found it guilty of "some negligence." After a suggestion by a member of the journalism faculty that matters of alleged censorship should be presented to the Publications Committee (a student-faculty board), three students appeared before that committee to give their views. They were allowed to testify (each one separately, while the others waited outside), then were politely thanked, and just as politely ignored.

The whole episode at least resulted in rousing some students from their usual apathy. It provided a good outlet for the pent-up resentment of some foreign students, including Africans, against patterns of segregation all over America, and the official sanctions they receive. Furthermore, the issue provided a rallying point for students ranging from mildly liberal to radical, and a significant unity of action was achieved. Possibly this will set a precedent for more effective action in the future.

BARBARA GIBSON

Barbara Gibson is a student at the State University of Iowa.

Students Win Rights at Chicago

LATEST EVENT on the civil-liberties scene here was Student Government's creation of a "Campus Newspaper Advisory Commission" to over-see the Chicago *Maroon*, about which controversy has been raging since fall, when Dean of Students Robert M. Strozier dismissed Stalinist editor Alan Kimmel (allegedly for attending the Berlin Peace Congress, though other reasons were substituted later) and simultaneously suspended the *Maroon* from publication. (The ban was lifted after a week.)

An investigating committee of Student Government, after much deliberation, presented a compromise report recommending a strictly advisory board with no power to remove the editor or otherwise control the paper, but with what amount to inspection powers. It will receive and investigate complaints of violation of the *Maroon* constitution (the clauses on free entry to the staff and no removal without due cause) and may print its findings on such cases, together with general journalistic criticisms, at reasonable length in the *Maroon* itself. However, Student Government removed from the commission its proposed powers as a referring board or "lower court" — it can no longer pass directly on to the Student-Faculty-Administration Court its findings on a case, though it may presumably give informal assistance to individuals with legitimate grievances. Incidentally, no case of grievance (on the open-entry and no-removal clauses) was discovered through the hearings on the situation.

When the investigation began, a sizeable bloc of opinion in Independent Student League, the liberal-coalition majority party (see *Anvil*, Winter, 1951) favored a quite stringent control board, but later hesitated on the dangers of this and finally supported the merely advisory board. The staff of the *Maroon* for the most part opposed any board; the new (non-Stalinist) editor Martin Orans argued to the investigators that any board would constitute an opening for suppressive forces to use in the future, when a new round of rightward moves by the administration may develop.

The *Maroon* action follows the success of the Student Government stand on an earlier question — recognition of the Labor Youth League. The administration held up recognition of L.Y.L. on the ground that it might be "illegal". After much pressure on the Student Government, and much behind-the-scenes finagling on both sides, Dean Strozier allowed S.G.'s recognition to stand. (The Dean holds veto power over recognition of student groups.)

On these two major issues of the year, thus, liberal elements in the student body have held the line with fair solidity against administration encroachments. Barring a serious increase of pressure from "the outside," or a collapse of morale in the liberal student groups active in campus politics, this year may prove to have been a turning point. A group including several members of the Politics Club who sit in S.G. is currently trying to draw campus attention to the need for continuity in policy on the part of the Independent Student League and other political organizations if the line is to be held during the summer and on into next year.

Can Asia Avert Totalitarianism?

An Indian Leader's Challenge to the Western World

NO ONE IS EXPECTED to give an assured answer to this sixty-four dollar question. How Asia will meet Communism does not depend on it alone. It depends upon a variety of factors, over some of which at least Asia has no direct control at present. It depends in particular on the policies adopted by Western powers towards Asia. If they continue their present forms of imperialism — no doubt milder than the earlier — and treat the Asian people as mere pawns in a game of power politics, Asia will have no reason to join one side or the other.

Asia at present is far more interested in economic justice and racial equality than in taking sides in the power struggle. Russia is succeeding in convincing many Asians that it alone among the great powers of the world stands for racial equality and economic justice. However, even the illiterate masses of Asia are slowly coming to realize that Communism has no respect for individuals, and that it treats the individual merely as a cog in the wheel. But the Asian is caught on the horns of a dilemma — coercive Communism on the one side and coercive imperialism on the other, with neither of which he is in sympathy. He finds that no sooner were Japanese militarism and totalitarianism put down by the joint efforts of the East and West, than the imperial powers, with substantial American assistance, returned to Indonesia, Indo-China, and Malaya to continue their exploitation and oppression.

As for their racial practices, the Western democracies, more than any other powers, have made Asia color-conscious and race-conscious. When early European settlers landed in India and China they were treated as welcome visitors. But in the course of time they lost this confidence because of their color-complex. Not having learnt a lesson from earlier follies, Western powers are now assiduously propagating the myth that the present world struggle is an East-West struggle, insinuating thereby that all that is tricky and brutal comes from the East. The bulk of Soviet Russia may be in the continent of Asia, but her philosophy, social institutions, and statecraft are predominantly Western. Machiavelli, Hobbes, and Marx, who are the philosophical progenitors of the Russian state system, were not Orientals. To many in Asia, the present power struggle is not an East-West struggle, but a West-West struggle into which Asians are drawn, often against their own wishes.

It is an irony of our day that without a shooting war, Communism has spread its tentacles over a considerable part of the world. While before World War II, only about 200 million people lived under the Communist regime, the number today is 800 million. The most significant gains have been made in Asian lands. To assume that this phenomenal spread is due to the cleverness and strategy of

Stalin and his *politburo* is to give them far more credit than is due.

Many in the Orient are giving heed to the seductive appeal of Communism for a variety of reasons. No part of the world has such abject poverty and oppressive landlordism as does Asia. An overwhelming majority of the people are underfed, poorly clothed, and ill-housed. Illiteracy reigns supreme in many parts of Asia. To people living under these conditions, freedom and democracy mean little unless they are translated into concrete economic terms.

Asia's Economic Needs

The Government of India today has laudable schemes for the improvement of the economic conditions of the masses. There is a five-year plan and there are several river valley projects comparable to the T.V.A. But for the most part they remain only on paper. Year follows year and plan follows plan: but hunger, starvation, and unemployment stalk the land. Nehru himself is a man of courage and vision. But he does not have the necessary number of able and selfless lieutenants to carry through a bold, new program. He is excellent in his analysis of the present situation in India and the world at large. But when it comes to action he seems paralysed. The forces of reaction are too strong.

What does all this mean for the West? To tell the starving Asian that living conditions are infinitely better in the U.S.A. than in Soviet Russia, and that individual freedom is more respected in the former country than in the latter, is a mockery. The Asian knows that he cannot have the American economic "paradise" in his life time. But he is willing to listen to the Communist, so long as he promises to abolish landlordism and money-lending at exorbitant rates of interest, and give him better living conditions, even if that means going through a blood-bath which he foolishly hopes will be only for a little while. The young intellectual in Asia is attracted by such Communist slogans as "planned production for community consumption" and earnestly believes that Communism provides him a channel for human idealism which he claims modern democracy has failed to do. He tends to regard democracy as mercenary and corrupt, where material gains not infrequently are the monopoly of the crafty and the well-organized pressure groups in society.

Without even shooting a gun, Communism will continue to make inroads in Asia if the *bourgeois* parties in the Western countries do not wake up in time and speedily set their houses in order. One reason why North Korea was able to win the affection of the people in the early stages of the struggle at least is that while the American occupation authorities and the South Korean government were

dilly-dallying with the question of land distribution, the North Korean government promptly proceeded to attack it as its No. 1 problem. It is likewise naive to assume that Chiang Kai-shek and the Nationalists lost out because they did not receive adequate military support from the United States. The fact of the matter is that the core of the regime became rotten, and nothing on earth could have saved the outer covering.

Challenge to the West

Can the West redeem its mistakes of the past? The present policy of the Western powers to cover the entire face of the world with military alliances and bases is short-sighted and suicidal. Even a man like Dulles realizes that 25,000 miles of Maginot line cannot assure peace and security. When the testing time comes, it is bound to crumble. Communism cannot be stopped by guns. It can only be stopped by concerted and immediate steps being taken to improve the living conditions of the masses. The fundamental conflict in Asia today is not a conflict between rival ideologies. It is a conflict between persons or systems that offer one meal a day and those that offer a meal and a half a day.

It is a truism to say that if you want to stop Communism, you must stop poverty. The problem may appear stupendous, but it is worth trying to solve. It is better to fail in an endeavor which will ultimately succeed than to succeed in an endeavor such as militarism which will ultimately fail. The first requisite of world peace, and the primary way of stopping Communism, is a world-wide economic and social program, to the successful prosecution of which every country, friend and foe, will be invited to make its generous contribution. As the Woffords assert in *India Afire*, Point IV must become Point I of American and world policy. These should be hundreds of Horace Holmeses with a missionary zeal and passion, giving themselves to meeting the basic needs of the common man.

If Asia is to turn its back upon Communism and give its loyal and whole-hearted support to the Western world, it is a folly to tie military provisions to any economic aid. Economic aid given under a Mutual Security Act may sound altogether reasonable to Americans; but Asians do not view it in the same light. Already the governments of Burma and Iran and the Moslem party of Indonesia have raised their voice of dissent to any form of Mutual Security Aid. Negotiations have been completed for a grant of fifty million dollars to India under this act. But it is not made clear whether any military involvements are implied. If America insists on military alliances, the granting of bases, and the sale of strategic materials as conditions of economic aid, the characteristic Asian answer will be "You keep your money and we keep our self-respect." Asian countries which have only recently acquired their political freedom after years of struggle are not too keen to place their necks under any form of imperialism, however gentlemanly it may appear.

In the contest with Communism, Asia cannot be expected to get red hot in its feelings, so long as the Western powers perpetrate imperialism in Indo-China and Malaya. hold on to such possessions as Hongkong, Pondicherry, and

Goa, place a stigma upon the limited number of Asians who may desire to settle in Australia and New Zealand, or practice racialism of the worst kind, as in South Africa. The cry of the democratic countries is further bound to fall on deaf Asian ears so long as arms and ammunitions are poured into the laps of Chiang Kai-shek in preparing him to invade the mainland of China when the suitable time comes. Many in India who cannot be accused of being pro-Communist believe that China has greater claim to Formosa than the U.S.A. has to Hawaii. It is also their belief that the current American policy in relation to China is one of aiding and abetting a civil war and closing one's eyes to realities. Many in India who believe in the wonderful capacity of the Chinese people for adaptation hold that if China were not pushed around as much as it is today, it might eventually evolve an economy and philosophy of its own which would be part-time capitalist and democratic, and part-time Communist and totalitarian, but all the time Chinese, even as in its religious loyalty China is part-time Confucian, part-time Buddhist, and part-time Taoist.

In Event of Invasion

The question in which most Americans are interested is, will Asia, with American military assistance, be prepared to take up arms against a possible Communist invasion? Here again, there is no one answer. Different Asian countries may adopt different policies. The present ruling classes in such countries as the Philippines and Siam primarily in their own self-interest, may readily take up arms. Many in India and Burma are likely to say that modern warfare is a luxury which they cannot afford. They will argue that World War II pushed them off their slender economic margin from which they have not yet recovered, and that World War III will push them into an abyss from which they cannot hope to rise during the lifetime of any one living. They may even say that when two big giants like Russia and the U.S.A. come to blows with each other, it is wise for little fellows like themselves to keep out.

If India is directly invaded by the Communists, Nehru is bound to use his armed forces. He may even make a frantic appeal to the United Nations. But the best course in keeping with the demonstrated efficacy of the non-violent program and policy of Mahatma Gandhi will be to practice *Satyagraha* or soul force, using such weapons as non-cooperation, civil disobedience, and refusal to pay taxes, without ever entertaining any kind of bitterness towards the invader and oppressor. The Indian has a mystic faith that when the testing time comes God will raise a person such as Vinoba Bhave to lead the non-violent struggle. India, being at least half-pacifist, first thinks of negotiation, mediation, conciliation and non-violence as instruments befitting human dignity, and only secondarily thinks of armed intervention.

Because of long years of racialism which the West has practiced against the East, the Orientals, in spite of their national differences and jealousies, have a certain amount of fellow-feeling towards each other. This being so, Chinese aggression is likely to be less resented than Russian aggression. The Oriental may have a blind faith that it

will be easier for him to work out a compromise with a fellow-Oriental than with an Occidental. This fact partly explains the rejoicing of many an Asian person when Japan invaded South-east Asia and drove away the European before him. If Japan had not become as grasping and aggressive and brutal as it turned out to be, it would have enjoyed the affection and gratitude of Asians for a long time.

A further fact to note in forecasting the reaction of Asia to Communist invasion is the half-fatalistic outlook of many Asians. They can be roused to action when they can be given a dynamic faith in a cause as was done under Gandhi. But very few of them will be prepared to throw away their lives in order to make the world safe for British and French imperialists, American militarists, South-African race-baiters or Australian advocates of a 'white Australia policy.' If told that the alternative of Russian and Chinese totalitarianism is bound to be infinitely worse, the immediate reaction of the Asian is to shrug his shoulders and say that it is a Hobson's choice so far as he is concerned.

Imperialism Must Go

Asians at present are generally lukewarm towards the West in its frantic efforts in building a dyke against the Communist tide. One chief reason for it is the systematic way in which even today the West ignores Asian people and their trusted leaders in planning for the future of Asia. It is like a person building a beautiful nest of his own in which a passing bird may lay its eggs and hatch the young ones for him to play with. If the West is not careful, the West may build the nest, but the East will refuse to lay the eggs.

What consultation there is should be effective, taking into account the psychology of the people and their fears and suspicions as well as their felt needs. Rightly or wrongly, much of the East believes in a considerable amount of state action and a middle economy. Increasing numbers in India believe in a decentralized Gandhian socialism.

The FIGHT for SOCIALISM

by Max Shachtman

A basic primer in the principles and program of Independent Socialism

\$1.00

Cloth-bound \$2.00

INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST PRESS

114 W. 14th Street

New York 11, N. Y.

Therefore, to preach to them the virtues of a Simon-pure capitalism is a waste of breath. Asians must be given a full opportunity to work out their own salvation. They resent being considered the wards of anybody. When Mr. Warren Austin exclaims "We will not abandon Asia to tyranny," the Asian asks, "When did he become my godfather?"

If Asia in general and India in particular, which is a middle or third power in Asia, are to be understood aright, it is well for Americans to realize that we are 100% opposed to imperialism, whatever the brand may be, and that we are at least half-spiritual, half-pacifist, half-socialist, and half-fatalist.

Charles Malik of Lebanon is completely right when he says: "Communism cannot be met by a mere *naï*; it requires a mighty *yea*." The "mighty *yea*" calls for the surrender of every vestige of imperialism and colonial exploitation and of racialism and racial inequality, the respect of people as people, disinterested economic and technical assistance on a scale undreamt of hitherto, and the fast replacing of war, violence, and strife by non-violence, love, and peace with freedom and justice.

DR. EDDY ASIRVATHAM

Dr. Eddy Asirvatham was, until recently, head of the Department of Political Science and Public Administration at the University of Madras, and is now Professor of Mission and Christian International Relations at Boston University.

If you. . . .

Oppose the imperialist maneuvers of both the American and Russian war blocs. . . .

Want to do something about building a democratic socialist movement in America. . . .

Believe in the rights of students to organize on campus according to their political beliefs. . . .

then, your place is with the SOCIALIST YOUTH LEAGUE

Youth Section of the Independent
Socialist League

For more information about the Socialist Youth League and for sample copies of *The New International and Labor Action*, America's leading socialist publications fill out the blank below and mail to:

SOCIALIST YOUTH LEAGUE

114 West 14th Street

New York 11, N. Y.

Name

Address

School

Southern Myth and William Faulkner

Effects of Tradition on Faulkner's Artistic Development

UNTIL VERY RECENTLY, regional consciousness has remained stronger in the South than in any other part of the United States. This "historical lag" is the source of whatever is most distinctive in Southern thought and feeling. After its defeat in the Civil War, the South could not participate fully and freely in the "normal" development of American society — that is, industrialism and large-scale capitalism arrived there later and with far less force than in the North or West. By the Reconstruction period New England regional consciousness was in decline and by the turn of the century the same was probably true for the Midwest; but the South, because it was a pariah region or because its recalcitrance in defeat forced the rest of the nation to treat it as such, felt its sectional identity most acutely during the very decades when the United States was becoming a self-conscious nation. While the other regions meekly submitted to dissolution, the South worked desperately to keep itself intact. Through an exercise of the will, it insisted that the regional memory be the main shaper of its life.

Perhaps because it had so little else to give its people, the South nurtured in them a generous and often obsessive sense of the past. The rest of the country might be committed to commercial expansion or addicted to the notion of progressive optimism, but the South, even if it cared to, was unable to accept these dominant American values; it had been left behind, it was living on the margin of history — a position that often provides the sharpest perspective on history. During the decades that followed the defeat of the South, its writers could maintain a relation to American life comparable, in miniature, to the relation in the nineteenth century between Russian writers and European life. For while nineteenth-century Russia was the most backward country on the continent, its writers managed to use that backwardness as a vantage-point from which to observe west-European life and thereby to arrive at a profound and withering criticism of bourgeois morality. Precisely because Russia was trailing the capitalist West, the Russian writers could examine the bourgeois code without hesitation or illusion. It was this crucial advantage of distance, this perspective from the social rear, that was the major dispensation the South could offer its writers.

And it gave them something else: a compact and inescapable subject. The Southern writer did not have to cast about for his materials, he hardly enjoyed a spontaneous choice in his use of them, for they welled within him like a dream recurrent since childhood. Faulkner has given a

vivid if somewhat romantic description of this subject in *Intruder in the Dust*:

... For every Southern boy fourteen years old, not once but whenever he wants it, there is the instance when it's still not two o'clock on that July afternoon in 1863, the brigades are in position behind the rail fence, the guns are laid and ready in the woods and the furled flags are already loosened to break out and Pickett himself with his long oiled ringlets and his hat in one hand probably and his sword in the other looking up the hill waiting for Longstreet to give the word and it's all in the balance, it hasn't happened yet, it hasn't even begun. . .

But of course it has happened, it must begin. The basic Southern subject is the defeat of the homeland, though its presentation can vary from the magnolia romancing of *The White Rose of Memphis* to the despairing estimate of social loss in *The Sound and the Fury*. Nor does it matter, for the moment, whether one defines the Southern subject, in Allen Tate's words, as "the destruction by war and the later degradation by carpetbaggers and scalawags, and a consequent lack of moral force and imagination in the cynical materialism of the New South," or as the defeat of a reactionary slaveowning class followed by its partial recapture of power through humiliating alliances with Northern capital and a new scrofulous commercial class of local origin. Regardless of which interpretation one accepts, the important point is that this subject, like a thick cloud of memory, has been insistently and implacably *there*. The Southern writer could romanticize it, reject it, enlarge it into an image of the general human situation; he could not escape it. And precisely this ubiquity of subject matter provided him with some very considerable advantages. Not so long before the Civil War, Hawthorne had remarked that "No author can conceive of the difficulty of writing a romance about a country where there is no shadow, no antiquity, no picturesque and gloomy wrong, not anything but a commonplace prosperity." But now the War and Reconstruction gave the Southern writers all that Hawthorne had found lacking: all but antiquity. And there were ruins to take the place of that.

It was not until the First World War, however, that serious Southern writing began to appear — that is, not until Southern regional consciousness began to decay. One reason for this lag was simply that before the 1910's and 1920's there had not been enough money in the South to send many young people to college or to encourage them in such social luxuries as literary careers. A land bent by defeat was not likely to turn to letters with an urgent passion or enthusiasm. Nor could the South look back upon

a serious literary tradition of its own, certainly none comparable to that of New England; ante-bellum Southern writing had for the most part been sentimental, genteel, and insipid. Its talented men had given themselves to politics and oratory, and had looked upon literature as a minor pastime hardly sufficient to engage their intellectual capacities. Only some decades later, when the most sensitive minds of the South would be appalled by the Snopesian vulgarity of its politics, would they turn to the arts half in hope, half in desperation.

For it was the reality of twentieth-century life, in all its coarse provocation, which drove so many Southern writers to a regional past that in happier circumstances they might have peaceably neglected. The mottoes of Southern agrarianism were hardly to be taken seriously as social proposals for the most industrialized country in the world, but as signs of a fundamental quarrel with modern life, an often brilliant criticism of urban anonymity, they deserved very much to be taken seriously.

Before the Southern writers could make imaginative statements about their own past, they had to be exposed to intellectual drafts from beyond their regional horizon. Southern literature at its best — the work of Faulkner, Caldwell, Ransom, Tate, Warren — was conceived in an explosive mixture of provincialism and cosmopolitanism, tradition and modernity. To measure the stature of their ancestor Poe, the Southern writers had first to understand what he had meant to Baudelaire, and for that they had to possess a sophisticated awareness of the European literary past. For the Southern imagination to burst into high flame it had to be stimulated, or irritated, by the pressures of European and Northern ideas and literary modes. Left to itself, a regional consciousness is not likely to result in anything but a tiresome romanticizing of the past and thereby a failure to understand the present. Once, however, the South reached that point where it still remained a distinct region but was already cracking under alien influences, it could begin to produce serious work of art. As Allen Tate has shrewdly remarked, the distinctive Southern "consciousness is quite temporary. It has made possible the curious burst of intelligence that we get at the crossing of the ways, not unlike, on an infinitesimal scale, the outburst of poetic genius at the end of the sixteenth century when commercial England had already begun to crush feudal England." What Tate seems to be saying here is that Southern literature assumed a dimension of seriousness and grandeur only when the South as a region began to die, when its writers were forced to look back upon a past that was irretrievable and forward to a future that seemed intolerable.

It is therefore insufficient to say, as many critics do, that Faulkner is a traditional moralist drawing his creative strength from the Southern myth; the truth is that he writes in opposition to his tradition as well as in acceptance, that he struggles with the Southern myth even as he acknowledges and celebrates it. His relation to his own beliefs is far more ambivalent and difficult than was the case for most nineteenth-century American writers. We may safely assume that Melville and Whitman, in their major work, were moved by the democratic yearnings of

nineteenth-century America; one feels of *Moby Dick* and *Leaves of Grass* that they are books written with the resources of an entire age behind them. Melville's epic conceptions and Whitman's rolling declamations follow, in part, from their adherence to a myth that is still viable and therefore likely to stir men to dedicated action. Faulkner, however, is working with the decayed fragments of a myth, the somewhat soured pieties of regional memory, and that is why his language is so often tortured, forced, and even incoherent. Unquestionably Faulkner has been influenced by Melville, but in their uses of language one can see reflected the difference between a belief still vigorous and a belief picking at its own bones. Yeats's definition of rhetoric as the will doing the work of the imagination is pertinent to both Melville and Faulkner, but particularly to Faulkner. For what is the soft shapeless rhetoric of *Sartoris* but the sign of a strained will floundering in sentimentality, and what is the agonized rhetoric of *Absalom, Absalom* but the sign of a strained will confronted with its own intolerably acute awareness?

What then is the Southern myth? Like any other myth, it is a story or cluster of stories that expresses the deepest attitudes and reflects the most fundamental experiences of a people. And its subject, in this case, is the fate of a ruined homeland. The homeland — so the story goes — had proudly insisted that it alone should determine its destiny; provoked into a war impossible to win, it had nevertheless fought to its last strength; and it had fought this war with a reckless gallantry and a superb heroism that, as Faulkner might say, made of its defeat not a shame but almost a vindication. But the homeland fell, and from this fall came misery and squalor: the ravaging by the conquerors, the loss of faith among the descendants of the defeated, and the rise of a new breed of faceless men who would fatten on their neighbors' humiliation.

From these stories there follows that pride in ancestral glory and that mourning over the decline of the homeland which comprise the psychology of the "lost cause." Thus, for one intermittently Southern writer, John Peale Bishop, the South found its highest distinction in "a manner of living somewhat more amiable than any other that has ever been known on the continent." And for another Southern writer, Allen Tate, the South is the one place that "clings blindly to forms of European feeling and conduct that were crushed by the French Revolution." Where else, he asks, "outside of the South, is there a society that believes even covertly in the Code of Honor?"

A myth which pervades a people's imagination is hardly open to rational attack or defense, particularly when it is considered as part of a work of literature. The historian, no doubt, would have to compare the claims of the Southern myth with the actual course of Southern history. He would evaluate the tradition and order so often ascribed to the old South; inquire exactly for whom its way of living could be somewhat more amiable; speculate on the extent to which the Southern emphasis on honor and heroism may often have been a means of salvaging pride from defeat or a token of uncertainty about the moral value of its cause. And if our historian were inclined to moral reflection he might ask the one question that by its very

nature the myth cannot tolerate: granted heroism, granted honor, was the homeland defending a just cause? For the critic these questions, while important, are not the crux of the matter, since it is hardly necessary to take a face value or even give substantial credence to the claims of the Southern myth — I certainly do not — in order to acknowledge the powerful uses to which it can be put by a sympathetic imagination. The Southern myth, like any other myth, is less attempt at historical description than a voicing of the collective imagination, perhaps of the collective will. The old South over which it chants in threnody is an ideal image — a buried city, Allen Tate has called it. Both the violence and the poignancy with which this ideal image has been employed suggest an awareness that the buried city can never be found.

Such myths form the raw material of literature. The writer often comes to a myth eager for acquiescence, but after articulating its assumptions he may begin to wonder about its meaning, its value. During the past few decades Northern writers have been engaged in a large-scale examination of the myths of industrial capitalism, of enterprise, accumulation, and success; the rejection of these

myths has motivated a great many contemporary writers. Somewhat similarly, Faulkner in his stories and novels has been conducting a long, sometimes painful and at other times heroic examination of the Southern myth. He has set his pride in the past against his despair over the present, and from this counterposition has come much of the tension in his work. He has investigated the myth itself; wondered about the relation between the Southern tradition he admires and that memory of Southern slavery to which he is compelled to return; tested not only the present by the past, but also the past by the myth and finally the myth by that morality which has slowly emerged from this entire process of exploration. This testing of the myth, though by no means the only important activity in Faulkner's work, is basic to the Yoknapatawpha novels and stories; and from it comes his growing vision as an artist.

IRVING HOWE

Irving Howe is a free lance writer and author of Sherwood Anderson and The UAW and Walter Reuther. The above article is a part of his book, William Faulkner, which will appear in July, 1952.

A MESSAGE TO READERS OF ANVIL

Eight months ago, without fanfare, a new publication was born.

It promised to print the many stories and articles that most newspapers and magazines **dare not publish** because they might bring forth pressure group reprisals or advertising cancellations.

In short, it promised to dig out and publish "inside stories" which would have no other possible way to reach the American people.

The name of the publication is **EXPOSE'**.

Said our statement of policy:

"... Expose' will do battle with frauds, whether they be people or products. Expose' will fight bigotry. It will spotlight all who would destroy our freedoms — whether they be Communists or the '100% Americans' who would adopt Communist methods in their pretended fight against Communism.

Expose' is independent and liberal, as the great majority of the American people are independent and liberal.

Hundreds of exciting stories and articles have already appeared in Expose':

*The Prescription Racket by Edmond Dickson. . . *Religion and the Press. . . *The Truth About Winchell (the 80,000 copy seller that inspired the New York Post series). . . *Life Insurance, the most for your money by Sidney Margolius (former shopping editor of PM). . . *Anatomy of the Murder-Mystery by G. Legman. . . *extracts from Tom Paine and Robert G. Ingersoll. . . and — articles by noted attorney Arthur Garfield Hays, Billy Rose, Robert Ludlow (associate editor of *The Catholic Worker*), Rep. Adam Clayton Powell, and so forth.

We have published stories that newspapers wouldn't touch on the activities of CORE, the Fellowship of Reconciliation, and other pro-American anti-war groups.

In the current issue (#6) we feature stories on the four Doty brothers who are in prison for their novel rejection of the draft. . . . and of Ammon Hennacy who for nine years has refused to pay income tax because "most of the tax goes for the upkeep of war."

We are now working on a most unusual issue, one that will present all sides of **The Coming American Socialism** — presenting first-hand views by people on all sides of the question.

Expose' is a monthly — but hopes to publish twice a month when our subscriptions reach a break-even level.

Begin your subscription now by using the coupon below.

SUBSCRIPTION COUPON

EXPOSE', Dept. A

56 West 55th Street, New York 19, N. Y.

I want to subscribe to Expose'. Please send me

() the next 21 issues for which I enclose \$3

() the next 11 issues for which I enclose \$2.

Name

Address

City..... Zone..... State.....

Conformity, Inequality and Fraternity

Habits and Curriculum of the Campus Fraternity

AT MOST AMERICAN universities, fraternities and sororities are living-groups. These living-groups have a number of things in common: their values, their internal structure, their effect upon members, and their function in the campus society. These things which most fraternities and sororities have in common make them a cohesive organism, a whole which is usually referred to as the "fraternity system."

In the course of the controversy occasioned by the "fraternity system" in recent years, it has been assumed both by its champions and adversaries that it fulfills a unique function on the campus. Few people, however, have been willing to analyze this function. The present article is not an attempt at long overdue scientific analysis, for such an analysis would require careful documentation from many campuses. The purpose of this article is rather to discuss certain traits which seem significant, and to indicate directions in which further study might be fruitful. Fraternities alone are mentioned, because the name is more commonly used to designate the whole — in most cases, what applies to fraternities is equally true of sororities.

A fraternity, it has been said, is above all a form of living. When asked about the purpose of such a group, most fraternity men will answer that it teaches people to get along together; that it teaches social manners and rules of good behavior; that it provides a congenial atmosphere for college students; that it teaches a desirable system of values: loyalty to the group, honesty, truthfulness, courage, etc.; consequently, that it prepares students to become successful members of society and good citizens.

Values of the "Brothers" and "Sisters"

Such are, more or less, the claims of *all* living groups on the campus; what makes them differ among one another is a difference in the interpretation of terms and a difference in emphasis. A clue to the interpretation of values in the fraternity system is its internal hierarchy, in which some fraternities are rated high on the scale, others low. For example, the Sigma Chi fraternity or Chi Omega sorority are rated as superior and socially desirable, whereas fraternities such as Tau Kappa Epsilon or Theta Chi are lost somewhere on the bottom of the list. The criterion on which such a rating system is built is based mainly on the fraternity's role in intramural sports, dating and participation in "activities," in decreasing order of importance. The fraternity must rank high in intramural contests; a sorority must be sought after for dates — often a situation develops in which fraternity men "date" the sorority rather than the individual girls — and it is good if the members of the fraternity participate in "activities" — usually musicals, yearbooks, humor magazines; activities,

that is, which demand little intellectual exertion, creativeness or sense of social responsibility. Very few engage in political activity — whether conservative, liberal or radical — in serious artistic or intellectual creation. In such a society built on a limited range of thought and activity, the interests of the members are obviously limited. The scope of the fraternity product is necessarily restricted to social activities, and this on a very impersonal, abstract level — one does not go out with Jean Smith, one "dates a Kappa." Most other activities are also subordinated to this criterion of social prestige: sex is competitive and impersonalized, one "makes" girls like one scores points in a contest, one collects "activities" not for their own sake but for the sake of accumulating them. As a result of this, the code of behavior is not so much based on the value of the action as such to the person but rather on the social prestige that may be derived from it.

Discriminatory Practices in Fraternities

The fraternity system maintains this pattern of values, interests and activities by an elaborate machinery of defense against outside influences on the one hand, and of enforcement of conformity on the other. Fraternities have become notorious by their discriminatory devices more than by anything else. To this date only very few accept Negro and Jewish members, and many have "quotas" for Catholics. In addition the "rushing" committees of the fraternity usually prefer "pledges" who do not differ too much from themselves, in terms of background, appearance or interests. This preliminary selection is buttressed later by a system of mystical initiation ceremonies and social pressures, an internal hierarchy and numerous regulations. It is well-known that if one wishes to join a fraternity one passes through the "pledge" stage, from which one emerges after a variable period of time — usually one semester — to the status of "active". During the pledge stage one has fewer rights and more duties than the active. It is a sort of trial period in which unreconstructed non-conformists can be weeded out and the other pledges cast into the mold of the respective fraternities. This is obtained by breaking as much as possible whatever individual characteristics there are that conflict with the pattern; the techniques are the time-honored ones of repression, and differ only in degree from those used in the Army. The significance of hazing, paddling, "hell-week", is the enforcement of conformity — if the pledge "can take it" he will make a good fraternity member. Today the trend is, however, towards replacing outright brutality with subtler forms of repression: pledges are made to perform menial work for the actives; or they are required to eat directly from the dish with the hands folded behind the back; or

to walk around the campus carrying signs; or to sing and dance before the group at meals; in short, any number of senseless and humiliating tasks which are designed to tear apart their personality before it is put together again to fit the prevailing pattern.

The Social Graces -- Frat Style

The result of this process is people that closely resemble each other in outward appearance, behavior, outlook, mental and emotional scope. To some degree these people are interchangeable, as proved by the dating system practiced between fraternities and sororities, especially by the custom of "blind dating" -- obviously it matters not so much who the girl is one goes out with as long as she meets the accepted requirements of the system: pastel-colored angora sweater, woolen skirt, white socks, saddle shoes, breasts, member of a high-ranking sorority, the accepted set of facial expressions, epilated, deodorized, manicured, and without too much pretense at intelligence lest she scare her date.

It would appear, then, that "loyalty to the group" in the fraternity system means first and foremost "conformity to the group." As far as the goal of "learning to get along together" goes, it is undoubtedly fulfilled since it is easy for people to get along together when there is no noticeable difference between them. If, however, the term is to have any meaning, "getting along together" should be a desirable achievement for groups and individuals that are *different*. In this respect the fraternities fail. To begin with they restrict themselves by racial and religious discrimination to a selected group which in turn is "purged" from potential diversity and hence from disturbing influences. What remains is drawn from the Anglo-Saxon, protestant middle class of merchants, wealthy farmers, business executives, bureaucrats, and professional men described in *Middletown*, of which Ruth Benedict says:

Eccentricity is more feared than parasitism. Every sacrifice of time and tranquillity is made in order that no one in the family may have any taint of non-conformity attached to him. Children in school make their great tragedies out of not wearing a certain kind of stockings, not joining a certain dance class, not driving a certain car. The fear of being different is the dominating motivation recorded in *Middletown*.*

The consequence of this is not "getting along together" but, on the contrary, a great deal of mistrustful provincialism and of hostility against anything different. This hostility is usually stronger in the fraternities which are low on the social scale, and sometimes assumes extreme forms of snobbishness. The fraternities which are rated higher are, as a general rule, more secure and can afford more normal behavior.

Two Main Functions

From the fraternity point of view these considerations are irrelevant, however, since the traits described above contribute to the fulfillment of its two main functions, which are to create an artificial elite in a traditionally

* Ruth Benedict, *Patterns of Culture*, New American Library, p. 252.

democratic society, and to train the faceless, irresponsible class of obedient specialists which the managerial state demands. This latter function is well described by William H. Whyte Jr. in *Life* magazine of January 7th, 1952. In his article *The Wife Problem*, a discussion of the ideal wife for the up-and-coming business executive, he says:

(management) knows exactly what kind of wife it wants. With remarkable uniformity of phrasing, corporation officials all over the country sketch the ideal. In her simplest terms she is a wife who (1) is highly adaptable (2) is highly gregarious (3) realizes her husband belongs to the corporation.

Are the corporation specifications presumptuous? It would appear not. The fact is that this kind of wife is precisely what our schools and colleges -- and U.S. society in general -- seems to be giving the corporation. (my emphasis--A.D.)

In this context it is also significant that fraternity students have often been used by corporations or small business men to break up radical meetings, CORE actions or labor strikes -- two instances are typical: the breaking of a CORE sit-down strike against a discriminatory restaurant by the football team at the University of Kansas in 1949, and the breaking of a telephone operators strike in Los Angeles by sorority girls who were employed by the company for the duration of the strike at half the wages normally paid to the striking operators. As a general rule, few of the participants in such actions understand what they are doing and no doubt conceive of themselves as standard bearers of the American Way of Life.

The Minority Group Fraternities

The fraternities are not alone on the campus. There are the university dormitories and the co-ops. There are also the minority group fraternities. The latter are a somewhat related phenomenon and deserve close attention. They are, in the main, the Negro and Jewish fraternities and sororities. These organizations are structurally quite similar to the ordinary fraternities, but have a few progressive traits -- sometimes young "house-parents" instead of mothers, these institutionalizations of the "mom" complex; also a greater amount of housework is done by the members themselves. Sometimes the spirit in these houses is also quite different, fresher, more alive.

The existence of these organizations, however, is in itself indicative of several important phenomena: one, that if fraternity life is to be considered statistically normal college life, minorities are forced to segregate themselves in order to participate in it; two, that these members of minority groups who organize themselves into their own fraternities, instead of participating, for instance, in interracial groups, are *ipso facto* accepting the segregation that has been imposed on them. Instead of creating their own values they are accepting those of their "upper class" in which they themselves are "inferior". In other words, they are entering the campus society on the terms of the fraternity caste, and to them the act of emancipation does not consist in creating their own pattern of life, in being themselves, but in imitating as closely as possible the example of the dominant caste. Needless to say, this is but another form of bondage.

The other living groups on the campus should be briefly compared to the fraternity system since they provide at the same time a scale of comparison and potential alternatives. Many universities have recently embarked on a building program for dormitories. These usually house groups of about 50 or 60 people, as much as a large fraternity, or even groups of several hundred. They usually also have housemothers and officers invested with a certain official authority. In most cases they don't discriminate on a racial or religious basis. Although they don't put the same emphasis on social values as the fraternities do, they maintain a paternalistic atmosphere in which the power to make the decisions that matter does not rest with the students, and in which the development of a real sense of responsibility is inhibited. Socially they accept for the most part the leadership of the fraternities. Much like the fraternity system, the university dormitories are built on authoritarian principles, on the assumption, that is, that the student does not know what's good for him and that all important decisions must be made by the father image, this being either the fraternity elite, or the deans, or both.

Principles of Student Co-op Movement

The co-ops encompass a relatively small percentage of the students, but deserve close attention inasmuch as they are the only type of student living group that is built on premises fundamentally different from those of the fraternity system. Their "ideological" basis are the so-called "Rochdale principles", of which there are six: (1) open membership, regardless of race, color, religion or creed; (2) one member, one vote; (3) cash payments from patrons; (4) limited return on capital; (5) savings returned to members; (6) extension of co-operative administration — expansion, that is. Insofar as a student co-op functions successfully, its spirit is usually very basically democratic, not to say libertarian. All authority that is respected rests with the group; all decisions of importance are taken by the group. There is a minimum of rules, bureaucracy, disciplinary or punitive devices; there is no discrimination except on the basis of anti-social behavior, if it threatens the existence of the group. When the university regulations demand houseparents, they are usually a young couple, not very much older than the membership of the house, who function inconspicuously in the house like the average member. It is easy to see that in such a set-up responsibility rests primarily with the individual, and that habits of independent thinking and democratic procedure are more likely to be established here than in the paternalistic or downright authoritarian atmosphere of the university dorms and fraternities. For this reason co-ops have traditionally served on the campus as basis for liberal and radical student activity, without ever committing themselves officially to liberal positions except in limited situations.

Weak Points in Co-op Movement

Unfortunately, the co-ops are not everywhere and always the democratic utopia that has been sketched above. In some universities they approach the ideal fairly closely, in some others they are stagnating, in others they are

disintegrating. This is not surprising: on the campus today freedom of thought and responsibility are a heavy load to bear. The university system as a whole is oriented in a contrary direction, and the reactionary trends in society at large are reflected on the campus. Their consequence, apathy and fear, have also affected the co-ops. For the co-ops to maintain themselves in such a situation will require considerably more militancy, vigilance and understanding of social events than that which has been shown by the co-op leadership so far. As the case may be, co-ops are today the only real challenge to the fraternity system, the only attempt by students to create a system of values based on equalitarian, libertarian and hence genuinely democratic values. The co-ops themselves are not always conscious of the wider implications of their basic premises — the fraternities are even less so, incidentally. Sometimes, however, they conceive of themselves as definitely fulfilling a social function which is in all points opposed to the social functions of the fraternity system. At the University of Kansas, for example, their propaganda booklet *What Are the K.U. Co-ops?* states:

On the K.U. campus you are likely to find out that the co-ops are just about the only student organization which accepts you as a responsible adult. Co-operative living requires and develops the maturity implied in the free acceptance of responsibilities, rather than obedience to orders, as an essential condition for a free society. And, of course, this is our social aim: trying to make our society more one of free and voluntary co-operation rather than one founded on conflict and compulsion. By their organization as student-owned, student-operated, student-governed living units, the co-ops are preparing today the foundations of a better, freer society.

Necessity for Long-Range View

The question remains of what to do about fraternities — besides building co-ops. This, in turn, raises the question of whether anything can be done. The fraternity member comes to college already seasoned by high-school fraternities which, if possible, are parodies of the college fraternities. Moreover, he usually comes from a thoroughly — if sometimes subtly — reactionary background. While in the fraternity he is immunized from outside influences by the multiple pressures a system can apply to wavering members. The social forces all around us are also unfavorable: many universities are becoming little more than trade-schools for docile technicians; the country is hysterical, non-conformists are hounded in college like everywhere else, the veterans have left the colleges and most juvenile regressions, lumped together by the generic name of "school spirit", have been revived. However, communication can almost always be established, if considered worthwhile, even if it is a slow and tedious process. If nothing else, we may remember that wherever there is repression there is rebellion, and that in every herd of sheep there are a few black ones.

ALAN DANIELS

Sartre, the Devil and God Almighty

An Analysis of the French Existentialist's Latest Work

THE FLIES, RED GLOVES, *The Respectful Prostitute* and now *The Devil and God Almighty*. These four plays form the cornerstone of Sartrean dialectic and ideology, expressed in theatrical form. There are, to be sure, other plays but they lack the relevance and directness of these four which, it is not unfair to suggest, were written to illustrate upon a stage employed as a place of action their author's favorite themes, somewhat vulgarized: In this absurd world of ours there are no spectators; we are all committed or "engaged," to employ an over-worked word of the Sartrean vocabulary; being (existence) is both prior and essential to having (possession); the presence, life and regard of the "other" is somehow decisive for each one of us as an individual, an ego. A vocabulary of Sartrean expressions now exists, but an analysis of its content belongs elsewhere. Besides, its utility, objectivity and validity have always been subordinate to Sartre's intervention in the political reality of the day (he is an acknowledged master at this), to the taking of a "position" and the offering of solutions.*

The background which has led to the development of this philosophy, with its theater and its attitudes, as well as a substantial school of literature, is well known. As is usually the case, we cannot deduce either an explanation or an understanding by simply citing its elements: the vague anti-fascism of European intellectuals, the German occupation, the resistance movement, the post-war disillusionment and descent from high hopes, the rise of Stalinism and its partner, European neutralism. It must be noted, however, that Sartre never writes of a revolutionary epoch itself, something which appears alien to his ready intelligence. The series of novels, plays and stories which, in turn, illustrate the more abstract workings of Sartrean phenomenology, are concerned with either the period of confusion and moral bewilderment which precedes a revolutionary period, or its counterpart; the disintegration and collapse which follows upon defeat and resistance to defeat.

* Until 1950, Jean-Paul Sartre was one of the most notable of a group of left-wing writers, critics, and artists who were part of the **Rassemblement Democratique Revolutionnaire**, a democratic, political, revolutionary anti-Stalinist organization which was active in French politics. It conceived of its mission as a regrouping and integration of left-wing forces in France who were alien to Stalinism. It regarded De Gaulle as well as the Communist Party as enemies of freedom and socialism in France. The Communist Party of France was regarded by the R.D.R. as a working class party with bureaucratic deformations, and as subservient to the Kremlin. It felt also that the masses of the Communist Party of France as well as of the S.P. were capable of being influenced by genuine revolutionary socialist ideas. The R.D.R. had a strong following among the Paris intelligentsia and among some sections of the working-class left but became inactive recently and disbanded. — The Editors.

"Neither victims, nor hangmen;" this was the slogan of Albert Camus which best expressed the deep, if illusory, humanism of the French resistance movement. Less than a decade later, with that movement already a dim and perverted memory, Sartre's newest play, *le Diable et le Bon Dieu* ("The Devil and God Almighty"), changes this formula. "Accomplice, or hangman;" such is the iron law which expresses his anguish (we shall see that Sartre is an anguished man) before reality and history. Either we become accomplices of those who uphold the *status quo*, or we become hangmen despite ourselves, if we try to change it. This, it would seem to us, is both the sense and proposed justification for the new play.

Now showing in Paris with much success—a success in part guaranteed by its grossness, blasphemy and incomparable vulgarity—*le Diable et le Bon Dieu* is no doubt its author's most important work for the theater. It has variously been described as his *Faust*, his anti-Claudian *Satin Slippers* and other attributes generally reserved for the category of *chef-d'oeuvre*. The play has been built, mounted and presented with the care generally preserved for the construction and launching of a new, enormous, revolutionizing machine. Among the consulting engineers who participate are some of France's greatest actors, designers, costumers, decorators etc., not to mention the chief supervising engineer himself, the late Louis Jouvet. Rarely has the French theater known such an enormity which, during four (4) steady, word-filled hours from 8 PM sharp until midnight rumbles, gesticulates and turns on the stage of the Theater Antoine, overwhelming the audience in front of it. The theater program proudly informs us that it took 104 technicians, who worked a total of 19,400 hours to prepare the stage; that everything in the theater (except the play, of course) had to be rebuilt, enlarged; that 38 projectors, 600 yards of cable, 2,000 yards of cloth, 600 pounds of nails, a ton of paint etc. were required; that . . . in a word, as an unfriendly critic noted, Cecil B. de Mille and M-G-M have had their challenge!

It must be clearly understood that this mechanism is put into motion to demonstrate its author's thesis, and for no other purpose. Before considering what this is, however, and in view of the unlikelihood that the play will ever be presented to American audiences, we must detail its content and story at some length.

The Devil and God Almighty

The action of *le Diable et le Bon Dieu* takes place in Germany during the period of the Protestant Reformation and the Peasant Wars of the early 1500's. It is chaotic and troubled Germany during the struggle between Luther and Rome, side by side with the social struggles between peas-

ants, knights and landlords, the city communities, the Church etc. Luther, Melancthon, Thomas Munzer, Tetzl, Goetz von Berlichingen, Florian Geyer are some of the names associated with this epoch period of revolutionary struggles. At the start of the play* the noble, Konrad, is waging war against his suzerain, the Archbishop of Mainz. At the same time, the city of Worms has seized the occasion to revolt against its own Bishop and has imprisoned him and the clergy inside the city. Within Worms itself, an internal class struggle between the city *bourgeois* and the poor has broken out. The Archbishop of Mainz, to restore his power, crush the rebellious Konrad and the city of Worms, has enlisted the services of *Goetz*, bastard brother of Konrad and freebooting head of a band of knights, professional soldiers and pillagers. The bastard Goetz is the central figure of the play.

The Archbishop has just learned of the victory of Goetz over his brother, whom he has killed. But his joy in this news is tempered by his fear of Goetz, the uncontrollable. Will he now go his own way, pursue an independent course and, among other actions, insist upon besieging and destroying Worms? The Archbishop, satisfied with his victory, is ready to call matters quits and forgive rebellious Worms. The inhabitants of Worms, massed about the walls of their besieged city, learn of Goetz's victory. The *bourgeois* are prepared to capitulate to their Bishop and the Archbishop of Mainz, but they are prevented by the masses, led by a baker, prophet and revolutionary agitator, *Nasty* (sic!) who, instead, arouses them to murder their imprisoned Bishop and prepare the slaughter of 200 priests enclosed in a cloister. The strategem is to prevent any conciliation, of course. But before he dies, the Bishop manages to give the key of a subterranean tunnel leading out of the city, to *Heinrich*, priests of the poor. He is the only priest permitted to circulate by the revolutionists. The dying Bishop orders Heinrich to give the key to Goetz, thus permitting him to enter and subdue the city. Heinrich is placed before the dilemma of betraying the people, or obeying the Church. He submits and leaves the city to seek Goetz. At the same time, *Nasty*, the revolutionary leader, secretly leaves the city to secure help by arousing the peasants (a workers' and peasants' bloc). He falls into the hands of Goetz.

A Study in Evil

The bastard-knight Goetz is surely one of the most monstrous characters ever produced and presented on the stage of a theater! We are introduced to this brigand, anarchist, professional doer-of-Evil ("Evil is my *raison d'etre*; I do Evil because Good has already been done . . .") within his war tent, surrounded by his captains and in the company of *Catherine*, his prostitute-mistress. Militarist, ("I am a soldier, therefore I kill), our friend Goetz is likewise a blasphemer and an atheist who taunts God on

(* We are following the complete text of the play as published in the June, July and August 1951 issues of *Les Temps Modernes*; although minor parts of this text were omitted in the presentation. All extracts are from this source.

every occasion. Only "I, God and the phantoms" exist, and Goetz defies God to stop his campaign of murder and destruction. From the moment of his appearance, the play and its development take their source from this rootless creature who belongs neither to the nobility nor to the "people." This frustrated monster, bursting with pride and anguish, is a psychopathic type who gloats upon horror, violence and destruction. The balance of the play is controlled by his personal struggle with God, his blasphemy, harranguing of the Almighty and his exposition of the Sartrean dialectic.

Heinrich, the priest torn between his people and the Church, immediately regrets his treacherous action. The sight of Goetz suffices for him to change his mind and refuse to surrender the key. At the same time, the captured revolutionary chief, *Nasty*, sees his proposal for an alliance ("Kill the nobles, and let us build a new city where equality shall rule.") mockingly rejected by Goetz. The offer of land and wealth brought by the banker emissary of the Archbishop is equally rejected. Instead, Goetz takes a series of lightning decisions: he will outstrip all his previous accomplishments in the realm of horror. First, he will torture and kill all those present (the banker, *Nasty*, *Heinrich*, etc). He will reduce Worms to ashes, and kill all those in the city: rebels and clergy; rich and poor. Finally, he will turn over his mistress *Catherine* to the collective rape of his warriors. Why? For his own amusement, to prove the validity of his depravity, to horrify the world, but above all else to defy God to stop him.

But brusquely the machinery of the play shifts into reverse; the gigantic equipment grinds to a halt and resumes in the opposite direction. *Heinrich-Mephisto* cleverly touches the most sensitive point of *Goetz-Faust*; his pride and arrogance. Does Goetz really believe he is an inventor and originator in the real of Evil? But we are all Evil, miserable, doomed to Hell; not a man is capable of doing Good.

Goetz — And so everyone does Evil?

Heinrich — Everyone.

Goetz — And no one has ever done Good?

Heinrich — No one.

Goetz — Fine. I'll bet you that I shall do it.

Recantation and Decision

A roll of dice decides the issue; Goetz bets against himself and loses; he has a year and a day to prove he can do Good. Worms is spared, the condemned are freed, the lands which Goetz "inherited" by murdering his step-brother are to be distributed among the peasants, a communist "City of the Sun" based upon Love, is to be built. But — and this is a key point in the play's meaning — *Catherine* tells us that Goetz deliberately lost his bet, he cheated himself in casting the dice; in a word, he chose the Good. Why this deliberate, if motiveless, reversal of the "general line", as a critic has humorously called it? Simply to permit the play to continue and develop its remaining thesis? No. This Goetz for all his horror-talk, his threats and his posturing, his blasphemy and defiance,

at bottom, a fraud! The priest Heinrich has seen through him, discerned that he horrifies himself most of all, and called his bluff. In his anguish before God and himself, the unhappy monster guaranteed his falling into the trap by cheating on himself. Thus ends the first act of *le Diable et le bon Dieu*. Touched in his pride, frightened by the very vehemence of his denial of God, drawn to the unknown, Goetz prepares to seek out the Good, "...invisible, on the other side of the wall."

Up to this point, however one may have reacted, the play has held our interest by its tension and action. It is of the theater. But two acts and two and a half hours remain. Critical opinion has been almost unanimous to agree that henceforth it loses its theatrical quality and degenerates into talk, ideologic affirmation and argument. The characters cease to develop and instead freeze into abstractions of the Sartrean viewpoint whose words quickly bounce off one another's hides. Except for isolated episodes, action ceases. Goetz, now dressed as a monk, lays siege to the realm of Goodness with the same desperate energy hitherto employed to do Evil. But his efforts, of course, are bound to fail; in fact, their objective consequences are more evil than ever before since this time they affect the "people"! Poor blundering utopian, in distributing his lands to his peasants he creates the danger of a premature general revolt of the peasantry which could become a blood bath. Nasty begs him to wait for "seven years" (we are at a loss to explain the choice of "seven"; a lucky number perhaps), but Goetz scornfully rejects this. He must build his "City of the Sun" now; today; he cannot spare a moment in doing Good. Nasty and Heinrich temporarily halt a premature uprising by terrifying the priests, driving them into hiding and thus preventing the holding of services. The peasants, in their ignorance and superstition, retreat. Goetz' attempts to win the sympathy of his peasants go unrewarded; Teizel and his friends give Goetz both a humiliation and a lesson when they sell the indulgences of Rome to the same peasants who turn their back on the man who has rewarded them with the coveted land. Goetz learns, and by a revolting ruse he wins them over. The dying Catherine, whom Goetz has now rejected in the name of chastity, is brought to a church where Goetz is present. She implores the now defrocked priest Heinrich to give her the last rites. Upon his refusal, Goetz seizes his opportunity and after an almost hysterical exhortation before the statue of Christ he pierces his hands with his own dagger. Now bearing the stigmata of the Lord, he appears before the peasants; they are his. An act of sincerity? Let us quote the words with which Goetz ends this scene: "I have had them. They're mine; at last."

Failure to Exorcise Evil

Now the "City of the Sun" can be built, with Love as its guiding spirit. Together with Hilda, an ill-defined figure who loves Goetz and whose role is to console the people whom she sees seduced by Goetz, a peasant-communist community is formed. But, like all such utopias, the bitter winds that swirl about it will not leave it in peace. Wanted

or unwanted, the generalized uprising of peasants against the nobles breaks out. The peasants are in process of being crushed; in bitter anger they turn upon the "neutralist" peasants of the Goetzian utopia and destroy them and their village. Goetz, flaying and starving himself in hatred of all mankind, lives in the ruins with the understanding Hilda. They await the appearance of Heinrich, come to "collect" his bet; Goetz's effort to do Good has met a complete check. But the end is not yet reached. Goetz may yet extricate himself from the disaster. Nasty, leader and ideologue of the revolting peasants, is already looking for a military technician who can command the peasant forces in their unequal battle with the trained nobles. But the obvious candidate must first undergo a spiritual purging before he can qualify; he must banish Mephisto, God and the Devil.

In a hallucinating scene between himself and the former priest, Heinrich, Goetz reaches the ultimate truth, after heavily drawing upon Nietzsche: Goetz affirms that he cheated and "invented" to betray Evil, but that a worse Evil was the only consequence. But in the midst of all this apparent Evil and injustice, together with this blocking of his obviously good intentions, how can we affirm the existence of the Almighty? Who has motivated and maneuvered all this vast campaign of Good vs. Evil? None other than he, Goetz, himself! What had God to do with it all? Had He ever given any sign of existence? Goetz formalizes his philosophic conclusions: God and Evil simply describe certain relations between themselves and God, the absolute; this "void above our heads"; this "hole in the earth." God doesn't give a damn for the things of this world. His sole effect is to embitter the relations between men by isolating them from each other. And the ultimate conclusion: "If God exists, Man is nothing; if Man exists . . .". Unlike Nietzsche, Sartre does not announce the death of God; he terminates his existence—a more drastic action! In the delirious joy of his discovery, Goetz announces the end of Heaven and Hell; henceforth, nothing but the Earth.

Heinrich, annihilated by this line of reasoning, infuriated by his inability to defend God, resorts to violence, that final response of all absolutists. But Goetz now draws his strength from the Earth he has just rewon. He stabs Heinrich. "The comedy of Good has ended with a murder." There remains only the resolution of the remaining ideologic and psychologic difficulties. All is quickly resolved.

"Hangman and Butcher"

In Hilda, Goetz finds the woman who will renew his former ties with the Earth; in his encounter with Nasty, he finds the solution to his political confusions. Nasty, to be sure, had patiently explained all this to him one year ago, but we learn only from personal experience. Goetz desires to be "... a man among men"; to love his fellows. He accepts the class hatred of Nasty, for "to love one another is to hate the same enemy." Nasty decides that Goetz shall head the army of the revolting peasants; in a final

tableau before the military chiefs of the peasants, Goetz takes command. His first act is to stab one of the chiefs who fails to display sufficient trust or confidence in him. Commands and threats tumble from his lips. "Proclaim at once that we shall hang any soldier who attempts to desert." "We will be sure of victory when your men will be more afraid of me than the enemy." ". . . I shall be hangman and butcher." And we quote the final words of Goetz, with which the play ends:

Don't be afraid, I shall not flinch. I shall horrify them since I have no other way of loving them; I shall give them orders since I have no other way of obeying; I shall remain alone with this empty sky above my head since I have no other way of being with you. There is this war to carry on, and I shall do it.

Thus, we conclude this sketch—often under the obligation of self restraint—of *le Diable et le Bon Dieu*. What is one to make out of all this? There is no denying a certain elementary strength and vitality in the play; Sartre never fails to pose strikingly those issues which divide men: power, the contemporary validity of tradition, the use of authority for coercion, etc. In narrower political terms, the drama of the bourgeois "intellectual" and his relation with the masses; or, to narrow the matter down to its true proportions, the relationship between the radical "intellectual" and the communist movement. This has been the one consistent theme of the Sartrian theater; the most disturbing problem of the European intellectuals (particularly, the French). In this play, Sartre has formulated more concretely than hitherto his solution; what a catastrophic reflection on the spiritual and intellectual life of Europe today! Let us see why.

Analysis of Various Themes

The various themes of *le Diable et le Bon Dieu* may be reduced to the following set of propositions. We may note, foreseeing a possible objection to this stripping of the play, that the characters themselves are treated by Sartre as representative of a particular thesis, with a corresponding development. Precisely this gives the play its wooden and mechanical motion, once the first introductions have been made.

First of all, there is the thesis according to which Good and Evil, one present within the other and inseparable, exist only as aspects of the domineering and reactionary relationship which God holds over the believer. The "humanization" of man, by Sartrian standards, demands the utter destruction of this theological doctrine; it is this concern which gives rise to whatever faint ties can be discovered between Sartre, the blasphemer, and Nietzsche, as well as other God-destroyers. Like Nietzsche, he proposes to pass beyond "Good and Evil," but he finds his subjective values (good and evil) only within those relations which exist between men, thus bordering again upon a semi-Marxist attitude. But how shall we decide our action, once God has been annihilated? It is here that a complimen-

tary thesis, that of the existentialist school of philosophy, is proposed.

The end of the play has indicated—perhaps without the author's awareness—a startling contradiction. God, who has separated men from one another, is dead—but *Goetz is just as separated as ever from his fellow-men!* Thus the need to "win" them still through terror and fear, as his final speech demonstrates. Who knows, perhaps he is more separated from them than ever before, since the common terrain provided by God no longer exists. At any rate, Herbert Luthy, in an excellent critique of the play published in the review, *Preuves*, has suggested Sartre's solution to this continuing dilemma as lying in the dramatic formula for action and life which is contained in the author's philosophy. "The play of a total arbitrariness, in which action is reduced to gratuitous gestures and intrigue to a succession of casts of dice. Man, claims Sartre, is his own creation; nothing is given to him, nothing is imposed upon him. . . . Nothing comes out of nothing; man is his own cause in each of his acts—*causa sui*."

Perhaps more important for Sartre than this conflict of religious belief which, despite its implications, remains rather abstract (even puerile) in the play, is the second, secular theme he propounds and which deals, in the concrete, with the relations between men. We have touched on phases of this theme; let us here formulate it more precisely. The personality of the individual may be rigidly deduced from his origin; activity, personality, behaviour etc.—all are determined, even in the case of isolated and ambiguous types like the bastard, Goetz. There can no longer be any question as to the strict determinism inherent in the doctrine of Sartre, and which was already suggested in *Les Mains Sales* (Hugo, son of a bourgeois, doomed by his "class" origin); his studies on anti-Semitism, the writer Jean Genet, etc. Twist and turn though he does, Goetz cannot break out of the framework imposed upon him by his dubious, alienating origins; after playing with Good and Evil for four hours, he recognizes the truth of the "class analysis" presented to him both, as regards his own reactionary role and the nature of German society at the period of the Reformation, by the baker, Nasty, within the first ten minutes of the play! But recognition of this "truth" cannot even change his consciousness, his personality, any more than acting accordingly (that is, taking over military leadership of the peasantry) can change his status! Poor Goetz, at best, he can only serve the cause of the proletariat-peasantry, never truly belong to it. His birth has determined this tragedy. Substitute for Goetz the entire European and world intellectual strata and you have arrived at Sartre's true attitude towards the intellectual. . .

Further Evidence of Sartre's Position

To support our view that *le Diable et le Bon Dieu* represents a disastrous descent into totalitarian depths, we must examine the play, if only briefly, at other levels. If it was Sartre's intention, from an historic standpoint, to provide an authentic background to the drama of Goetz and his alienated soul, then the result is laughable. There

is as little in common between the play and the epoch of the Reformation and the Peasant Wars of Germany, as there is between Goetz and Goetz vonBerlichingen, or Nasty, the baker, and the great, if neglected, Thomas Munzer. The Reformation was a period in which the issue of religion concerned itself with the most profound problems of religious belief, practice and enlightenment; not at all with the vulgarized blasphemy presented by Sartre. The conflict between Luther and Rome, the new interpretations of the Bible, pushed to their limits by Munzer and his friends, find no echo in this play. Even the internal relations between differing tendencies of the Reformation are misrepresented and cheapened by Sartre, as an extract from a letter addressed to Luther and Melancthon by Thomas Munzer, indicates:

Lieben Bruder, lasst euer Warten und Zaudern, es ist Zeit, der Sommer ist vor der Tur. Wollet nicht Freundschaft halten mit den Gottlosen, sie hindern dass das Word nicht wirke in voller Kraft, Schmeichelt nicht euren Fursten, sonst werdet ihr selbst mit ihnen verderben. Ihr zarten Schriftgelehrten, seit nicht unwillig; ich kann es nicht anders machen.

We have the right to question the legitimacy of an author's extracting certain elements of a complex historic situation, which has been studied and analyzed at great length by important historians, in order to provide himself with a convenient backdrop to his thesis. This is "theater with a message" at its worst, particularly if we realize that even that historic element extracted by Sartre is distilled into a thin essence which bears an exact affinity with the contemporary world as seen by the school of Russian and Stalinist-influenced intellectuals; that is, the "progressive" world of the masses, led by the allwise leader, versus the grey, "reactionary" mass formed by the rest of us. This historic falsification and distortion assumes a sharper form when we examine in greater detail the leading "personalities" of the play. If Goetz cheats on himself deliberately, so he may test that inner force of his which commands him to do "Good," it is equally true that Sartre stacks the cards in his favor and against God; in favor of his thesis and against his audience.

Goetz: Tool of History

In part, this is obvious and has been noted by many critics. All the play's characters are pale figures alongside of Goetz who has a working monopoly on all the cleverer and more penetrating lines; Goetz's opponent and "contradictor," the semi-priest, semi-friend of the poor and total *miserable* is a caricature. Heinrich is unworthy of the slightest credence. He belongs to the Devil and his sympathy for the poor is hypocrisy. "I dreamed of doing Evil and when I saw you I realized that I was going to do it in

* "Dear Brothers:

Leave off with thy waiting and irresolution; it is time, summer stands before the door. Willst thee not bring to an end friendship with the godless; they thwart the Word from acting in its full strength. Flatter not thy princes, or thee, too, shall perish with them. Be not reluctant, thee sensitive scribes; I cannot set about it otherwise."

truth. Do you know that I hate the poor?" As Goetz's religious adversary, his resistance vanishes at the first sign of the coming of atheist wisdom, vanquished by a few puffs of blasphemy and materialism. Whatever opinion one holds on these issues, Sartre has substituted a polemical consciousness for a dramatic consciousness. As polemist, he annihilates, belittles and paralyzes his opponent. But a true dramatic sense demands that the two opponents face one another as equals, with equal weapons and an equal chance — whatever the author's opinions may be — and that both live throughout the drama, with an equal profundity and intensity. Heinrich, as advocate and defender of the existence of God, is rather like one of those notorious lawyers who defend the accused in totalitarian countries. His "client" is guilty, to be sure, but he pleads extenuating circumstances, such as indifference to the world of men. In this respect, the defense of God is never presented and hence the absurdity to discuss this play on the same level as that of the religious plays of Claudel, for example. Francois Mauriac, whatever one may think of his beliefs, is justified in denying even the credit of true blasphemy to Sartre, whom he contrasts unfavorably in this respect with Andre Gide. The discoveries of Sartre-Goetz are either banal, or beside the point, or — worst of all — lead to conclusions which terrify one, once we have caught our breath and considered their sense.

And it is on this question of the Sartrean vision of our world, which is, after all, the central matter of the play, that we wish to conclude our analysis. Consider then: Goetz has deliberately chosen the road of doing Good, and has done his best (including charlatanism and trickery) to attain this end. God, the ingrate, refuses to recognize his good intentions and places obstacle after obstacle in his path. (Considering that the whole effort began in fraud, can one "blame" His refusal?) Finally, the utopian city of Good, constructed by Goetz, is destroyed, proving the viewpoint held by Nasty and Hilda. (Is, incidently, Sartre thus expressing his opposition to the "neutralist" viewpoint, and the doctrine of "building socialism in one country"?) The edifice collapsed, Goetz wrestles with Heinrich-God and kills him. (We note the well-known fact that precisely the same arguments employed by Goetz to destroy the existence of God can and have been used as formal arguments to prove the contrary, His existence). Hilda, the most rigid of the play's characters, who finds ". . . joy an obscene thing, and those who are happy, alone," leads him to the revolutionist, Nasty. Goetz experiences the one faintly human moment of his life in this instance of confusion and discovery. God vanquished, he wants to rejoin his fellowmen. He rejects the offer of leadership made to him. "Leaders are alone. I want to see men everywhere, around me, above me — let them hide heaven from me. Nasty, let me be just anyone." Nasty, the all-powerful revolutionary chief, who dispenses his "class justice" as readily as he issues commands and delegates power, naturally refuses. Goetz's cure from the malady of God-drunkenness cannot take the form of a sentimental humanism. This manipulator of men and technician of revolutions, this self-appointed "father of the people" who has already told us that, "No one else than I has the right to speak in their

(the poor) name," quickly sets things right, and assigns Goetz his proper place.

The Totalitarian Man

We have already noted the diligence and responsiveness of the latter in accepting his new role. Isn't Nasty, then, intended to be the real hero of the play; this totalitarian caricature of a "People's Commissar"? From the first moment, all the threads were securely held in his hands; the play is tidily wound up with himself in perfect control; even Goetz finally recognizes this. But Nasty is Stalinist, totalitarian man in the fullest sense; he knows no scruples, even letting himself be rubbed by the magic wooden hand of a witch who thus makes men "invulnerable." He never hesitates to proclaim his belief in the doctrine of his ends being justified by any conceivable means. The very vulgarity of his behaviour would seem to justify our belief that Sartre has deliberately drawn him in such an extreme fashion so as to leave no possible doubts concerning his conclusions — the future belongs to totalitarian man. "We must kill in order to enter Heaven," someone says at the beginning of the play; the future is bloody with war, civil strife and the blankest of conflicts, but the "City of Man" will emerge from the heap of skulls and corpses, Sartre concludes. The man who survives this will not be Goetz, an instrument of history, but Nasty, the true leader of men — without scruple, intelligent, analytic, humorless, colorless — *Stalinist man*.

The difference of Sartre with the official Communist movement are skin deep, and largely due to the intransigence of the Party and its refusal to accept certain tenets attached to Sartrism. Little wonder, then, that Sartre has refused to support movements for investigation of alleged Russian slave labor camps, and is capable of writing in his preface to a recent book* that "... we cannot even say that a worker *joins* the Communist Party; we must say rather that he is born into it, for to be a proletarian and to be a Stalinist is one and the same thing." (pg. xlii)! The Communist Party (our friend, Nasty) thus becomes the only legitimate expression of the social conscience; this is the one consistent thought of *le Diable et le Bon Dieu*, with its story of a universe ruled by horror, brutality and chicanery. Through the medium of Nasty, those objectivities can — perhaps be used for set purposes.

Methodology of Sartre

The totalitarian Sartre is completed by the anti-humanist Sartre who, in substance, burns with contempt for the masses he proposes to save. We see this in Nasty, the juggler not of individuals but of entire layers of mankind; it is reinforced by the passivity with which the peasants are presented throughout the play. Not once do they have their say, or put forward their own spokesman. There is no evidence that Sartre has advanced one step in closing the gap between "intellectual" and "mass," the human problem which seems most disturbing of all to him. On the contrary, in a scene where the peasants of Goetz's utopian

community are learning their "lessons," the catechism of Goetzism, so to speak, we are given a shocking illustration of the author's methodology in establishing "contact with the people." A Goetz-appointed leaders of the catechism conducts exercises in recitation and spelling out the Word, according to Goetz. The sheepish peasants, like little children in an old-fashioned elementary school, repeat letters and words which have no meaning to them. To place in its proper frame this vulgarity of Goetz, one should examine the famous sketches and lithographs made by Kaethe Kollwitz describing the revolt of the German peasant masses. There is a deep contempt for men in the work of Sartre, particularly its recent evolution.

"Love of humanity" in the abstract is a dangerous thing, writes Herbert Luthy. It so easily justifies all sort of crimes against men in the concrete. This final judgment against Sartre must be accepted; there is much in the play which we cannot see too clearly, but this is clear enough. We should like to add to this a significant reminder which perhaps escaped the attention of the author. Not only did the historic Goetz lead to defeat that section of the peasant army which he commanded, but — as we are informed in Engel's well-known study of the German peasant wars — as a consequence of his deserting his troops on several occasions, he was known as the *Verraeter der grosse Haufen*, or traitor to the people.

STANLEY PLASTRIK

TRUE OR FALSE?

- The effective way to oppose war is to REFUSE TO BEAR ARMS.
- Refusal to kill your fellow man is a POSITIVE ACT of human decency.
- The alternative to suicidal war in the atomic age is NONVIOLENT RESISTANCE.

TRUE OF COURSE! IF YOU AGREE, JOIN OUR RANKS- If you still have doubts, write for copy of "WHICH WILL IT BE — G.I. OR C.O.?" and other literature:

war resisters league

5 Beekman Street, New York 38, N. Y.

Enrolling war objectors since 1923

* *Le Communisme Yougoslave*, by Louis Dalmas.

American Foreign Policy: Two Views

For Support of the Atlantic Pact

IT IS UNLIKELY that anyone nowadays has any illusions about the Soviet Union excepting perhaps the Communists and their allies. Internally, it is a brutal tyranny whose exploitation of the individual is as ruthless as was the Nazis'. Externally, it is an expanding imperialist state that today threatens the freedom and security of the world.

The major cause of tension and divisions among the Great Powers in the last six years has been the Soviet ambition to achieve world mastery through a combination of military and internal subversion. The Russians have never denied the fact that for them there are only two kinds of worlds the communist world, to be under complete communist control, and the anti-communist world to be treated as an enemy. The policy of forcing Russian rule on as many states as possible and of undermining all others is not a reaction to any "capitalist conspiracy." It dates back in execution to the end of World War II and in theory to the earliest days of Bolshevik rule.

The defeat of Germany and Japan and the serious weakening of other European countries in World War II, have shifted the world balance of power in favor of the Soviet Union. It emerged from the war as the strongest power in Europe and Asia in terms of territory, industrial resources and military strength. Under these conditions, the Soviet Union has been able to strike out on a program of imperialism. What followed as a result of World War II was simply the unfolding of a policy already determined by Communist theory, which postulates that there is an unyielding conflict between the Soviet Union and the capitalist world and that wars are inevitable as long as capitalism remains. The plans of Soviet conquest can be gathered from the writings of the Communist leaders themselves. In the *Problems of Leninism*, which is as frank in its declaration of policy as Hitler's *Mein Kampf*, Stalin openly says that "it is inconceivable that the Soviet Republic should continue to exist for a long period of time side by side with imperialistic states—ultimately one or the other must conquer. Meanwhile a number of terrible clashes between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois states are inevitable."

Obstacles to Peaceful Settlement

This outspoken hostility against the nations outside the Soviet orbit has prevented any peace settlement between Russia and the Western nations. Peace conferences have shattered the illusion about the chances of striking a compromise with the Soviet Union. On a few occasions, the Soviet leaders have talked, they have given the pretense of negotiating, but they have granted no concessions and each concession granted to them has been a prelude to further demands. They have regarded agreements with

the West as expediences, only to be broken when they stood in the way of territorial and political expansion. In their code of morality, every lie, ruse and cunning are justified on the grounds that it advances the aims of world revolution. As long as the present Stalinist regime remains in power, it cannot conceive of relations with the West other than an armed truce; and there is little hope for expecting any change in men who believe that history is moving in their favor.

In contrast to the Soviet Union, the United States and the European nations have shown a high level of political morality. Undoubtedly, they have committed mistakes, supported unworthy groups and movements, been inconsistent and lacked foresight, but they have not been responsible for the worsening of world relations since 1945. In fact, so far were the Western nations from undertaking a postwar career of imperialism, that they went to great lengths to appease Stalin. The West believed that appeasement would shatter the design of conquest which was deeply rooted in Communist thinking.

Comparison of Russian and American Policies

It was only the unfolding of Soviet imperialism after World War II that shifted Western public opinion from a mood of surrender to Stalin to one of hostility and suspicion. The United States emerged from the war as the strongest power in the world. It possessed a combination of land, air and naval power that could have challenged the Soviet drive for world mastery. But the American people and government, far from wanting to get involved in the affairs of Europe, disarmed hastily. The desire of America was to withdraw into the national shell and keep clear of quarrels and entanglements of a world full of strife. There was no postwar expansion of American or British territory or influence compared with the Soviet annexation, in Europe alone, of lands occupied by twenty-four million people and domination of a wide range of satellites with more than one hundred million people. The few islands which America acquired in the Pacific were for purposes of defense, not imperialist exploitation. During World War II and immediately after, the United States placed the limitation of armaments high on its list of peace objectives. The majority of the American people, without distinction of political party or economic interest, supported the Baruch plan to outlaw atomic warfare.

There could hardly be a sharper contrast than these American actions on the one hand and Soviet imperialism on the other. The United States, it must be admitted, has committed acts which have aroused Russian suspicion and fear. It may commit more and worse, but by the low standards of most nations, especially of the Soviet Union, it has shown self-control and even enlightenment.

The British, under an anti-imperialist labor government, reduced, not expanded, their overseas empire. They gave India, Burma and Ceylon self-rule on a national scale and granted a large measure of independence to their

colonies. Whether Britain was motivated by virtue or by necessity is a fruitless argument. The fact that it did dissolve so much of her empire compares favorably with the postwar record of Soviet expansion.

Recognizing the strength of Russia, communism and Stalin's drive for conquest, the West has committed itself to a policy of military containment. The practical application of such a policy to Western Europe is clear. It involves the military integration of Western Europe along the lines of the Atlantic Pact. It demands a small mobile military force to discourage breaches of the peace and to halt Soviet aggression when it occurs.

Appeasement or Rearmament

It is psychologically difficult for democratic nations to rearm. To democratic thought in the West, military preparations seem the equivalent of mobilizing for war. It is a disturbing moral question, approached with discomfort and accepted with grave misgivings. Military rearmament, however, is aimed at preventing the outbreak of aggression and creating "positions of strength" on the basis of which a modus vivendi can be reached with Russia. Its object is peace, not war; agreement, not conquest.

Consider the alternative to military containment. Hitler taught the West the folly of appeasement. Surrender only reinforced his desire for conquest. Appeasement is doomed to failure with Stalin, as it was with Hitler, because a dictator despises weakness and respects strength. While the Nazi and Communist policies are not similar in their tactics, they are alike in their ultimate ambition. Hitler wanted war for its own sake. The immediate aim of Soviet foreign policy, however, is to strengthen itself for the expected world struggle and to weaken the enemy by a combination of local aggression and internal subversion short of war. Stalin has shown that his strategy is tempered with realism. He will neither challenge odds that are too great for him nor take risks when the opposition is too strong. Yet it does not follow that the Communist reaction to appeasement would be any different from Hitler's. If the Soviet leaders believed that no military opposition would be encountered, whatever they did, they might also succumb to the desire to expand.

One of the major factors responsible for peace today is the Korean war. The West's response to Soviet aggression in Korea was bold and swift. It served notice upon the Russians that force would be met with force. If America, backed and supported by the free world, had not taken up the challenge offered in Korea, one military aggression would have led to another until at last delayed resistance would have meant total war. The political consequences of allowing the Communists to absorb South Korea, unmolested, would have undermined the West's morale and will to resist.

Lessons of the Korean War

The Korean war has shown the danger of leaving the West a military vacuum, deprived of the means of self-defense. It revealed the weakness and inadequacy of the West's military preparations and underlined the fact that Western Europe was an easy target for Russian invasion.

Communist aggression in Korea provided a spur to military rearmament and stimulated the Atlantic Pact nations into action on a larger scale.

This policy of armed preparedness places many stresses on the West. It is very trying to the temper of democratic states because the people's desire for peace makes them impatient with half-peace and unwilling to accept its responsibilities. If Russian hostility remains unchanged and if it is expressed in further acts of aggression, there might be the temptation to force Russia into an all-out war. On the other hand, there is the danger that any Russian gesture of friendship will lull the West into the belief that special exertions or continued defense were unnecessary. The West would no longer feel the need to build up its defensive strength. But if a middle course can be steered between total war and complete disarmament, if the West can muster the strength, resolution and steadiness of nerve, if the Western diplomats can find some basis of agreement with the Soviet Union, then there is hope that time will bring a letup in the cold war.

Military containment is an essential but negative side of an effective defense. Any dynamic program for peace must be accompanied by a more positive and constructive policy. The purpose of military containment is to gain time in order to put such a policy into effect.

Challenge to the West

Communism, unlike any other totalitarian philosophy, offers a unique challenge to the West. It has gained the support of millions throughout the world because of the conditions which breed poverty, exploitation and suffering. The Communists appeal in the name of justice and security to the underprivileged. They have seized every chance to pose as the champions of the hungry and oppressed. Their propaganda promises a new life for all: employment, security and freedom from exploitation. During the last few years, the West has shown that that it understands this challenge to some degree. Its policy for world peace has not only been military security, but economic reconstruction. World recovery and economic stability have received a high priority in its policy.

In Europe, the Marshall Plan was the example of a positive and enlightened American effort to contain communism. Because of this act of American statesmanship, Communism was halted in Europe and a pattern of recovery and order was brought out of the war's aftermath of poverty and confusion. The Marshall plan was not a project of American capitalists who regarded it as a condition of their own survival. On the contrary, the most reactionary fringes of capitalism were against it. Nor did America turn the Marshall plan into an attempt to reestablish capitalism in Europe. It gave economic aid under the plan to countries which ranged in their economic policies from socialist Britain to conservative Belgium. It is true that the Marshall plan had elements of greed and self-interest. But that was not the important fact about the plan. What was significant was the understanding it showed and the contribution it made to Europe's economic revival. The major failure of the plan was that while it won success in increasing production and wealth,

it did not bring about the proper distribution of that increase among the workers.

West's Economic Program for Asia

In Asia and Africa, America and Great Britain have put forward Point Four and the Colombo Plan which history may judge as the most positive acts of their leadership. Both these measures are aimed at raising the standard of living of the people in the underdeveloped countries and at removing the conditions which invite communism. However, the West's war against poverty in Asia and Africa has bogged down in an intensified race for arms. The greatest armament program ever undertaken in peacetime has been set in motion while no effort has been made to relieve the hunger and poverty of millions. Perhaps greater expenditures for economic security in the underdeveloped countries and less money for arms would rally the peoples' support for the struggle against communism. The United States has not inspired enough enthusiasm for freedom to counteract the masses' distrust of the West. Without this economic aid, the people of Europe and Asia might not be able to help us resist communism, however much they may want to. Certainly the magnitude of the West's military budget would not mean much without a new spirit which a merely negative program of rearmament alone would not bring forth.

American policy which forces the people to accept native reaction is not likely to strengthen the West's position either. American diplomacy must make it evident that it is more devoted to democracy than to fanatical opposition to communism. It must ally itself with the forces of democracy and prove by deeds that its policies are worthy of support. The admission of non-democratic states like Franco Spain into the anti-communist alliance gives plausibility to the Soviet charge that America is "fascist" and "bent upon war." The support of Chiang Kai-shek, the revival of cartels in Germany, the backing of reactionary cliques in Europe and Asia—all these measures deprive the West's rearmament program of its vitality and popular appeal.

Limitations of Western Policy

It is impossible to defend the West's anti-communist policy in all its aspects. Its weaknesses, as seen through Socialist eyes, are all too manifest. Yet it would be a tragic mistake to regard the cold war as a power struggle between capitalism and communism. The present world conflict is between democracy with all its human imperfections and totalitarianism with its denial of human values. Socialists who urge a Third Force are toying with a dangerous idea, morally irresponsible and utterly impractical. They are unable to make the most elementary distinction between a democracy, however imperfect, which is capable of progress toward a just society and despotism which is the implacable enemy of all forms of democracy, including democratic socialism.

The only course for the Western nations to follow in the future is to do everything that is necessary to make it clear that they both can and will defend the free world and prove within that world that their way of life is richer,

more enduring and more attractive to mankind than the practices and values of communism. It is on this task that the West must concentrate if peace and freedom are to survive.

GABRIEL GERSH

Gabriel Gersh is a member of the National Committee of the Student League for Industrial Democracy.

For the Democratic Fight Against U. S. and Russian Imperialism

THERE ARE FEW people in the United States today, outside the ranks of the Communist Party and its periphery, who have any illusions about the nature of Russian society. The same cannot be said, unfortunately, for many liberals and ex-radicals in their growing illusions about, and subservience to, American imperialism. Among many "advanced" political circles, it has become quite fashionable to rationalize and accept American foreign policy; it is considered outmoded, archaic, to attribute imperialist ambitions and actions to the American ruling class. Imperialism, we are told, is a thing of the past so far as America is concerned — an obsolete concept, desperately clung to by stubborn doctrinaires. The readiness with which these "new" evaluations are accepted among academic circles provides a disturbing contrast to the political acumen and social rebelliousness of the intellectual and academic world of the thirties.

Those who accept the Marshall Plan as benevolent and the Atlantic Pact as no more than a nation's justifiable instinct of self-preservation at work usually point to the following facts as proof of America's non-imperialist role: 1) America has few possessions 2) There is no wide-spread move for annexation and colonial empire 3) American export of capital comprises but a small fraction of her total national product.

Various Forms of Imperialism

Interestingly enough, inherent in this argument which denies America's imperialist role today is an acceptance of the concept of modern capitalist imperialism as the inescapable politics of an advanced bourgeois nation plagued with the problem of over-production and forced to find markets for capital export and investment. But this form of imperialism is not the *sine qua non* of imperialist drives. Imperialism in its more generic sense, refers to the imposition of the needs and ambitions of the ruling group of one nation over that of weaker, foreign peoples through any number of means; physical force, economic power, political maneuvering, etc. We know of the imperialism of a slave society such as ancient Rome, the imperialism of the modern anti-capitalist Russian system which also does not export capital, and the imperialism of advanced capitalist nations.

The fact that the United States does not export a larger

percentage of capital to foreign lands is not proof therefore, of its alleged non-imperialist character. Nor is the equally correct assertion that the United States does not seek outright possession of colonies, and in some cases actually lent tacit support to native independence movements, evidence of anti-imperialist policies. On the contrary, they are aspects of a very real and dangerous imperialism developing out of America's unique history and her position in world affairs today.

Although, as we have already agreed, America's export of capital involves only a small percentage of her total national product, it nonetheless remains a vital and immediate factor in maintaining economic stability. Exports have declined in relative importance, but that is by no means any confirmation of the thesis that foreign trade and investments are of merely incidental importance to the United States. If the U.S. were suddenly cut off from export markets and sources of needed imports the results would be catastrophic for our economy.

If There Were No Foreign Trade

The elimination of existing foreign trade would mean the virtual elimination of certain industries. The collapse of these industries would, in turn, have dire effects on related fields which are not themselves dependent on the foreign market. For example, in 1948-49 a quarter of the total production of cotton, wheat and tobacco went for ECA subsidized exports.* Similarly, an enormous amount of machine tools, agricultural equipment, military goods and food products find profitable outlets in Marshallized overseas trade. A report published by the Brookings Institute last year can summarize our claim:

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

What is also deceptive in the percentage-wise small figure of American export is that it does not consider the much larger profit derived from goods sold to, and finance capital invested in foreign lands as compared with domestic markets and investments. Finally, the termination of foreign exchange would mean forced unemployment of millions who are working for corporations which are filling overseas military and civilian orders.

The point made that the United States is not seeking colonies is disingenuous in its naivete. Of course, the United States is not seeking colonies. More than that, except for a brief period in American history when the country first embarked on a policy of imperialist expansion, the United States has hardly ever sought to extend its power through the acquisition of foreign territories. That is too troublesome, too expensive and too transparent. Instead, the United States has pursued the policy of intervening, influencing and determining the development of foreign lands through

* For a fuller discussion of this section of the article *Anvil* readers are referred to Sam Bottone's article, "Ends and Means of Welfare Imperialism" in the Spring, 1951 issue.

her tremendous economic weight and strategic political position.

The industrial revolution did not take place in the United States until after the Civil War. It was only after the 1890's that manufactures outweighed agricultural production. What this meant was an American industry which was capable of beginning with the latest technical inventions, innovations and techniques, with a labor market well provided for through immigration. In addition, the United States had a highly favorable geographic position: an enormous land area, rich in natural resources, which could be developed with relative quiet by a new and voracious class of industrial capitalists. Thus, while the mercantilist and early capitalist development of European powers was characterized by an endless succession of wars of annexation with backward areas, followed by conflicts among themselves over the division of the world market, the United States was permitted an easier and more peaceful growth. America was reaching its zenith when its exhausted European competitors were beginning to fall apart at the seams. A mighty industrial America had no impetus to seek colonies. Furthermore, the colonial world was already divided among the major European powers at the time American capitalism felt the growing pressures for markets for capital export and investment. Territorial acquisition, then, on any significant scale would have entailed costly conflicts with Europe. But if a colony were freed from the grip of the European power its borders could then be all the more easily penetrated by American capital. No fuss, no bother, no unnecessary, unprofitable bloodshed and the American ruling class is afforded an opportunity to wear the hypocritical mask of a world humanitarian, fighter for the independence of colonial peoples. A profitable business all around, and the explanation for the anti-colonialism of American imperialism.

What we have said about American imperialism thus far has been, in our opinion, generally true for decades. This does not mean that there is nothing new in the situation. In the past ten years there have been new and profound changes in the inter-relations of government, private capital and foreign policy.

The Growth of State Imperialism

American imperialism today is certainly different from the imperialism described by Lenin 30 years ago. In a sense it is entering upon a new stage. Alongside the continued exploitation of foreign lands by private capital, there is, today, the growing intervention of the state which poses a threat to the maneuverability of private capital. The reason for this is fundamental to an understanding of world politics today and for an answer to what political attitude a democrat and socialist must adopt in the Russian-American struggle for world power.

The theory that the state is the executive committee of the ruling class has no clearer substantiation than the history of American foreign policy between the Spanish-American War and World War II. During that 40 year period, the Open Door policy and dollar diplomacy were governmental strategies clearly designed to permit the expansion of private American capital. Finance capital and

government particularly during the first half of this period achieved, in actual practice, the maximum of harmony and understanding.

But since the beginning of World War II an increasing note of discord has been injected into this, heretofore, good old American teamwork. This discord, bringing with it an incipient new form of imperialism has been engendered by the tentacular expansion of a new social order, Stalinism. The struggle between the capitalist world and the Russian empire has no precedent. The Great War and World War II had one fundamental common denominator: they were conflicts between rival blocs of capitalist nations and the victory of one could not aim at the immediate *social* annihilation of the other. The stakes in the third war that is being organized are much greater. The victory of Russia would spell the end of capitalism as a world system; the objective of the United States would be the crushing of Stalinism as a viable social order. Preparations for this war between two contradictory social classes calls for new and more audacious methods. No matter how backward the political administration in Washington may be, the very exigencies of the situation will force upon it a social perspective which will bring it into ever sharper conflict with whole sections of the capitalist class. The private capitalist is primarily interested in one thing: profit, foreign investments are made by private concerns for the same noble purpose. The capitalist politician (statesman, if you insist) must have a broader view of domestic and foreign problems. His fundamental responsibility is to preserve the existing social order. From the turn of the century until the middle of the 30's there was little to upset the tranquil relations between private overseas investors and Washington administrations. This tranquility has now been considerably disturbed by the Marshall Plan, the Point Four Program, foreign loans, etc. What is ironic is that in all these cases the private capitalist stands to gain. Were it not for the Marshall Plan and foreign loans, not only would world capitalism be that much weaker, but the assets of American manufacturers would be considerably smaller.

The Need for Freedom to Invest

The American businessman, partially for psychological reasons but mainly from economic motives wants to be free. He needs room to manipulate, to invest where he can reap the greatest profit, not to be hindered by extraneous political considerations. He wants and needs the protection of government, but he fears the *direction* of the state. Once he feels that he is told how much he can invest, where he can invest, the terms of his investment, his freedom is threatened. His profits may rise, but the means of guaranteeing his future are endangered. When the NAM objects to the Marshall Plan because it means a loss of freedom, it is expressing these fears.

With the irrepressible conflict between Russia and the United States daily becoming exacerbated, Washington is forced to make investments which are designed to pay off immediate *political* dividends. The Marshall Plan was not designed exclusively to put Europe back in its feet so that it could once again carry on normal trade relations with

the United States, and carry a heavy share of the rearmament load. And it was certainly not the product of humanitarian considerations. It had the immediate political objective of stopping Stalinism: of invigorating a demoralized European bourgeoisie and of instilling ideas about American benevolence in the European working class which was rapidly falling under the influence of Stalinism. Its success has been only minimal on these counts. To execute these large scale, politically oriented loans requires the full talents of the state. No private monopoly, no matter how powerful has either the means or the inclination to finance a Marshall Plan. For this, the state is indispensable; and precisely because the state is a political organization, it cannot place its trust in private capital to achieve a political objective which is of life and death importance.

Just as the private investor seeks the aid of the state in his foreign economic ventures, the state will make every effort to guarantee its own political investments. And this guarantee takes the form of imperialist intervention in the political and economic life of Europe. Here too, we see a new element in this phase of imperialist development: one time powerful European nations are being reduced to the status of unwilling subordinates of the United States. Independent capitalist Europe is finished. Its empires are shattered, its economy dislocated and whatever gains have been made toward recovery have been largely diverted by futile military efforts to maintain its empires and by huge armaments programs upon which Washington insists.

Through the various provisions of the Marshall Plan, American intervention in Europe is assured. There are the counterpart funds that must be laid aside and whose use must meet with the approval of American authorities; the U.S. must sanction the annual reports of the Marshall Plan nations; the threat of withholding funds has worked miracles in revising European trade restrictions which operated against American interests. Aside from the formalized provisions for American intervention, it should be clear that through America's ability to prop up European capitalism, the latter will bend to American demands. Anything is better than annihilation by the Russians, including the indignity of having a European army commanded by a West Point man.

American imperialism in Europe can be rationalized if you wish to, but its existence cannot be reasonably denied.

The Lesser Evil Theory

Perhaps we will have convinced our opponents in this debate that America is still an imperialist power. They may then say: "at least American imperialism is not as vicious as the Russian variety. Why not support American policies, then, if they are designed to eliminate the greater menace?" We will readily agree that American imperialism is the lesser evil to Russian totalitarianism. But it does not follow, therefore, that we must give our political support or endorsement to American imperialism in peacetime or in war. Let us bear in mind that by "support" we are discussing a political attitude and not the question of whatever physical contributions to the war effort the government may force upon us through conscription or a labor draft.

That is a problem which does not have any direct relevance to this discussion.

In the first place we do not support American imperialism on the "lesser evil" basis precisely because it is imperialism; and because it is imperialism, it cannot possibly defeat Stalinism except in a military sense; and for capitalist imperialism to defeat Stalinism in a military sense will not have eliminated Stalinism as a world political force.

Stalinism derives much of its strength from its ability to dishonestly pose as the champion of the people. It offers something new, utilizing all of its experiences and cunning with telling effect. And one half of its propaganda is the truth. When it denounces capitalism as a backward, reactionary system which has brought Europe to its knees, it is telling the truth. When it lashes America for its imperialist role it is telling the truth; when it describes the misery of the Asian people and the attempts of the American-led bloc to keep the nationalist movement in check, it is telling the truth. Naturally, the Russian regime will not tell the whole truth. No such power will commit political suicide. For to tell the full story it would be necessary to explain that Russia, far from being a worker's paradise, a land of well-fed, smiling workers and buxom peasant women, is a vast concentration camp.

But the propaganda of the Stalinists is nonetheless effective. The French and Italian worker may lend a sympathetic ear to criticisms of Russia but they *feel* the whiplash of capitalist exploitation and can thus be swayed by the clever half-truths of Stalinism. And all the Atlantic Pacts and Marshall Plans that American can concoct will never revive the faith of the European workers in the capitalist system, or persuade them to pay homage to American magnanimity. At most, the Marshall Plan can neutralize the Stalinist influence in Europe, it cannot decisively defeat its appeal.

In Asia, the appeal of Stalinism has proven even more effective. The entire colonial world is seething with discontent and rebellion. The demise of England as a world power, the social anemia of the French bourgeoisie, the weakened condition of Holland, combined with the increasingly intolerable conditions of life in the colonies have ignited the entire colonial world. Is it any wonder that Stalinism is making deep inroads in Asia? As with the European worker, the Asian peasant, student and intellectual, are not nearly as moved by a truthful description of totalitarian terror in Russia as they are by their bitter and intimate contact with Western imperialism.

American Allies in Asia and Europe

The United States, feverishly attempting to build a stable anti-Russian bloc is not going to encourage revolutionary nationalist movements. An independent Asia and the expulsion of the British and French from Africa will mean the further descent of capitalist Europe and definite decline in its value as "partner" in a war with Russia. The colonial movements have made it clear that they want a complete break from Western domination, including that of America. This bodes ill for Washington's political and military objectives and consequently it seeks allies among

the more conservative and reactionary forces in the colonial and semi-colonial world: Quirino, Rhee, Bao Dai, Chiang.

On the continent, American policy has thrown to the winds all pretenses at preparing for a military defense of democracy. Totalitarian Portugal, Fascist Spain, the Greek and Turkish regimes have all benefitted from this peculiar democratic crusade. And with each such move that Washington makes, the Stalinist propaganda machine obtains an automatic oiling. On the political front, capitalism is lost before the onslaughts of demagogic Stalinist propaganda.

American policy with regard to the colonies, German re-armament, welcoming Spain into the fold, her reactionary conduct of the war in Korea, is not an accidental phenomenon. A more liberal administration in Washington would be forced to follow, *in its essentials*, the same policies. It might be done with a little more sophistication and less rashness, but American imperialism in its preparations for total war with a more dynamic, though more brutal, Stalinist world, has to follow an inherently indicated reactionary course regardless of which cabinet is at the Washington helm.

Responsibility of Truman Administration

Domestically, the growth of state imperialism finds its counterpart in the garrison state. Men like McCarthy are the cause for much of the hysteria, but it is the "liberal" administration in Washington which is primarily responsible for the deep inroads being made into our democratic rights. The loyalty oaths, the purges and the "report your neighbor" psychology do not find their source in such utterly irresponsible reactionaries as McCarthy; they have been initiated and executed by the Truman administration. The garrison state with its war economy, militarization of civil life and hacking away at civil rights will continue to grow more dangerous as the cold war intensifies. That is not the way a democrat or a socialist would prepare to defend society against Stalinism. But there is no socialist or democratic regime in the White House. There is an imperialist regime in Washington whose social role and psychology will not permit it to make any fundamental deviation from its present reactionary course.

In preparing for a total, social war with Stalinism, capitalist imperialism must tighten up. Precisely because of the scope of the struggle and the dynamic nature of Stalinism which is capable of successfully appealing to large masses in the *enemy* camp, American imperialism seeks to secure its position by exploitation, decrees and witch hunts at home and must maintain a close supervision over European affairs. The working classes of Europe and American must be watched with particular care for their interests are most inimical to those of the bourgeoisie.

If one decides to support American capitalism in an imperialist war with totalitarian Russia, then squeamish considerations about principles and ideals must be largely tossed aside. For this would be total war, a fight to the death for capitalism, and to support it means to accept the responsibility of aiding American capitalism battle in the *only way it can* under the present circumstances.

Political Advantage Is Military

Stalinism would have the political advantage over the United States in a war. This advantage has more than propaganda value. It can have decisive military importance as is testified to by the Korean events. Whoever wins the willing support of the people has won half the military battle. In Korea this political advantage cancelled the superior firepower, armaments, naval and air power of the American forces. There is no reason to doubt that in a global war the same military-political advantage would accrue to the Stalinists.

Thus the reason that we must not support American imperialism bears repetition: it cannot defeat Stalinism politically and cannot defeat it militarily on a healthy, progressive basis. On the other hand, if the struggle against Stalinist barbarism were led by a world democratic movement, then such a militant, anti-imperialist Third Camp could break the hold of Stalinism over the millions it influences in Europe and Asia, at the same time removing the military trump card of the Kremlin.

A military victory of American led forces in the event of war would not end the danger of totalitarianism. On the contrary it would be as great, in Europe, as before the war. In a total war, the economic resources of Europe would be completely destroyed and along with them would go the last vestiges of capitalist order in Europe. And the forces of totalitarianism would thrive on the ruins and chaos of a

devastated Europe. Russia would be defeated, perhaps, but it would prove to be only a military defeat; and an anti-capitalist, totalitarian movement would find Europe an ideal spawning ground.

What else could become of a devastated Europe? Could democratic regimes emerge? But to develop a popular democratic movement we must counter Stalinist propaganda with the ideas and actions of anti-totalitarians who are at the same time genuinely opposed to unpopular capitalist regimes and to American imperialism; and not after the war, but now.

A world democratic movement can be organized. It already exists to one degree or another throughout the world; from the nationalist movements of Asia to the splendidly solid British working class. If these forces were to join hands, and cast off any existing illusions about even limited cooperation with either Russian or American imperialism, there could be created that army of millions, a world wide third force. This popular movement could deliver the coup de grace to Western imperialism in Europe and Asia, politically destroy the popular base of Stalinism outside the Iron Curtain and find adequate means for coping with threats from Russian totalitarian imperialism.

JULIUS JACOBSON

Julius Jacobson is the editor of Anvil and Student Partisan.

The Film Brought Into Focus

THE SATURDAY Review of Literature has rather curiously forecast that John Huston's *The Red Badge of Courage* will end up as a classic. The film is a visual transcription of Stephen Crane's book of the same name, and stars Audie Murphy and Bill Mauldin. It narrowly misses being merely a sentimental vignette. We follow "the youth" (Murphy) from camp through his first battle. He is afraid, but does not run when he faces the first "Reb" charge; then he "skedaddles" when the second comes, creeps back to a column of wounded men, gets knocked on the head by a fleeing comrade, and finally arrives back in bivouac.

The youth's character is one-dimensional. The action of the film pivots on the main question of whether he will run, with its implications for his self-regard or lack of it. The story is ironical — for his behavior is contradictory and he is considered first dead and then a wounded hero by his comrade Mauldin, whereas he had merely skedaddled. Afterwards, he becomes a "real soldier" in another charge — fighting because he is "mad." And in the end, after victory, the troops march off, hoping a better world will ensue.

Story and Film Treatment

Cinematically, Huston has given us a dead-pan presentation of a Civil War battle, with something of the sweep and smoke of Griffith, though without the 3,000 horses. The war is treated, as Crane treated it, scenically; it is a vast, unpredictable affair, about which an individual soldier can take little thought. Huston is faithful to the text in centering the action upon the youth's conflict over his courage. As in the case of the rifleman who refuses to take cover ("I'll do my fighting standing up") the story deals with war as an envioning factor which is taken as a dramatic matter of fact. In this sense both book and film a-moralize war; when Crane wrote his story, in the 1890's, he took a scrupulously "pure" view, artistically, of the psychological processes he was describing — though the temptation may have been strong to treat it as a moral war. War in the book as in the film is an interesting phenomenon in man's world — an element in the human situation. In *The Red Badge Of Courage* men are under stress, just as the men adrift are in *Open Boat*. They do not concern themselves with the war as a general political event, though it inaugurated population warfare and caused Sherman to give

us pretty much the last word on modern war.

It is partly because of this absence of "issues" that the film caused some audiences to laugh in the wrong places. The historical setting, moreover, is remote, and a certain quaintness of mood arises from Crane's slightly lilled dialogue, which is used verbatim. Murphy's performance also seems a bit overwrought. The audience, however, is to blame for its laughter, largely; for the film nowhere pretends to be a study of war — it deals with fear, with cowardice, with the intricacies of self-respect. Such a film would naturally seem odd to audiences accustomed to seeing war as an elaborately efficient business. War is now logistics. It is "killing gooks." Crane's story appears to us a little picturesque; it seems to take its protagonist too seriously, and in too small a view. If we react to it as sentimental, it is because the film asks us to feel more than we think is justified by the story.

It may be that it is increasingly difficult to involve us emotionally in stories of soldiering, past or present. It may be that our hostilities have been so successfully channeled that we are currently interested in only one war (which we do not want, of course). Or it may be that we find it embarrassing to be told that war is an affair of human acts and human emotions after all.

ERNEST CALLENBACH

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 bear 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
247 LEXINGTON AVENUE

SUBSCRIPTION

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

Name

Address

School

NEW YORK, N. Y.