

anvil

And Student Partisan

EISENHOWER:

PURGE & POGROM

Messiah or Mistake?

In Stalin's Paradise

Cry the Beloved White Man!

A Review of the Catholic Left

Assault on the Colleges

America's Murder Incorporated

Inside Industrial Relations

Stage, Screen and Book Reviews



S p r i n g 1 9 5 3

anvil a student anti-war quarterly and student partisan

Vol. V - No. 1 (Whole No. 9)



Spring Quarter 1953

CONTENTS

Editorial: Stalinist Anti-Semitism — the Final Test	3
Leonard Prager	
Editorial: Assault on the Colleges	5
The Editors	
The Eisenhower Administration	7
Bob Bone	
Cry the Beloved White Man!	11
Walt Handley	
America's Murder Incorporated	13
Gabriel Gersh	
A Review of the Catholic Left	16
Alan Daniels	
Will Southern Schools Remain Jim Crow?	21
Dick Leftrowicz	
Inside the Industrial Relations Racket	23
G. Marteau	
Stage, Screen and Book Reviews	25

EDITORIAL BOARD

Bob Bone, <i>Editor</i>	David Kaplan	Michael Harrington
Abe Victor	Marion Reuter	Sam Bottone
Robert Mussigman	Leonard Prager	Margaret Levi
John Thompson	J. Glaston	Scott Arden
David Senes	Harry Rose	Bogdan Denitch

Al Davidson, *Business Manager*

John Holmes, *Ass't Business Manager*

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

NEW YORK STUDENT FEDERATION AGAINST WAR
41 West 33rd St. New York, N. Y.

SOCIALIST CLUB OF ROOSEVELT COLLEGE
POLITICS CLUB OF UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

FOCAL POINT OF YALE UNIVERSITY

SOCIALIST STUDY CLUB (UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS)

DETROIT ANVIL CLUB

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA YOUTH FEDERATION AGAINST WAR
VANGUARD CLUB OF LOS ANGELES

Facts of Life Dep't

This year Anvil and Student Partisan will publish only one issue per semester, or two issues for the year. The Editorial Board felt that in light of the tight financial situation it would be better to publish only two issues rather than mortgage the future of the magazine by overreaching ourselves.

In these days of anti-radical witch hunts, it is a victory for a group of our nature to publish even one issue per semester. To do so without losing much money, and without compromising decent standards of political journalism is little short of miraculous. Needless to say, without the cooperation of our readers and especially our student salesmen, it would be impossible.

Yet in view of the issues at stake — the achievement of peace and the building of a better world — even greater effort is called for. Given our present circulation, a small additional effort by each and every one of us can put us over the top. By getting one more person to sell the magazine, one more bookstore, or one more subscription we will be enabled to publish not only one issue per term with ease, but really live up to our aim of publishing quarterly.

Al Davidson,
Business Manager

A
COMPLETE
BACK FILE OF

anvil

(8 issues)

IS NOW AVAILABLE
IN
LIMITED NUMBER

Price \$2.00

Write: Business Manager
Al Davidson

Editorials

Stalinist anti-Semitism: The Final Test

A CONSIDERABLE BODY of pathetic "jokes" has grown up around the attempts of Stalinists to defend their spiritual homeland. The punch-line of this modern political "humor" is: "what about the lynchings in the South!" Faced with mounting evidence of economic inequality, and of a hierarchy of social classes more differentiated than that of the Czarist despotism, the beleaguered Stalinist would resort to the barometer of racial equality to arrive at a favorable comparison between the Soviet Union and the United States.

That the Soviet Union encouraged the development of its national minorities, protected the right of cultural self-determination, ruthlessly made war on all forms of racial and ethnic bigotry, even made anti-Semitism a crime punishable by law — these were truisms, not only firmly believed by Party adherents, but even tacitly admitted by many so-called anti-Stalinists. In pressing his comparison, the sincere Party stalwart could take the offensive against his opponent, pointing out the facts of Negro second-class citizenship, the plight of the Mexican, Japanese, and Puerto Rican minorities, and the discrimination against Jews in hotels, fraternities, medical schools, and various industries.

The "National Question" a Barometer

The logic of such an argument is patently specious, but it contains a significant element of truth. The "national question," the policy of a government toward its minorities, can serve as a negative test of a country's progressive character. The presence of an enlightened policy toward minorities does not of itself make a social system progressive; but the absence of such a policy decisively marks the system as exploitative and undemocratic.

In terms of the treatment of minorities, the "national question" and the "colonial question" are one. A national power may limit its colonialism to its extra-territorial holdings: democracy at home, tyranny abroad. The test remains valid; in the broadest sense colonies form an integral part of a country's socio-economic system, and the presence of a dual policy damns the home-country as much as does minority suppression within its borders.

In the present period, we see history turned back: the 19th-century struggle for national unification and self-determination must be fought all over again. Second-rate imperialist powers like Britain and France become virtual colonies; former imperialist rivals like Germany and Japan are partitioned and garrisoned; the relationship of the

Soviet Union to the Eastern European "Peoples' Democracies" becomes increasingly that of a home-country to its colonies. Stalin's recent efforts to build a "national front" of former Nazis and rightists in Germany indicates recognition and demagogic exploitation of this situation. The American counterpart is reflected in the blatant appeals to nationalism in the propaganda of Radio Free Europe.

That there are crucial differences between Soviet and American imperialism on the "national question" is not to be gainsaid. There is a great difference between the genocidal implications of Hiroshima and the Morgenthau Plan, and Stalin's actual extermination of the Volga-Germans, the Crimean Tartars, countless Caucasians, Balts, Kalmucks, and who knows how many others. There is a qualitative difference between the American flooding of the world market with Coca Cola and Hollywood films and the Soviet imposition of the Russian language and culture on the Slavic satellites. There is a world of difference between America's setting aside of concentration camps for future use, and the Soviet Union's empire of slave-labor camps with millions of inmates. In a word, the Soviet Union has reached barbarism; the United States is merely on the highroad, inhibited in its journey by democratic traditions, a relatively free trade union movement, and the necessity of making occasional concessions to those countries where heavy-handed colonialism would obviously aid the Stalinists.

In spite of these differences, we can use the barometer of "the national question" to expose the basically hypocritical policies of *both* imperialist powers. For Western society at least, (and this includes European Russia), the Jews constitute the test of tests. With a history of 2,000 years of persecution behind them, with their great vulnerability and high articulateness, they constitute a "classic" minority. The essential similarity in social and economic structure of Western Jewish communities, and the fact that such communities exist on both sides of the Iron Curtain, make the test even more effective.

Anti-Semitism in America

In American society, anti-Semitism as a social phenomenon is almost a fixed aspect of the national life. Yet political anti-Semitism never reached major proportions here. Individual government officials have been anti-Semitic, but government as such rarely has been. Even during the heyday of the Fond-sponsored Protocols of the

Elders of Zion, anti-Semitism as a political weapon appealed largely to fringe groups. The failure of America to take strong steps against the destruction of the Jews under Hitler, when much could yet have been done, was morally reprehensible, but did not constitute political anti-Semitism. It was unconcern for the fate of somebody else's Jews, a complacency which for some time was present even among American Jews.

The war economy in America, with its great need for highly trained specialists and for manpower in the armed forces; the focusing of national hysteria on Communists, with only occasional linking of "Communist" and "Jew"; and above all, the need for national unity, have largely reduced the virulence of anti-Semitism. But the potential remains. Economic recession or confusion during widespread war-destruction could fan the flames of Jew-hatred to unknown intensity. As long as we totter between total war and depression, it is all too sober to say that Jews, even in America, face a precarious future.

This is not alarmist. The materials are drawn from events which transpired in our own lifetime. We have seen one of the most civilized nations of Europe succumb to barbarism. Nazi Germany had a program for Europe which could only be achieved through genocide. Six million Jews were slaughtered — two thirds of the Jews of Europe. In high Nazi offices lay plans for a similar destruction of Czechs, Poles, and Russians. The Jews provided a perfect scapegoat for whipping up nationalist hysteria. By channelizing aggression against the "alien," the "parasite," the "international-Bolshevik-capitalist-Jew," Hitler created a mystique which made gas chambers possible. It is terrifying to think that what happened in the land of Lessing and Goethe could happen in the land of Jefferson and Lincoln. It is paranoid to say it will happen. It is utterly realistic to concede that it could happen.

Soviet Anti-Semitism

In the Soviet bloc, anti-Semitism is not a possibility, but a reality. Close students of the Soviet Union have been aware of a long history of anti-Semitism in that country.* Anti-Semitic overtones appeared as early as the struggle with the Left Opposition. Always present among the Ukrainian masses, anti-Semitism was especially strong in Party ranks. The Stalinists never waged a serious campaign against it. During the Nazi-Soviet Pact, nothing appeared in the Soviet press concerning Hitler's persecution of the Jews. When the Nazi armies poured into the Soviet Union, newspaper reports within the country concealed the fact that a huge proportion of the massacred civilians were Jews. News releases for the outside world, however, did just the opposite.

In an attempt to rally world Jewry to the Soviet Union, the Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee was created. Itzik Feffer and Solomon Mikhoels were sent to America where they addressed large gatherings in Yiddish, calling for solidarity in the struggle against the common enemy of the Jewish people. The achievements of Soviet Yiddish literature and

* The complete history is sketched in Solomon Schwarz' *The Jews in the Soviet Union*.

theatre, the glories of the Jewish Autonomous Republic of Birobidzan, the alleged absence of anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union — these were the paeans to which thousands of Soviet sympathizers, and even more numerous simple Jewish folksmenschen, thrilled.

In the last five years, however, official Stalinism has gradually abandoned any attempt to pose as the defender of the Jewish people. In September of 1948, Ilya Ehrenburg, himself a Jew, wrote a lead article for *Pravda* denouncing Zionism, Israel, and the notion of any ties between Jews of different countries. Shortly after, there began a concerted drive against "cosmopolitanism." Government directed, it insidiously identified Jews as "Talmudists," "rootless cosmopolitans," and "bourgeois nationalists." Jews who had taken Russian names were cited with their Jewish names in parentheses. Short stories about black marketeers and parasites with Jewish names were especially prominent in popular literary fare.

The New York Daily Compass and other incensed Stalinoid Liberals went to great lengths to describe these reports as State Department fabrications, although sections of the Jewish press had been protesting for several years against the annihilation of Jewish cultural institutions in the Soviet Union. The Soviet Yiddish press, theatre, organizations, and noted writers had disappeared, and a stone wall of silence surrounded the subject. Then, in 1951, came stories of mass deportations of Hungarian and Rumanian Jews: a wave of suicides swept Budapest and Bucharest. In 1952 came the Prague trials.

The Prague Trials

To review the details of what took place at this trial is in itself nauseating. The charges are not only fantastic, but they reek of rank anti-Semitism. A "Jewish-nationalist-Zionist-imperialist conspiracy" was discovered, financed by Baruch and the Rothschilds, under a secret agreement between Truman, Acheson, and Ben Gurion. Mordecai Oren, a fervent Stalinist leader of Israel's Mapam, was presented as an American spy: the Zionists were described as "the imperialist agents of Washington."

Eleven of the fourteen tried were Jews, and after their names came the phrase, "of Jewish origin." Their non-working-class parentage was stressed. In their own "confessions," they assisted the prosecutor by pointing out that as "Jewish bourgeois nationalists" it was inevitable that they commit treason against the Peoples' Democracy of Czechoslovakia. The facts are that there were never any more rabid anti-Zionists than these Jewish Stalinists. Those who attempt to deny the manifest *anti-Semitism* of the trials become moral accomplices of the crime.

The trial must be viewed as part of a larger whole, linked to the earlier drive against "cosmopolitanism," and to the recent purge of five Jewish doctors in Moscow. It is an ideological preparation for a wholesale purge which can only mean more mass deportations of Jews to certain death in Siberian slave-labor camps. Zionism is involved inasmuch as the Jews are the one group within the Soviet Union and its satellites which nurtures a hope of emigra-

tion. In Israel, Jews have a concrete alternative to Stalinist tyranny. Their ties with the West also make them suspect. This is the case despite the cultural genocide which has been waged against the Jewish people in the Soviet Union for decades, and which has wiped out almost every trace of Jewish cultural life.

Conciliating the neo-Nazis and the Arabs cannot explain this recent outbreak of anti-Semitism. That the trials may help to absorb popular reaction to the economic failures in the satellite countries is only a partial explanation. Broad policy at the Kremlin level is involved. Political anti-Semitism may be a factional weapon to depose the Zhdanov men in favor of the Malenkov forces, whom Stalin favors as his successor. The Zhdanov-Beria faction is vulnerable to this tactic because Zhdanov staffed his east European puppet governments with Jews, precisely because they were "cosmopolitans," and thus less susceptible to the sort of nationalism which produced the Tito split. This theory need not contradict the assertion that the oppression results from a general tightening-up in the Stalinist empire. All elements in any way resistant to Great Russian chauvinism must be ruthlessly dealt with. Mass purges and genocide have honorable precedents in the Soviet Union. The liquidation of three million Jews is not too great a task for Soviet "social engineering."

The test of tests proves too painfully that those of us who years ago equated Stalinism with Hitlerism were not simply being rhetorically exuberant. We wonder whether those who have blindly continued to hold faith in the Soviet Union will dare to justify this crime. In attempting to call anti-Semitism "anti-Zionism," these latter-day fellow-travellers are guilty of a heinous distortion. We wonder, too, whether those liberals who confuse all anti-Stalinism with the hysterical rightist variety will refrain from denouncing this new upsurge of anti-Semitism.

Our task is clear. We can denounce absolutely the subjugation of national minorities, and condemn absolutely all forms of chauvinism, because we refuse to be ideologically trapped in the hopeless *realpolitik* of the imperialist power conflict. To support either imperialist bloc, however critically, is to accept responsibility for its crimes against oppressed minorities. Moral indignation at any specific instance of oppression is inadequate unless it strikes at the root of the matter — the imperialist power struggle itself.

LEONARD PRAGER

Leonard Prager is an editor of Anvil.

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.

Assault on the Colleges

When President Conant of Harvard University was recently named proconsul of our German provinces, his appointment was opposed by Representative Mundt on the grounds that he was "too bookish." Reading has always been regarded as a bad habit in Philistia, but recently it has become downright subversive. A person who reads too much is regarded as potentially disloyal, on the theory that if he comes into contact with a wide variety of ideas, some are bound to be dangerous.

The would-be architects of American totalitarianism intuitively scent an enemy in the free university. That is why the 83rd Congress proposes to lavish its attention on our traditional centers of free thought. Two Congressional committees have already announced plans for "investigating" the nation's classrooms. The House Un-American Activities Committee, headed by Representative Velde, former sleuth for the FBI, will lead a frontal assault on the citadels of learning. The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee (formerly the McCarran Committee) will conduct mopping-up operations under Senator Jenner.

The reaction of the academic community to the proposed "cleansing of our colleges" has been appalling. By and large, the colleges have extended the welcome-mat to the witch-hunters, while issuing reassuring manifestos to the effect that "we have nothing to fear." In view of this sorry capitulation, it is worth reproducing a ringing statement on academic freedom issued by the Oberlin College faculty and administration about a year ago. The statement urges all colleges and universities "to make a strong and uncompromising defense of intellectual freedom." The editors of *Anvil* have seen no better answer to aspiring thought-police like Velde and Jenner:

●

"ACADEMIC FREEDOM is the liberty to examine, to discuss, and to evaluate phenomena in all fields of learning, subject only to the generally accepted criteria of conscientious scholarship. It is a freedom which is derived from the very nature of the democratic society within which our academic community exists. Times of crisis present sharp challenges to the professed values of a democratic society. At such times it is tempting to measure all things by the rough standards of unity, loyalty and orthodoxy. The inevitable tendency is to restrict such fundamentals of democracy as discussion and debate, and even to make divergence of opinion appear dangerous.

"Universities and colleges are particularly vulnerable at such times, because their operational code is predicated on the assumption that fallible men can serve truth and knowledge best by ceaseless questioning and the free exchange of ideas. Our hope of transcending our present and partial insights depends in large measure upon maintaining in these communities of scholars the freedom to pursue their studies wherever the truth, as they see it, may lead them. And when their experiments and scholarly studies lead to

conclusions which are contrary to accepted beliefs, their right to hold and to teach these conclusions should not be questioned; their arguments should not be met by coercion. or by dismissal of the scholar from the academic community, but by superior evidence and cogent reasoning on the part of those who hold contrary views.

"This does not mean that academic freedom is license, or that the teacher is without responsibilities. His freedom is bounded by the recognized standards of his profession. He is not free to distort, to insist upon the acceptance of his beliefs as absolute truth, to refuse criticism of his own beliefs, or to disparage the reason and conscience of his fellow scholars. True scholarship demands complete integrity.

"Free and responsible inquiry is essential if scholarship, as we have understood it, is to continue. The hope of progress and security for any society lies in encouraging diversity of opinion and the free examination of ideas rather than blind conformity or suppression. A college or university, above all, must be a place in which the validity of ideas, new and old, is examined critically. The gains from this careful evaluation of ideas accrue to the whole society

Dignity of Human Mind

"Academic freedom, like freedom itself, must be continually reasserted. The present attacks on academic freedom are not without precedent. Nevertheless they must not

be underestimated. They have drawn strength from the anti-intellectualism of our time and from the emotional tensions arising out of political controversy. A defense of academic freedom now is a defense of the dignity of the human mind and spirit. To affirm the ideals of academic freedom is to affirm the fundamentals of the democratic process itself.

"The Oberlin College faculty regards all forms of interference with intellectual freedom, discriminatory loyalty oaths, censorship, and other restrictions on free speech and thought as inimical to the democratic way of life. From its beginning, Oberlin College has fostered and defended intellectual freedom, and its faculty has been unhampered in its search for knowledge. On the Oberlin campus not only are all inquiry, all opinions, and all expression permissible, but wide diversity of scholarly opinion is encouraged. We, the Oberlin faculty, urge all colleges and universities to make a strong and uncompromising defense of intellectual freedom. We urge all faculties and administrative officials to avoid that categorizing tendency which creates guilt by association, for it is the character and integrity of the individual scholar, as well as his methods and purposes, that should determine his right to membership in a community of scholars."

Legal Rights Department:

Briefing Our Anvil Salesmen

Recent attempts in various parts of the country to halt the public sale of ANVIL make it imperative that all associated with the distribution of the magazine be versed in the legal guarantees to political and religious groups selling their publications in public places. The following Supreme Court decisions are of primary importance:

LOVELL vs. GRIFFIN (1938) — 303 U.S. 404

The *Lovell case* establishes that "the rights of free exercise of religion, free speech, free press and free assembly will be protected against infringement by the states (this includes municipal ordinances, by several earlier decisions — Ed.) except when the utterance or the act in question is (a) a crime at common law or (b) a statutory offense . . ." It also provides that "a specific tax upon printed publications, the

purpose of which is to place a restraint upon the dissemination of information, is an unconstitutional violation of the freedom of the press."

JONES vs. OPELIKA (1943, — 319 US 103)

The re-hearing of the *Jones case* established that peddler's licenses do not apply to publications. Both the *Lovell case* and the *Jones case* were fought by Jehovah's Witnesses. There is also a Jehovah's Witness case (*MARTIN vs. CITY OF STRUTHERS, 1943, 319 U.S. 141*) that establishes the right to sell literature from door to door, by ringing doorbells, etc. We recommend highly Edward F. Waite's article, "The Debt of Constitutional Law to Jehovah's Witnesses," which appeared in the *Minnesota Law Review of March, 1944*, for those seeking further briefing on the crucial problem of freedom to disseminate ideas through public sale of political literature.

The Eisenhower Administration

Is It Moving Toward a Liberal Garrison State?

The sophisticated conservatives have a program for slump. It involves the building of a war economy during peacetime while speaking all the liberal phrases. . . . Probably as they see it, the high military and the big management should unite and form a new elite. . . . They will be shrewd enough politically to attempt to capture the labor leaders for this program. . . . If they are smart about labor, they might hope to win over a bloc from the liberal center. . . . In the meantime, the sophisticated conservatives will discipline the practical conservatives whom the labor leaders fear. . . .

— C. Wright Mills, *The New Men of Power**

EISENHOWER'S VICTORY has brought to power the toughest, most professional opponents ever faced by the American left. Within a few months, the men who call the signals on Eisenhower's "team" have rolled up an impressive score. Handicapped by a Republican National Committee controlled by their factional opponents, they stole the presidential nomination from the Taft forces. In a bitterly fought election campaign, they brilliantly out-generated their Democratic opposition. After riding to power on the backs of the Dixiecrats and the Old Guard, they have tossed them both on the political garbage heap, wooing instead the liberal-labor supporters of their Democratic predecessors! At the present time they are successfully winning enough support from the milling herd of bewildered and disoriented liberals to provide "democratic" window-dressing for their garrison state.

Who are the men that make up Eisenhower's brain trust, and what do they represent? They are the sophisticated spokesmen of Big Business, of the monopolized sections of American industry. Their tendency is represented by magazines such as *Fortune* and *Business Week*, which are concerned with the long-range preservation of the capitalist system on a world scale. Their program is simplicity itself. They would stave off depression with a permanent war economy, and maintain the hegemony of the American Empire by dispatching martial legions to its far-flung borders. The price exacted of American democracy in exchange for this "stability" is limited wars abroad and a garrison state at home.

The New Regime

The personnel of the new regime follows the broad outlines foreseen by Mills. Eisenhower himself is of course a mere figurehead. His remark upon visiting the United Nations for the first time ("Brother, this is something")

* A basic book, worth reading or re-reading in the light of the 1952 elections. Written in 1948, this book delineates with startling prophetic insight most of the historical trends which have come to fruition in the Eisenhower regime.

indicates, if his campaign speeches did not, that he is an exponent of the bare-foot approach to politics. It is a fatal mistake to confuse his obvious mediocrity and naivete with the political sagacity of those who groomed him as a front. It is Eisenhower's "advisers" who will wield power in the new regime.

Mills writes of these sophisticated conservatives, "they work in and among elite groups, primarily the high military, the chieftains of large corporations, and certain politicians." All three career lines are represented in the new administration. From the officer corps comes the President himself, and his close friend and associate General Lucius Clay. From the corporation bureaucracy comes Charles Wilson of GM, George Humphrey of the Mark Hanna Co., and Winthrop Aldrich of Chase National Bank, to mention only a few. From careers in politics come Tom Dewey, Herbert Brownell, Senator Lodge, and John Foster Dulles, perhaps the key men in the new regime. With the Durkin appointment, labor has been offered participation in the government as a captive of Big Business and the military. With this addition, Mills' picture of four years ago becomes complete.

BIG BUSINESS GOES 'LIBERAL'

The appointment of Mr. Durkin is an incredible appointment. . . . It was never even suggested that a man would be appointed who has always been a partisan Truman Democrat, who fought General Eisenhower's election, and advocated the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Law.

— Senator Taft, *New York Times* Dec. 3, 1952

Those of us who refused to support Stevenson last fall, from the viewpoint of a socialist protest vote, were met repeatedly by the following argument from student liberals: "You may be right about Stevenson's position on war and civil liberties, but look at the Republicans! Eisenhower is a captive of the Old Guard, and his election will open the gates to fascism. Think of the Cabinet in the event of a Republican victory: McCarthy, Attorney-General; Jenner, Sec'y of State; MacArthur, Sec'y of Defense; and Taft, Sec'y of Labor! A victory for these men will plunge the country into a morass of reaction!"

These solemn predictions of national disaster in the event of a Republican victory are no exaggeration. They were put forward so vigorously that socialist voters were often regarded as "traitors to liberalism," and even unwitting precursors of Gerald L. K. Smith. Now history has seen fit to put these predictions to the test. Events have shown not a sharp turn toward reaction, but a basic continuity with the policies of the Fair Deal.

Not two days after the elections, jubilant Republican newspapers were already putting on the brakes, and laying the groundwork for a continuation of Truman's policies. After all, they cautioned, we can't expect Ike to balance the budget *this* year. Since he has inherited the Truman budget for the first six months of 1953, we can't realistically look forward to any substantial reduction in taxes. It seems that the Communists are exceedingly reluctant to end the Korean War, and as for the Mess in Washington — what a Mess! It may take years to untangle the damage the Democrats have done. We can't expect miracles overnight, etc.

Business as Usual

Nor has Eisenhower given evidence of drastic, reactionary intentions. On the contrary, his aim seems to be to reassure the world that while it may be time for a change, the change will not amount to much. Business as usual has been the keynote of the inter-regnum. Ike's symbolic visit to the White House emphasized a "smooth transition" to the new regime. His conspicuous pilgrimage to the UN was intended as a public repudiation of Old Guard isolationism, and a guarantee that the same old shell-game would be continued under new management. Above all, the Durkin appointment was calculated to pull the teeth of potential labor resistance to the new regime, by promising a continuation of the "Friends of Labor" policy of the Democrats.

The Durkin appointment may be worth a digression, if only to demonstrate the superior caliber of the Eisenhower brain trust. They understand that they came to power through an unstable coalition, under circumstances which can never be repeated. (Next time *they* will be the "ins.") They must therefore try to consolidate their position by winning support from the liberal-labor camp, or at least by "neutralizing" this potential opposition. Their initial aim is to win over the backward sections of the AFL, and to disarm, if possible, the expected militancy of the CIO.

The extent to which they have already succeeded in this tactic is illustrated by a recent radio and television address by James Carey, Secretary-Treasurer of the CIO. "The incoming administration of Dwight D. Eisenhower," said Carey, "will lend an ear to labor. The appointment of Martin Durkin as Secretary of Labor makes this evident. The worth of the appointment is shown by Senator Robert Taft's attacks on Durkin." (AP dispatch of Dec. 15)

Disciplining the Old Guard

The Durkin appointment must also be seen in the context of the need to discipline the Old Guard. This the sophisticated conservatives must do in order to carry out their program of permanent war economy, which is in direct opposition to the Old-Guard ideology. The Taft forces are now, and have been since 1940, the helpless captives of the Big-Business wing of the Party. There is no place else for them to go; hence they get no concessions. On the contrary, they have already felt the whiplash of Party discipline.

The appointment of Ohio businessman George Humphrey to the Cabinet without consulting the senior Sen-

ator from Ohio was an open affront. The appointment to a Cabinet post of an AFL bureaucrat, with whom Taft must work closely as chairman of the Senate Labor Relations Committee, heaped insult on injury. In organizing the State power, not a single political concession was made to the Old Guard. Every Cabinet appointment came from the Dewey slate. Taft submitted a list to Eisenhower which was totally ignored. Humphrey (Treasury) and Benson (Agriculture) are not Taft men. Their appointments represent an obvious attempt by the Dewey forces to build anti-Taft machines in Taft's own bailiwick, on the basis of the newly acquired Federal patronage.

The effectiveness of this discipline is best illustrated by the more vociferous reactionaries of the Republican Party. What has become of these Hobgoblins with whom the liberals were wont to frighten small children? They have come meekly home to roost, under the wing of a "friendly" administration. Not four days after the election Senator McCarthy, in a bald-faced confession of political opportunism, announced to the world that he "will concentrate on graft and corruption instead of Communism when he returns to Washington." In an interview with the *NY World Telegram* McCarthy stated:

Now it will be unnecessary for me to conduct a one-man campaign to expose Communists in government. We have a new President who doesn't want any party-line thinkers or fellow-travellers. He will conduct the fight.

Can this new note of restraint be the result of a McCarthy-Eisenhower pre-election deal? — Ike's support in exchange for Joe's soft-pedal?

A few weeks later Senator Jenner, leading Republican isolationist from Indiana, "put himself on record as a backer of the foreign policies of General Dwight D. Eisenhower." According to the *New York Times* of Nov. 26,

Mr. Jenner said his cooperation with General Eisenhower would extend to such items as foreign aid and reciprocal trade, both of which he has fought in the past. Yet, when asked at a news conference whether this did not represent a change in position, he replied "Absolutely not!"

Not to be outdone, Senator Taft announced in a press conference that he would go easy on proposed changes in the Taft-Hartley Law. According to the *New Haven Register* of Nov. 28,

Taft says he has no intention now of pushing for one change which organized labor would fight bitterly — a ban on industry-wide bargaining.

We need not labor the point that Black Tuesday has turned out to be only tattletale gray. The liberals are already discovering that for themselves. What they will not be able to grasp is that the new regime represents an authentic *continuation* of the "creeping totalitarianism" of the Fair Deal. Finding that things are not as bad as they anticipated, they erroneously conclude that there is nothing to worry about. Finding the Eisenhower administration not much different from its Democratic predecessor, they conclude with a sigh of relief that the country is really in the hands of "liberal" Republicans, and they need not go into militant opposition after all!

THE LIBERALS CLOSE RANKS

Americans for Democratic Action has pledged support of the incoming Republican administration as long as President-elect Dwight D. Eisenhower honors his campaign promises. . . ADA leaders said they did not consider the election of Eisenhower "a repudiation of liberalism."

— AP dispatch, Phila., Dec. 15

During the campaign, feeling against Eisenhower ran high among the liberals. It found expression in the slogan "The Great Crusade has become the Great Surrender." The man who compromised his principles and sold out to Taft was not fit to occupy the White House. Then suddenly Eisenhower performed a feat which restored him to grace — he got elected. Literally overnight the liberals' line on Ike took a 180-degree turn. From all segments of liberal opinion, telegrams of congratulations and pledges of support poured in to the man whom they had formerly denounced as a tool of reaction. It may be worth reproducing some of these testimonials, in order to catch the flavor of this development.

Estes Kefauver, in the *New Republic*: "Much remains to be done. And we are ready to join forces with Gen. Eisenhower to finish the job . . ."

Hubert Humphrey, in the *New Republic*: "Dwight D. Eisenhower, as President of the United States will be my President. As an American citizen and as a United States Senator, it is my intention to comport myself in such a manner as to pay respect to the high office of President of the United States . . ."

Murry Lincoln, in *The Nation*: "General Eisenhower has had wide experience in tackling global problems . . ."

Walter White, of the NAACP, after a visit with the President-elect: "General Eisenhower spoke very feelingly and strongly on the necessity for having no second-class citizenship for any American citizen . . ."

James Carey, of the CIO, after a "most pleasant conversation": "General Eisenhower has indicated that the doors of the White House will be open to us . . ."

Jerry Voorhis, of the Cooperative League: "Benson's appointment gives cooperatives a status in the Cabinet that should increase public understanding and acceptance of them . . ."

This universal paean from the liberals should surprise no one. The "Liberals-for-Eisenhower" Movement has a long history. In 1948, it will be recalled, an important group of liberals, spearheaded by the ADA, asked Ike to run for President on the Democratic ticket. Early this year, Senator Paul Douglas publicly suggested that both parties nominate him, as "the only man who can unify the country." Now that Ike is President, this trend has been resumed.

Meanwhile, to be sure, a brief hiatus has occurred in Ike's career as a liberal. Through an unfortunate misunderstanding Ike, who is really a liberal at heart, accepted the nomination of the Republican Party. Then, with one arm around Joe McCarthy and the other around Jimmy Byrnes, he rode into power. But why hesitate over trivial details? He *won* didn't he? As every liberal knows, it's the

man that counts, and Ike, by whatever devious means, is undeniably in the White House, where his liberalism can assert itself effectively. After all, political objectives are not always reached in a straight line — minor detours are sometimes necessary.

Causes for Reconciliation

The liberals' prompt reconciliation with Eisenhower has many causes, which we will suggest in ascending order of importance. (1) Pressure, group politics and careerism. The self-interest of the NAACP, the Co-ops, or the CIO in cultivating the good graces of the new regime are obvious. The campus liberal, likewise, is often the recipient of professional training which will lead to a career in government. Men of good will must convince themselves that they are entering the service of a government of good will.

(2) The need for a Father-image. Without exaggerating psychological factors, there can be no doubt that liberals have sought an "escape from freedom" in recent years. Their uncritical faith that they could trust Stevenson "to make the right decisions" is a case in point. By a simple process of transference they will soon find a new faith in Eisenhower. Witness Allan Nevins, liberal historian at Columbia and pre-election opponent of Eisenhower, who writes in the *New York Times Magazine Section* of Nov. 23:

In so heavy a crisis, Democrats and Republicans alike will cherish the faith that the commander who fought with such careful, sagacious planning and such indomitable courage on the field of battle, will bring the same great qualities to the field of civic affairs.

(3) Lesser-evilism. The politics of the lesser evil has a logic of its own, which led many liberals to support Stevenson in spite of serious reservations. Now Stevenson is irrelevant, in terms of the "realistic" politics of the next few years. The choices are again narrowed. This time it is Eisenhower and the "liberal" Republicans, vs. the Old Guard. What liberal can hesitate? More basically, in terms of world politics, it is Eisenhower vs. Stalin. As much as American liberals think they detest fascism, if America went fascist tomorrow — if Eisenhower appointed McCarthy Chancellor — they would support him against Stalinism.

(4) Political agreement. But most of all, the liberals are becoming reconciled to Eisenhower, the mouthpiece for Big Business, because *they agree with him* on the basic issues of war and witch-hunt. Their policy for dealing with the threat of Stalinism is basically one of military containment. Who can implement this policy better than a general? As for creeping totalitarianism at home, the liberals are no longer willing to defend the civil liberties of Stalinists. Why should they object when Eisenhower extends the purges of the Truman administration and pushes the country gradually in the direction of a garrison state?

Rationalizations

No less interesting than the liberals' real reasons for their rapprochement with Eisenhower are their imagined reasons, or rationalizations, commencing with their inter-

pretation of the election itself. In order to separate Ike from everything traditionally hated and feared in the Republican Party, liberals have insisted that his landslide was a *personal* rather than Party victory. Only *The Nation*, which so far has maintained a relatively critical line, emphasized that the election was in addition a triumph for the Party of Big Business. Having elevated Big Brother above his Party, the next step is to endow him with unquestionably benevolent intentions. A pathetic tone flows from this assumption in recent liberal journalism: If Eisenhower asserts his leadership, stands by his "real principles," if he is wise, if he accepts responsibility, if he chooses the "right" advisers, etc., his election may yet be a triumph for liberalism.

The personal magnification of America's new Leader was followed by the sudden discovery that the Republican Party has a "liberal" wing. "Manifestly," writes Allan Nevins, "*Manifestly*, ever since Mr. Landon's cataclysmic defeat in 1936, the dominant element in the Republican Party has been the wing closest to the dominant Democratic wing." This startling discovery immediately suggested an appropriate tactic to the fertile liberal imagination. Their brilliant new stratagem is to protect Eisenhower and his "liberal, internationalist" group against the Taftites! We have already seen how the Dewey machine is cringing at the feet of the Old Guard, and how desperately it requires the assistance of liberal Boy Scouts!

We have dealt at some length with an unsavory subject in order to illustrate the utter bankruptcy of modern liberalism. Through their rapprochement with Eisenhower, the liberals are walking backwards into the future envisioned by the sophisticated conservatives. By rendering a "me-too" endorsement to the new regime, they will unwittingly provide Big Business with a liberal front. In the past, according to the liberal rhetoric, one was either for "the people" or "the vested interests." With the advent of the sophisticated conservatives to power, it is possible to be for both simultaneously. Never have liberals had it so good.

THE LESSON OF THE ELECTIONS

This is the role of the modern "liberals" who hate fascism, but fear revolution. In the end such liberals count for nothing.

— Clare and Harris Wofford, *India Afire*

The liberals' political universe has been turned topsyturvy by the unexpected behavior of the Eisenhower regime. The most bewildering fact, for which there seems no accounting, is the striking similarity between Republican "reaction" and its Democratic predecessor. The liberals' current explanation leads only into a dead end. They observe this undeniable similarity, and since they regard Truman's Fair Deal as "liberal" by definition, they simply extend this nomenclature to embrace the "liberal" wing of the Republican Party. By a convenient act of "doublethink" they transform Winthrop Aldrich of Chase National Bank into a liberal!

What they should learn from this election is not how "liberal" the Republicans have become, but how *conservative* the Fair Deal had become. The basic continuity of administrations is not due to a sudden conversion to liberalism on the part of Thomas E. Dewey, but to the bipartisan commitment to a permanent war economy. This is what Allan Nevins half comprehends when he writes:

The great social, economic and political forces in a world of two billion people move inexorably forward as administrations come and go.

The election again underscores the evolution of the Democratic Party from the liberalism of the New Deal to the conservatism of the Fair Deal. Else how were the reins of power handed over so smoothly to the avowed party of Big Business? In this perspective, the Democratic Party must be seen not as the permanent party of American liberalism, but as the party which had a *temporary* liberal interlude during the thirties.

The next intelligent question to ask is "Why did this basically conservative party temporarily lapse into liberalism?" To raise the question is to answer it. Because of the *independent political action* of the masses during that decade, which forced the Democratic Party to the left. Because of growing unemployed workers' organizations, because of mass sit-down strikes, because of the two million votes cast against the capitalist system in the 1932 elections.

The absolutely essential condition of a vigorous liberalism is the existence of a mass movement *to its left*.* In the presence of such a movement, liberalism becomes superfluous. Worse — it becomes a drag on progress. (See the following article on South Africa in this issue). In the absence of a mass leftward movement, liberalism degenerates into a sterile endorsement of the status quo. Today, when the main drift of American society is toward a garrison state, liberalism takes on some of the totalitarian characteristics of the main drift.

Which Way for American Labor?

The only hope of resistance to the main drift is the labor movement. Yet at this point it is not impossible that the sophisticated conservatives will temporarily succeed in bringing the labor movement to heel. The temptations are great: full employment at high wages in a permanent war economy — even pension plans and a guaranteed annual wage are not excluded. Above all, the sophisticated conservatives offer a joint-defense of the American standard of living (ie, the American Empire) against "political instability" in the rest of the world.

On the other hand, the strains of the permanent war economy are severe. The crushing burden of armament, borne chiefly by the working-class, may well produce a development similar to Bevanism. Whether or not the sophisticated conservatives have solved all their labor problems through a shrewd Cabinet appointment remains to be seen.

BOB BONE

* The editors of Anvil do not regard Stalinism as a leftist movement.

Cry the Beloved White Man!

South Africa's Liberals Try to Stay on Top

Oh, let us love our occupations,
Bless the master and his relations,
Live upon our daily rations
And always know our proper stations.

(Dickens)

THE FERMENT in South Africa which all the world watched nonchalantly and expected little from has begun to worry some of the liberals of the South African opposition party, the United Party. This group, which did not raise its political voice or its opposition strength in the long months of preparation for the disobedience campaign, ignoring the grave warnings of the African National Congress, is now urgently concerned. Why? Plainly because the action undertaken by the non-whites has turned out to be more than a brief, spasmodic, ill-organized affair with harsh accusations, incensed marching and speech-making — then confused rout, a couple of days to sleep it off, and normalcy again.

It has taken the confused and shocked South African liberals four months to realize that this campaign bears all the marks of mature political thinking and organization. For the first time Negroes, Indians, and Coloreds are cooperating on a national level with such cohesion that even six thousand whites, thus far, have joined the cause and suffered imprisonment. Confronted with this astounding fact, South Africa's liberals have prescribed the following remedy for heading off incipient revolution:

Equal Rights for All Civilized People

We have watched with dismay the situation that has developed from the growth of the Non-European movement of passive resistance against unjust laws. This movement clearly is no sudden impulse. It bears all the signs of careful thought and planning over many months by men who are acknowledged leaders among Africans and Indians and have organized it with a full appreciation of all it implies. The movement has met with very remarkable response both from the mass of the people and from those to whom it appeals for voluntary personal support and for substantial courage and sacrifice.

In these circumstances it is clear that we South Africans face a double challenge. It is a challenge to those who hold the reins of government; and it is, not less, a challenge to all who participate in the exercise of political power, i.e., the whole white community. The challenge comes primarily from those who are excluded by reason of their race or color from any real form of citizenship.

Considering the movement in this light, we are sure that no good can come from merely condemning it and denouncing its leaders. We Europeans must frame an answer, and adopt an approach to the movement that holds within it constructive possibilities.

Otherwise, we foresee a progressive worsening of race relations, and an even deeper bitterness than is already visible in our country in the relations between its peoples.

1. Reprinted from Rand Daily Mail, Johannesburg, Sept. 29, 1952.

We believe that it is imperative that South Africa should now adopt a policy that will attract the support of educated, politically conscious non-Europeans by offering them a reasonable status in our common society. This can be done by a revival of the liberal tradition which prevailed for so many years, and with such successful results in the Cape Colony. That tradition, an integral part of South African history, was based on a firm principle, namely, equal rights for all civilized people. In our opinion, only the acceptance of that fundamental principle can provide the South African government with the moral basis it now lacks.

We believe that the wise and steady application of this principle will gradually remedy the worst grievances and disabilities which non-Europeans now suffer, since their deepest feelings are stirred by the fact that our laws are not based, as they should be, on tests of civilization and education, but of race and color.

On their side, we ask the African and Indian leaders to recognize that it will take time and patience substantially to improve the present position. We ask them to accept the principle we have indicated as a long-term aim, and we do so in the hope that it will make negotiations possible and their success probable.

As an immediate short-term programme of reform we urge all who sincerely desire racial peace and harmony in our country to concentrate on demanding the repeal of the most mischievous measures on the statute-book.

They are measures such as the Group Areas Act, the pass laws, and the Suppression of Communism Act in its present form — measures which offend the human sense of justice as well as the canons of good government.

Finally, we appeal to all concerned to express themselves with restraint at this disturbing time and to refrain from doing or saying anything that might aggravate the present unhappy situation.

(Signed, etc. . .)

If this letter were not sufficient to expose the hypocrisy of the South African liberals, perhaps one of its signers has elsewhere provided us with decisive proof. Alan Paton, in the movie version of his *Cry The Beloved Country* (whose script he wrote), most movingly and thoroughly analyzes the plight of the oppressed African Negro. When the audience is completely convinced of the humiliation and futility of Negro life, which under existing conditions erupts in divers social disturbances, then Paton suggests his remedy — better housing and more boy's clubs!

The active participation of the African masses in the resistance campaign has dramatically revealed the superficiality of Paton's approach. As the African National Congress seized the initiative, uplift from above was replaced by upheaval from below. Faced with a revolutionary situation, the South African liberals have revealed their true colors.

To any who have had an opportunity to get at the facts of the disobedience campaign (from other than the deliberately meager press sources), the letter reproduced above will show an appalling resistance-breaking technique. What appears to be a lofty and noble attempt at a

"third way" in this stormy situation, upon closer examination is unmistakably a most clever tactic to break the ranks of the resistance.

Consider the situation. The nerve of the resistance movement is composed of the blacks, the majority of whom are illiterate and some of whom are still frankly primitive. The second largest group are the Coloreds or people of "mixed descent," the majority of whom are literate and, indeed, under the Smuts regime had been granted a limited franchise. The third group is the Indian population — native Africans of Indian descent. Because of this heterogeneous aspect of the movement all whites in South Africa thought the campaign hadn't a ghost of a chance. Yet all these groups, literate or not, demonstrated a remarkable political discipline and presented a united, non-violent front to the oppressive Malan government.

It is at this point that the liberals of the United Party began to feel a trifle insecure. After all, even though they constitute an opposition party, even though they are liberals, yet they are still white. This anti-European campaign is succeeding; it spells equality for the native population; this in turn spells an end of white minority domination of the colored majority. Plainly unpalatable . . . even for liberals.

Observers who read this plea for "restraint" should notice especially the call for the adoption of "a policy that will attract the support of *educated, politically conscious non-Europeans*" by offering them a *reasonable status* in our common society." Here the liberals indulge in that rhetoric

so familiar to radicals in America which is designed to split the opposition into rival factions and thus enervate the resistance.

This divide-and-conquer tactic by the white liberals is in the last analysis a product of their racial chauvinism. Their appeal to all "civilized people" among the non-whites is aimed at the Coloreds who, by virtue of their white ancestry, are presumed to possess a monopoly of intelligence and organizing genius. If these mulattos can be granted some intermediate status, so think the liberals, they may be mollified and abandon the resistance — thus insuring its defeat. Unfortunately for such theories of racial superiority, the African National Congress seems to be more than holding its own. The liberals' attempt to "behead" the movement is doomed to disappointment.

To date this appeal for "restraint" by the South African liberals has gone unheeded by the leaders of the disobedience movement. These determined men have not broken ranks to stoop for the few bones cast their way by a desperate, frightened white group. Perhaps the continued militancy and discipline of these non-violent resisters will force the South African liberal away from the brink of reaction toward a more realistic political perspective. It is more likely, however, that the mark of delineation between these liberals and the conservative government of Malan will become even more indistinguishable as the campaign progresses.

WALT HUNDLEY

Walt Hundley is a student at Yale Divinity School.

Boston Students Aid South African Resistance

Rebounding from the shock of the November election results and the nationwide swing to the right which it signified, a group of students and other young people in the Cambridge-Boston area was formed to act as a working committee to undertake a campaign of fund-raising in support of the nonviolent resistance movement in South Africa. The constituency of the students and young working people who volunteered in this undertaking includes independent socialists, pacifists, social-minded theological students, young Quakers and the like. The immediate stimulus for the formation of this action committee was the article by George Houser in the fall number of *Anvil* on South Africa (this issue of *Anvil* was in great demand here) followed by several talks by Bayard Rustin on his trip last summer to Africa.

Affiliation with the national organization, *Americans for South African Resistance*, was immediately sought and obtained. The local group dubbed itself *Bostonians Allied for South African Resistance*, but has since been known exclusively as BAFSAR.

In January BAFSAR put out a printed brochure presenting briefly the situation in South Africa today, the concern of the group for it, and the activities which

BAFSAR planned to undertake. The leaflet states the committee's motivation as follows: "Feeling upon us the burden of racial injustice in our own country and throughout the world, and having sympathy for the aspirations of dark-skinned peoples everywhere for recognition of their human dignity, we endeavor to support them in these aspirations and to create fuller understanding in ourselves and our fellow citizens of the complex social and economic patterns of racial discrimination that exist."

Currently, BAFSAR has stepped up its activities in the holding of forums on South Africa, as the demand from various organizations increases. It is busy publicizing the large evening meeting in the middle of March with George Houser and Z. K. Matthews, at which a direct appeal for funds for South Africa will be made.

A side effect of these activities for the support of the South African resistance campaign has been a revitalization and growth of the various cooperating organizations in the socialist and pacifist student and young people's ranks at Harvard, Boston University, Simmons, Tufts, Radcliffe, and other institutions in the Boston area.

Gale Potee

America's Murder Incorporated

Washington's Occupation Policy in Germany

IN THE OFFICES and meeting halls of the neo-Nazi organizations in Western Germany, there is to be observed a certain solid satisfaction. It is only a provisional satisfaction, for much remains to be done before the dishonor and humiliation of defeat can be finally erased; but it is solid in the knowledge that events are moving firmly in the right direction. With the prospect of the Bonn government acquiring even more trappings of outward sovereignty before much time elapses, the fetters on the neo-Nazis are being rapidly removed.

There is nothing more remarkable in Western Germany in the eighth year after the war than the aggressive self-confidence with which the neo-Nazis survey their situation. But it is remarkable only when seen without its background. These men have some excuse for self-confidence. Though many were imprisoned by the Americans in 1945, they were at liberty again a few years afterwards; and today, they form one of the most powerful political forces in Germany. They and the Ruhr industrialists, acting together through the same political organizations are rising once more to supremacy in Germany.

U.S. Supports Neo-Nazis

High among the reasons for this self-confidence is the support which some neo-Nazi organizations are receiving from the U.S. For the past several weeks, Western Germany has been agitated by the discovery that the U.S. authorities have been training, arming and financing a German underground army for use in the event of war with Russia. Dr. August Zinn, the Socialist Minister-President of Hesse, revealed that the U.S. authorities established a clandestine guerrilla army within the Bund Deutscher Jugend (League of German Youth), one of the many neo-Nazi bodies which have cropped up in postwar Germany. The function of the underground army, known as the "Technical Service," was to sabotage Soviet communications, troop installations and supply depots, and conduct guerrilla warfare in case the Russians should invade Western Germany.

Periodically, the BDJ units went to the Waldmichelback estate in the Odenwald Forest, where they were trained in the use of German, Russian and American weapons, including grenades, machine-guns and knives. The 100 "elite" youth involved were all former German officers of the Air Force, the Army and the Nazi SS units, ranging in age from 30 to 50. An American agency gave the Technical Service 50,000 marks (\$11,900) a month for operations plus a special sum for the establishment of the training camp and the purchase of the Waldmichelback estate.

What was more sensational in Dr. Zinn's revelations was the BDJ list of West German "undesirables" who were to be assassinated when the Russians struck. The list

contained the names of 15 Communists and of some 81 prominent Social Democrats. Among the intended Socialist victims of the BDJ were Erich Ollenhauer, Socialist party leader; Hanns Fehn, trade union leader; Ludwig Metzger, Hessian Culture Minister; Max Brauer, Mayor of Hamburg; Wilhelm Kaisen, Mayor of Bremen and several Bundestag leaders, including the only Jewish deputy. The Hesse Minister of the Interior, Heinrich Zinnkann, was placed on the list because he had banned the meetings of fanatical right-wing organizations. It was a cruel irony that the Mayors of Bremen and Hamburg were included because they are not only anti-communists like the others, but also pro-rearmament. To the BDJ, however, even a Social Democrat who supports rearmament is still a Communist of a slightly different hue.

The BDJ did not content itself with the anticipation of liquidating Germany's "enemies and traitors." According to *Der Spiegel*, a West German news magazine, the BDJ murdered a colonel who participated in the course at the Waldmichelback estate because "he expressed a desire for East-West understanding." A Christian Democrat member of the Bundestag who inquired about this charge was told by the Federal Office for the Protection of the Constitution that the facts of the case were true but that further investigation had been blocked by the American authorities.

German Opinion Alarmed

Adenauer's supporters tried at first to ridicule the BDJ affair and dismiss it as Socialist election propaganda. But after Dr. Zinn's disclosures were confirmed, scarcely a section of German opinion failed to be alarmed. Karl Gerold, editor-in-chief of the *Frankfurter Rundschau*, a pro-American newspaper which supports German rearmament, said in an editorial that "if the American military authorities did not know that murder and civil war were being plotted they were both deceivers and deceived. We German democrats refuse to join forces with fascists in the fight against Stalinists. People who do not understand what the conflict between freedom and oppression is all about should go home."

The Social Democratic press followed suit with even stronger language. The *Darmstaedter Echo* denounced "the good-for-nothing Americans who give military training to good-for-nothing adventurers." Erich Ollenhauer, the main target of the BDJ assassination program, was especially bitter against the U.S. "What has now been made public," he said in a Berlin speech, "is the result of a stupid brainless antibolshevism which is quite valueless for the cause of democracy."

The Hesse government has withheld some of the facts of the BDJ incident because it does not want to embarrass the American authorities. However, the U.S. State Depart-

ment has officially admitted that it established a German sabotage organization after the outbreak of the Korean War in anticipation of a possible Russian move into Western Germany. Later, the U.S. authorities claim they dissolved the Technical Service because it was "engaging unduly in Nazi politics."

Immediately after the discovery of the organization, the U.S. authorities prevented the arrest of Erhard Peters, the chief of the Technical Service, by placing him in an occupation building to which the German police had no access. The Federal Supreme Court confirmed that the German police arrested some of the other leaders involved on a charge of conspiracy but had released them when the Americans intervened. The leaders admitted to the police that they destroyed part of their files and turned over the remainder to an American liaison man.

The BDJ was founded in Frankfurt in 1950 when millions of Germans were once again belonging to, or sympathizing with, openly Fascist organizations. Its founding statement, couched in the best language of conservative nationalism, was signed by several well-known names. They included the manufacturer, Joachim von Ostau, well-known for nationalist views of an unusually primitive kind; Dr. Karl Ott, former high official in Goebbels' propaganda ministry and now Secretary of State of the Lower Saxony Ministry of the Interior; Hugo Eckener, the Zeppelin man; Dix, one of the German defense counsels at Nuremberg; and a mixed bag of die-hard conservatives.

Poisoned by a long period of Nazism, 18,000 youngsters have joined the BDJ. The tactics of the BDJ are similar to those of the Hitler Youth. Armed with knives and truncheons, the BDJ's young troopers have broken up Communist meetings and have attacked the Socialist youth.

• The Romans of Our Century

Two underlying motifs run through the propaganda of the BDJ. One is the demand for German rearmament, with a clear implication of reconquering Germany's lost provinces in Eastern Europe; and the other is the hope that the Americans will restore the Nazis to power in Germany. At a meeting of the BDJ in Frankfurt in December, 1950, one of its leaders proclaimed the BDJ's real aims: "They are false Christians who say that Christians must not kill . . . We'll reconquer Breslau and Koenigsberg . . . We are aganst any kind of planned economy . . . Denazification was the biggest crime and swindle against the German people. The United States is our guarantee of victory; the Americans are the Romans of our century. We don't want to haggle over defense like Schumacher; for we are receiving the unreserved support of the USA and we shall go on fighting to vindicate the honor of the Waffen SS."

Some of the more obvious leaders of the BDJ are Nazis and ex-Communists with unsavory backgrounds. There is, for instance, the BDJ's leader, Paul Luth, who directs the group's operations from Frankfurt. He was a zealous member of the German Communist party from 1945 to 1947 and conducted high-level negotiations with the Russian occupation authorities in East Germany. Another top leader of the BDJ is General Halder, formerly chief of the German general staff until 1943. Like so many other Nazis,

General Halder was tried and acquitted by a Denazification tribunal after the war. In the spring of 1949, Halder wrote a best-selling pamphlet, "Hitler Als Feldherr," in which he claimed that Germany could have won the war but for Hitler's mistakes — and but for the cardinal Allied mistake of fighting against the Germans to the finish instead of turning in good time against the Russians.

If Luth, Peters and Halder have to be discarded because of the recent scandal, there is plenty of solid Nazi talent to take their places. Others on the executive council of the BDJ are known to include Colonel Beck, an intelligence officer in the elite armored division, Grossdeutschland; Generals Natzmer and Kaufman, the former Gauletier of Hamburg and — his denials notwithstanding — General Remer, a notorious Nazi who had been promoted to a General for helping to put down the anti-Hitler plot of 1944.

Although the monthly dues of every member is only half a mark, the BDJ has been able to flood Western Germany with millions of leaflets. Last year, the BDJ admitted it received 1,700,000 marks in donations. While the Ruhr industrialists as a body do not appear to be financing the BDJ at the moment, one or two of them — such as Alfred Hugenberg, chairman of the Vereinigte Stahlwerke and Herman Reusch, managing director of the Gutehoffnungshuette — are known to make money available from time to time to some of the top leaders.

Anti-War Youth

The Adenauer government has given financial support to the BDJ, including a grant of 10,000 marks for a campmeet at Frankfurt last year. Adenauer considers the BDJ a useful ally in the coalition of conservative forces that has prevented the emergence of a new Germany since the second World War. This coalition, consisting of Adenauer and company, the heads of the great undisbanded imperial trusts and the ex-Werhmacht high command, now wants a new German army. But the major difficulty which now confronts its rearmament plans is the pacifism of the youth. The German youth today, perhaps for the first time in history, are deeply convinced that war cannot help them, cannot solve their problems. Consequently, the Adenauer government has undertaken, using every agency of press and propaganda, a campaign of "psychological preparation" designed to undermine the youth's resistance to remilitarization. Adenauer has been able to enlist the BDJ and other right-wing organizations in this "spiritual remilitarization" campaign because they are counting for their salvation upon a rearmed Germany and upon a third World War.

There are reports that the U.S. has spawned many other underground organizations similar to the BDJ. *Die Welt*, the semi-official newspaper of the British occupation authorities, claims fresh discoveries of U.S.-supported underground activities which are designed to organize a partisan army. The newspaper states that Flensburg, a small town on the Danish frontier, is being used as a depot for arms and equipment for this partisan army.

The Bavarian Minister-President, leader of the conservative Roman Catholic Party, charged that a secret or-

ganization equipped with American arms had been discovered in Bavaria. Nobert Hammacher, executive member of the BDJ, said that he knew of ten to fifteen illegal organizations like the BDJ. The Reuter's correspondent in West Berlin reported that there are more than 30 anti-communist groups in the city which "have admitted close contacts with Western intelligence agencies . . . Direct financial support comes from private groups in the United States and Western Europe. Subsidies, in the form of cheap accommodations, cheap printing facilities and translation services, are said to be supplied on recommendations of local United States officials."

Official Confirmation

The fact that the U.S. has spawned a network of underground organizations has now been confirmed by the Bonn government itself. Dr. Egidi, head of the police department of the Ministry of the Interior, admitted that "it is deeply regrettable that seven years after the end of the war certain American services should set up, train and organize on the territory of the Federal Republic secret armies, without the competent German authorities being consulted or even informed."

The BDJ incident has produced many repercussions in Western Germany. The Socialists are using the affair as a means of reinforcing their objections to rearmament. They are claiming that it demonstrates that the U.S., in its haste to find anti-communist allies, is rearming the wrong Germans. The Socialists hope that the scandal will cause a

revulsion of public opinion in Western Germany and arouse a profound distrust of America's rearmament plans in Western Germany.

Meanwhile, the German nationalists and Nazis, assured of American backing, are now beginning to speak a new language of authority and self-confidence. They are counting for their salvation upon their American benefactors who, overfrightened by Communism, are willing to condone relations with the most totalitarian elements.

Because of America's policies during the last few years, there has been a change of atmosphere in Germany. It is best illustrated by the swelling orchestration of support for those who are demanding the release of all war criminals, the removal of all restrictions on the neo-Nazis and the reunification of Germany by the use of force. Little by little, and quite noticeably now, the tone of official Germany is frankly and outrageously that of unrepentant nationalism. Ex-Nazis are found everywhere in places of authority and influence — in the courts, in the schools and universities and in parliament. America's support of underground organizations like the BDJ strengthens the unrepentant nationalists and Nazis, which is a development not displeasing to the Americans. Only among the nationalists and Nazis can they find mercenaries for a rearmed Germany and for a third World War.

GABRIEL GERSH

Gabriel Gersh is National Chairman of the Student League for Industrial Democracy.

Do You Believe in DEMOCRACY. .

Unlimited by national boundaries?

Unlimited by racial discrimination, war, militarism, imperialism, totalitarianism?

Not limited to political democracy, but including economic democracy, democracy in education, etc.?

If so, you should read

the BLAZE

Official Publication of

DEMOCRACY UNLIMITED

HENRY HITT CRANE
Honorary National Chairman

For a free sample copy of THE BLAZE, fill out this coupon, clip and mail to:

DEMOCRACY UNLIMITED
7532 Parkdale Avenue
St. Louis 5, Mo.

Name:

Complete Mailing Address:

.....
.....

John J. Holmes

PRINTING

Books and Periodicals

Union Label if Desired

EXTENDED CREDIT

41 WEST 33rd STREET
NEW YORK 1, NEW YORK

Wisconsin 7-5830

A Review of the Catholic Left

A Survey of its Origins and Political Direction

I have placed my hope in the hands of the revolutionists, since I prefer to see the world stake its soul rather than deny it.

Georges Bernanos

AMONG THE MANY tendencies arrayed on the contemporary political scene, one of the most interesting is a movement that has become known as the Catholic left. It is interesting because its existence poses new problems and opens up new possibilities for those of us concerned with the various aspects of social transformation. A brief survey of the history of the Catholic left will show that, far from being a fabricated movement, it has come into being spontaneously, usually against the opposition of all existing political bodies, including the Catholic Church. During its short existence, it has succeeded in growing continuously, winning working-class support in some areas and becoming an intellectual influence in all political-advanced centers.

When a new movement arises on the political scene, a number of questions are immediately posed. What are the social needs that made it arise; what role is it called upon to play; and, finally, what attitude are we to take towards this movement? To most of us this means establishing its relationship to the great issues of the day: war and peace, and social revolution. One of the reasons why it is difficult to undertake such an analysis in the present case is that the Catholic left is not a unified movement, but a variety of groups, some of which are opposed to each other in terms of their historical origin, their activities, and their political outlook. In addition, each of these groups is a complex, contradictory phenomenon in itself, which does not immediately fit into any of the simple categories to which one might try to assign it. It will therefore be necessary for us to determine first who the Catholic left is, then to analyze each of its tendencies separately.

Who the Catholic Left Is Not

To begin with, let me make it clear that I am not concerned here with the liberal wing of the Christian Democratic parties, which cannot be included in any "left" without making the concept meaningless. As government parties in France, Italy, and Germany, they carry out a policy of reaction: war preparations at the expense of working-class living standards; protection of capitalist interests; colonial repression; liquidation of political freedom. Of the liberal sentiment that existed in the post-war Christian-Democracy, nothing is left but a small liberal wing which is engaged in a losing battle, comparable to the battle of the liberals-for-Eisenhower. Like their American

counterparts, the function of the Christian-Democratic liberals is to be eternal window-dressing, and undaunted apologists for an increasingly vicious reaction. If "left" is to mean anything at all today, it must represent precisely the opposite: the demands of freedom, peace and security for all people, the demands of life against the totalitarians of East and West.

Because "left" to us implies the defense of the people against their oppressors, we cannot be concerned either with the ecclesiastical appendages of Stalinism, which exist among Catholics in Eastern Europe, France and Italy. For that matter, the religious followers of any secular political movement fall outside the scope of this article. What defines the Catholic Left as a movement is the fact that it exists independently, in its own right, even though it is often allied with one secular political movement or another.

It remains to point out that there is a non-Catholic Christian left that should normally be considered in the context of such a survey. The Christian left includes significant segments of Protestant opinion, especially among the non-conformist sects of England and America. There it usually takes the form of a more or less revolutionary pacifism, expressed most consistently and meaningfully by such individuals as A. J. Muste of the FOR. Although these movements have an importance of their own, we shall deal here with the Catholic left because it has a longer history and a wider distribution, and is therefore more instructive to study. Many conclusions we can draw from a study of Catholic leftism are, moreover, applicable to analogous movements in Protestantism.

Historical Background

The history of Catholic leftism goes back as far as the origins of the proletarian movement itself. In most of its aspects, it is a form of adaptation by the Churches to new social conditions arising out of the industrial revolution.

In its beginnings, it is more precise to speak of Catholic liberalism. This movement arises in the middle of the past century, together with the successful bourgeois revolutions of the 1840's and '50's. Representative of this tendency was the group around the review *L'Avenir*, published in France by Lamennais, Lacordaire and de Montalembert. The issue which these people were fighting was that the Church in France should not identify with the monarchy but rather with the republican bourgeoisie. More generally, the central thesis of the group was that the Church must not be identified with any particular social form. Although they were very soon disciplined by the Church — Lamennais was excommunicated, Lacordaire

and de Montalembert capitulated after appropriate self-criticism — their ideas were substantially accepted later, when it became obvious that a Church oriented towards feudalism had no hope for survival.

At the same time the first signs of Christian trade-union activity appeared, especially in Germany. The ideology of these groups is very confused and contradictory. Although their aims are bourgeois aims, (that is, to align the Church with the then progressive capitalist transformation of feudal society) they are compelled, as the bourgeoisie itself was, to seek out the support of the working-classes. Ideologically this is translated into the doctrine that the Church should base itself on "the poor" rather than on the privileged classes. And since all new movements seek to find precedents for themselves in history, the progressive Catholic groups adopt as their forerunners the mendicant orders of the Middle Ages and St. Francis of Assisi. Thus an essentially progressive step was formulated ideologically in a reactionary manner, in terms applicable to a feudal epoch and reflecting the social relationships of feudalism, thereby causing a confusion of concepts lasting to this day.

The progressive religious tendencies of the 19th century are mostly reformist. They de-emphasize the concept of the class-struggle or oppose it, and mainly try to appeal to the better instincts of the capitalists. Revolutionary Christian organizations appear on the scene much later, when the strength of the revolutionary working-class movements make further adaptation necessary.

The Spiritual Leaders

The ideological ground for these contemporary developments is prepared by two novelists: Leon Bloy and Georges Bernanos. The work of both of these French authors is characterized by a deep feeling of revolt against capitalism and its effects on the individual personality. Some pages in the work of Bernanos and Bloy equal the finest documents of secular revolutionary writing. Nowhere has the belief been better expressed that the human personality is infinitely valuable; that it is abused, wasted and destroyed in capitalist society; that exploitation in every form is evil and must be abolished; that man is made to be free and, within the limitations imposed on him by original sin and the imperfect nature of the world, is made to be happy.

This revolt, again, is mainly expressed in medieval terms: the evil is "money," the great corrupter; the revolt is against the "evil rich" in behalf of "the poor," who alone are worthy of God's mercy, since "the last shall be the first." It is not really important, however, that the terminology and the theological basis of Bloy's and Bernanos' rejection of capitalism is inspired by theologians who were engaged in fighting an historical rear-guard battle. The fact remains that the subjective values by which the medieval church attacked capitalism from a reactionary point of view also make it possible for Bloy and Bernanos to attack capitalism from a religious but libertarian point of view. As we shall see, this point of view has serious limitations, but unquestionably it has its value as a contribution to radical thinking.

Neither Bloy nor Bernanos aligned themselves with any

of the conventional political camps of right, left or center. They always maintained the position of independent critics, even though at the time of the Spanish Civil War Bernanos, who had initially supported Franco, switched sides and wrote "Les grands cimetières sous la lune" — one of the most powerful denunciations of Spanish fascism that has emerged from that conflict. Politically their position was usually one which can find no application on the level of action, and which is therefore sterile in the long run. This is borne out by the fact that those of their followers who participated in the actual shaping of events had to align themselves in a manner which Bloy and Bernanos always scorned to do.

Influence of Berdayev

Another influence we must consider is Nicolas Berdayev who began his intellectual career as a Marxist and became a Christian along with the "God--Seekers," a group of Marxist intellectuals who, like many others, retreated to an ecclesiastical storm-cellar during the period of reaction following the abortive revolution of 1905, Berdayev's concept of Christianity, however, involves temporal as well as spiritual responsibilities of a radical nature.

Unlike Bloy, and much more than Bernanos, Berdayev takes sides. His political attitude flows from his system of ethics, which involves a creative and continuous adaptation of Christian principles to the contemporary context. In his own words: "... our function at every period ... is to determine our relation to the problems of life and history in the terms and according to the criteria of eternity." If, according to Berdayev, ultimate solutions can only be Christian, (that is, absolute), the relative, day-to-day solutions which we are obliged to work out should be creative and Christian as well.

What Berdayev says of the Christian in society also applies to any other type of revolutionist: "The Christian then must be *in the world, yet not of it*. We must share the life of actual communities while relentlessly exposing their shams, and above all taking a creative part in their transformation." Thus, according to Berdayev, the Christian is more genuinely a revolutionist than many Marxists, who attack bourgeois society in terms of its own values, and who attempt to achieve a transfer in the relations of production while maintaining the values of a profoundly anti-human society.

For Berdayev the conflict between the values of Christianity and those of bourgeois society cannot be reconciled: "The break of Christianity with the bourgeois world is inevitable." Among other things, this implies an incompatibility of Christianity and capitalism, the economic system which forms the foundations of the "bourgeois world." In a form vividly reminiscent of the *Communist Manifesto*, Berdayev states: "Capitalism is above all anti-personal, the power of anonymity over human life. Capitalism uses man as goods for sale." "Production does not exist for man but man exists for production. This is why it is possible to destroy and dump into the sea huge quantities of grain for purely economic interests at a moment when millions are starving . . . Man is crushed by a vast, shapeless, faceless and nameless power, money."

This approach is not only common to Berdayev, Bernanos, and Bloy, but is also closely related to the thought of G. K. Chesterton, Eric Gill, Hillaire Belloc, Peter Maurin and of a whole tendency of religious intellectuals who have contributed decisively to the intellectual equipment of the Christian left. More directly relevant politically are two papal encyclicals dealing with social questions: Leo XIII's "Rerum Novarum" and Pius XI's "Quadragesimo Anno." As political statements both encyclicals are masterpieces of ambiguity, which makes them exceedingly useful to both the reformist and the revolutionary tendencies of the Catholic left. As a programmatic basis the encyclicals are therefore more or less meaningless in themselves; what is significant is always the interpretation given to them by various tendencies.

The Organizations

If we consider the form under which most ideas outlined above have crystallized on the political scene, we are confronted with various groups which have this at least in common, that they are worker-oriented, however dissimilar they may be in other respects. There is, to begin with, the Catholic trade-union movement, which has its own international organization, the IFCTU (International Federation of Christian Trade Unions.) The ideology of the Catholic trade-unions varies according to the local situation; in fact, these organizations should rather be considered as the arena in which the various tendencies of the Catholic left meet and struggle for influence.

In America and Germany there is no Catholic trade-union movement; there are nuclei such as the ACTU (Association of Catholic Trade Unionists) or the KAB (Katholischer Arbeiter Bund) which are tendencies in themselves and whose record is anything but progressive. In predominantly Catholic countries like France, French Canada, Italy or Belgium, on the other hand, unions like the French CFTC (Confederation Francaise des Travailleurs Chretiens) have been in the forefront of the working-class struggles and have succeeded in imposing themselves on the political scene because their militancy often compared favorably with the other established trade-union bodies. Their strength is significant: the membership of the CFTC is established at the present time at one million, as compared with an estimated two million for the Stalinist-led CGT.

Originally the outlook of unions like the CFTC was formed by a leadership trained in the Jocist movement (Jeunesse Ouvriere Chretienne). The JOC are cadres trained by the Church and sent to working-class areas to establish Catholic centers and to combat socialist and Stalinist influences. Their avowed function is to be a defense organization of the Church, and their ideology is appropriately class-collaborationist and conservative.

This outlook, however, ceased to be dominant in the years of the war and the underground. The Catholic trade-union movement, particularly in France, Belgium and, to a lesser extent, in Italy, underwent considerable transformation after World War II. The anti-fascist underground produced a new type of Catholic leadership, more responsive to social needs in their own right, and willing to sup-

port sweeping changes in the social order. It also produced a militant rank-and-file in the Catholic working-class which exerts pressure towards more and more progressive steps.

The Revolutionary Catholic Left

Within the Catholic labor movement in France several more or less radical tendencies exist, distinguishable by their press. The militant leadership produced by the underground is represented by the review *Reconstruction* and, much watered down, by *Temoignage Chretien*. These groups are roughly comparable to the American review *Commonweal*.

Esprit is a cultural and political monthly on a very high level published by a group of predominantly Catholic intellectuals. Its founder was Emmanuel Mounier, a man of great intelligence and courage, who made it into the most influential magazine of opinion in France next to Sartre's *Les Temps Modernes*. Its orientation is definitely anti-capitalist, with occasional pro-Stalinist overtones — much less so now than in its early years. Positively, its position can be defined as personalist socialism: an approach to socialism which is centered on the individual and his problems, in concrete human situations. A very similar magazine exists in Germany: the *Frankfurter Heft*, published by Walter Dirks and Eugen Kogon, the latter known in America mainly as the author of a book on the Nazi concentration camps entitled "The Theory and Practice of Hell."

La Quinzaine is a fortnightly published in Paris representing more or less the point of view of the worker-priest movement. It is more directly oriented towards the workers than *Esprit* and deals more with problems of trade-union activity. The worker-priest movement received considerable publicity last summer when two workers, who were arrested and beaten up by the police after participating in a Stalinist-led demonstration against General Ridgway, turned out to be priests belonging to the Mission of Paris.

The worker-priests trained by the Mission of France are sent into "de-Christianized" areas, especially working-class areas, where they live the same life as the industrial workers, do the same work in the same factories, but conduct church services to a small audience of converts from the neighbourhood or the working place. The worker-priests participate fully in the struggles of their unions. Their position on Stalinism is "neither for nor against" but their policy is to be at all times wherever the workers are, which in France and Italy means largely among the Stalinist ranks.

Close to the worker-priests' movement is the MLP, or Mouvement de la Liberation des Peuples, an organization with a clear-cut revolutionary orientation. The MLP combines intervention in the daily struggles of the workers through trade-union work, organization of co-ops, mutual aid set-ups, etc., with participation in political class-struggles, usually in loose alliance with the Stalinists. The cadres of the MLP were originally formed by the JOC, but very soon broke completely with the JOCist orientation and established themselves as an independent movement.

The group around *La Quinzaine* and the MLP is in many ways comparable to the American *Catholic Worker*, although the program of the French groups seems to be inspired by Marxist rather than anarchist concepts. The *Catholic Worker*, however, has in common with the French groups its basic rejection of capitalism and its acceptance of the class-struggle. The clearest and most concise statement of the *Catholic Worker's* "general line" was given by Robert Ludlow, one of the editors of the CW, in an interview to the *New Populist*, a now defunct liberal review at the University of Chicago. He poses the question in the following manner:

The fundamental question is this: whether we should cooperate with the capitalist class or refuse co-operation, which means whether we should accept the capitalist system or reject it. No matter what advantages are obtained for the workers from the conference table, to co-operate with the employer means to iron out the difficulties in the working out of capitalism and thus to prolong it as the economic system of our society. As I understand it the Young Christian Workers and the ACTU and official Catholic Action takes this course of collaboration. As I understand the Catholic Worker movement and those in agreement with it, we accept the class war as a reality under capitalism and choose the side of the workers and refuse collaboration with the capitalist class, thus advocating the withdrawal from the system or a taking over of what of the system is not in itself immoral by the workers. . . .

If a class exists by exploitation it is madness to sit down at the conference table with its representatives and haggle about the division of spoils.

Certain misinformed Christians — we give them every benefit of the doubt — raise objections to this position on the grounds that the class-struggle is an evil since it sets people against each other and since, as a Christian, one should love even one's enemy. To this Ludlow answers:

To love a person as an individual does not mean that you approve of his function in society; you might feel impelled to demand that he cease to function in society in that role. And so to accept the reality of class-war under capitalism and to cast one's lot on the side of the workers and to refuse to betray the workers by collaborating with the employer class is not an offense against Christian charity but is rather part of that war against evil, against the powers of darkness, which is part of every Christian's life.

The Catholic Left and Official Catholicism

Those of us, Christians or not, who are engaged in political action with essentially the same objectives, or at least, the same moral motivations as those outlined by Ludlow, usually know the Catholic Church as one of our most consistent, intelligent, powerful and ruthless enemies. We know the Churches and in particular the Catholic Church as a powerful and involved apparatus with property, hierarchies, a press, capital, political fronts, and above all with very tangible temporal commitments. In most parts of the world, the churches are part and parcel of the apparatus of social discipline set up by the ruling classes, and they contribute significantly to the perpetuation of the most inhuman social systems of modern times.

In Russia the Orthodox Church is an agency of the state bureaucracy; in Spain, Portugal, Italy, Ireland and most Latin American countries the Catholic Church is part

of a semi-fascist or deeply reactionary ruling class, and intervenes in a very wordy way in the political struggles of these countries. In the United States the churches are, on the whole, a racket. At best, they fulfill social rather than spiritual functions; in all cases they have succumbed to the temptations of temporal power and prestige that capitalism in America has established as a criterion for success. Everywhere we look, we see official Christianity entrenched in dominant positions in society, and almost invariably on the side of crass injustice.

Therefore, numerous questions inevitably arise when considering a movement like the Catholic left. Its motivation is that the Church is losing support among the masses of the world, while the only way to prevent this loss is to identify with these masses. This is the job the Catholic left proposes to do. But we see a conflict of interest between the underprivileged masses which the Catholic left is trying to reach, and the official Church. Thus the Catholic Left has two political commitments: one to the Catholic Church as a power-oriented apparatus with its complex and indissoluble ties to capitalism, the other to the working-class of the world whose aspirations have nothing in common with the goals of official Catholicism. The question then is: whom does the Catholic left represent? Does it represent the interests of the Catholic Church within the working-class, or the interests of the working-class within the Church?

Rejection of Capitalism

It is here that we have to make a distinction between the reformist, labor-oriented groups of the Catholic "left" such as the JOC or the ACTU, and the revolutionary groups such as the Catholic Workers and the MLP. The question that we have posed above is really relevant only to the latter groups. The former have already taken sides: although labor-based movements, they are not movements of the working-class, and represent only the interests of the official Catholic Church. The difference between the two is clear: the JOC and the ACTU, like many secular, labor-based movements, have only one basic commitment: to prop up the existing order from "below," in this case by providing a labor base for the Vatican parties.

The revolutionary groups are a very different proposition. Like the reform movements, they arose to retain the allegiance of the Catholic masses to the Church, as an "answer" to Marxism and Syndicalism. But unlike the reformist groups, who are attempting to keep the Church alive on the old terms, the revolutionary Catholic groups, by their writings and their activities, have made clear their uncompromising rejection of capitalism and of all its works, in opposition to their own reformist movements and even more so against the reactionary spokesmen for the feudal-fascist wing of Catholicism. The terms on which they are seeking to maintain the Church among the working-class are the terms of the revolutionary working-class itself. Their aim is to establish a spiritual community of Catholics in a socialist or anarchistic world.

Can these groups follow such a policy without digging their own grave? That is to say, can the Catholic Church survive in the socialist society which they are preparing

to accept? This is actually asking whether an ideology can subsist in changed social conditions, and it is evident that it can, even though its form may change in many ways. In all probability the Catholic Church will survive the transition to a socialist era under the form of "Left Catholicism" as it has survived the transition from feudalism to capitalism.

What is the attitude of the contemporary Church to these movements? Many socialists assume automatically that any movement of the Catholic left that has not been excommunicated must therefore be an agent of the Vatican. Although this approach is based on many bitter experiences with the ACTU type, nothing could be farther from the truth. It assumes, to begin with, that the Catholic Church is a monolithic, completely unified whole, which, like the Stalinist movement, can impose its directives in political matters at will. This is not the case. The area in which the Church can enforce conformity is pretty much limited to points of theological doctrine. If it is true that Catholics in remote corners of the earth have carried out political directives of the Vatican, this is so because they were independently prepared to carry out the same policy.

Generally "the Church allows a great deal of liberty in (political) matters" as Robert Ludlow says, "and has not seen fit to insist on conformity." It is unlikely, moreover, that it could impose conformity if it did see fit to insist on it. It is no longer in a position to do so. Under present circumstances it is in its better interest to refrain officially from taking a political position while waiting for the outcome of the world-wide social crisis. In the meantime, it permits its local branches to adapt themselves to Stalinism as they have been permitted to adapt themselves to Fascism and to every repressive system that does not liquidate them entirely. And, since it is safest to bet on every horse, it permits its handful of revolutionaries to maintain their positions as well.

Perspectives of the Catholic Left

We have attempted to describe a section of the Catholic labor movement that is engaged in the class struggle on our side, the common front of socialists and revolutionary pacifists. For us, who are more concerned with peace and freedom for the world than with the Catholic Church and its chances for survival, the value of the Catholic left hinges ultimately on whether or not we can count on them as allies in our struggle. From what precedes, it would appear that we can, and fully so. But their value as allies also depends on their perspectives: what role can they play among the progressive, liberating movements of our time? What political future do they have? Can the revolutionary Catholic left become an effective force for social transformation? We can see several handicaps which it might have to overcome first.

A characteristic common to almost all revolutionary Catholic groups, in spite of their clear commitment to the working-class, is a peculiar "class-less" approach. This derives from an individualistic, atomized view of society produced by applying personalism where it is not applicable. The concept of charity, of love, of insistence on

the value of the individual, are attitudes which are essential elements in all truly liberating ideologies. But they are not enough. In addition a methodology is needed: a method of analysis, a guide to action. Only the possession of such theoretical instruments distinguishes the revolutionary from the rebel.

Although socialists will not contest that the bums on W. Madison Street and the Bowery which the Catholic Worker cultivates are as valuable as human beings as the next person, they will insist that for purposes of political action it would be more fruitful to work among the socially healthy circles of the organized working-class. If it is true that the issue is in some sense one of the relatively "poor" against the relatively "rich," it is evident that not all of the "poor" can be organized, and that, as a matter of fact, the really poor in this society are unorganizable. Regardless of how much importance one's ideology may attach to individuals, the fact remains that individuals intervene in social struggles only to the extent that they organize and act as groups. What should therefore be the primary consideration of all radical groups is not the relations of individual to society but rather the groups in society and their relation to each other.

The same ultra-individualistic approach is the reason for the frequent alliances of radical Catholics with Stalinist groups, because it prevents a correct analysis of what Stalinism is. "To be at all times at the side of the workers" involves a great many responsibilities, and one of them is to evaluate the nature of the movements one has to deal with. We are prepared to agree that many Stalinist individuals may be worthwhile people, and that, like the bums of the Bowery, their value as human beings is as great as anyone else's. We can even bring ourselves to agree, with some effort, that it is desirable to love one's enemies. But we say, with Robert Ludlow, that "to love a person as an individual does not mean that you approve of his function in society; you might feel impelled to demand that he cease to function in society in that role."

But an independent, radical Catholic working-class organization has to overcome certain other difficulties before it can intervene in politics in a progressive manner. Today, for example, what can it do? It can on the one hand, attempt to influence the Christian Democratic parties in a radical direction. Anybody with political sense, or just sense, will write this off as a lost cause. On the other hand, it can form its own party or, if Ludlow prefers, its own syndicalist organization. The problem then arises whether it is fruitful to differentiate oneself on a religious basis by forming rival organizations, thereby splitting the labor movement even further.

A third course is open, however. The Catholic left can support independent socialist working-class movements and maintain its identity as a propaganda organization. For revolutionary Catholics have a political future only to the extent that they associate themselves with independent socialism. Ideologically, as Catholics, their future depends on whether they can communicate to the world what is valuable and lasting in their Christian heritage.

ALAN DANIELS

Will Southern Schools Remain Jim Crow?

The Supreme Court Faces a Momentous Decision

AGAIN THE QUESTION of segregation in the public school system has been placed before the Supreme Court, the nation's court of last recourse. This time, the final-stand attitude of proponents of integration may force a momentous decision. For this time, the attack has not been made against inequality of the physical facilities in the dual school systems but against segregation itself.

On Dec. 9, 10, and 11, 1952 the Supreme Court was urged to declare state-imposed segregation of races in the public schools a violation of the constitutional rights of the school systems of South Carolina, Virginia, Kansas, Delaware, and the District of Columbia.

Two famous constitutional lawyers locked legal horns in the S.C. case. Mr. John W. Davis, 1924 Democratic Presidential nominee, defended the segregated school system of S.C. by stating that racial segregation is essentially a legislative matter, not a matter of constitutional rights. Therefore, he reasoned, it is not within the province of the courts to invalidate segregation. He then proceeded to defend the position of the states' righters, who maintain that our entire Federal structure depends on local self-government where it is competent. Education, according to states' rights supporters, should be left to those immediately affected — those in the states themselves. Mr. Davis, in pointing out that there is no conflict between the 14th amendment and segregated schools, reminded the court of the historical position of "separate, but equal facilities." This "statesman" of segregation further contended that the ending of segregation in S.C. would cause a condition which "one cannot contemplate with any equanimity."

Mr. Thurgood Marshall, special counsel for the N.A.A.C.P., presented the case for complete integration of public schools. He asked not for equality of facilities, but rather for equal protection under the 14th amendment — a protection that is the personal and present right of each citizen. (The 14th amendment forbids any state to abridge "the rights and immunities" of any citizen, or deny him "the equal protection of the laws.")

In the Virginia case, State Attorney General J. Lindsay Almond, warned that the outlawing of segregation would "destroy the public school system in Virginia as we know it today." Furthermore, he claimed that Virginia residents would not vote bond issues for integrated schools, and that Negro teachers would lose their jobs. Virginia was working on a program — the only morally defensible one, Mr. Almond assured the court — that of providing a system of equal facilities. Mr. Almond and T. Justin Moore, Richmond, Va. attorney, defended the state separate school system as "part of the way of life in Va.," and based on "real reason."

The opponents of segregation were ably represented by

Mr. Spottswood W. Robinson the 3rd of Richmond, who opened his argument by criticizing the lower court for having issued a mere "equalization decree." He urged the Supreme Court to hand down an "anti-segregation decree." His basic premise was that state-imposed segregation is a denial of due process of law as well as denial of equal protection of the law.

Kansas Reluctant in Defense

The Kansas case was uniquely characterized by a lukewarm disposition on the part of the State of Kansas to defend its segregated schools. The nine Supreme Court Justices urged the state of Kansas to give a presentation of its views in oral argument and also implied that refusal to do so might be construed as a concession of invalidity. The Attorney General of Kansas asserted the right of the state to maintain separate schools on the basis of the pivotal Plessy v. Ferguson case decision of 1896 — the famous promulgation of the "separate, but equal" doctrine.

Whereas in South Carolina, Virginia, and Kansas, the constitutional cases from 3-judge Federal courts, each of which had upheld segregated schools, the Delaware case was unique. The Delaware State Supreme Court has held that the 14th amendment's "equal protection" clause requires the admission of Negroes to white schools — this despite a State Constitutional provision requiring segregated schools. Even so, the State takes the equalization of schools position. Opponents of segregation declare the state's position to be unconstitutional, violative of the 14th amendment.

The case in the District of Columbia, the nation's capital, arose from the refusal of Sousa Junior High School to admit some students solely because of their race. Parents of these students explored all possible administrative remedies with no success. They therefore sought recourse in the Courts. Their allegation was that their children were denied due process of law in violation of the 5th amendment. The respondents in this case were the members of the school board and officials of the District of Columbia.

Mr. George E. C. Hayes, arguing for integration, contended that Congress never intended to include school segregation in the laws which set up the District school system and that the laws and their application are unconstitutional. Said Dr. Hayes: "This Government is being asked to support a statute having for its basis nothing other than race or color. This Government cannot afford to do that."

Since the 1896 "separate but equal" doctrine, there have been some overtures toward integration. For example, the Supreme Court ruled for integration in the McLaurin case of Okla., and in the Sweatt case of Texas. In these two instances, professional and graduate schools

were integrated by the courts. On the strength of the McLaurin case, Okla. must now give Negroes the same training as whites — and at the same time. The state cannot isolate a Negro student for classwork at the University and establish this as “separate, but equal.” The Texas case went a little further. Here a Negro student was not isolated in class, but actually could attend a separate law school. However, the Supreme Court decision said that even though the schools were physically equal, the state was not providing equal education because the teaching in the white school was admittedly superior.

The Sweatt case made the definition of equal so precise that it is doubtful that any state could meet the requirements in separate graduate and professional schools for Negroes. Under the stirring restlessness of Negroes some of the links in the “separate, but equal” doctrine have been broken. The rest of the chain that binds Negroes to separate education can be ruptured by the Supreme Court now — segregation as such is being tested.

The defendants of the racist status quo say that tolerance cannot be legislated or decreed whether the Supreme Court rules against segregation or not. However, social psychologists tell us a different story. A new generation of children, educated in integrated schools and playing in

schoolyards together, will have an entirely different set of social values from their parents.

Public schools have been successfully integrated in recent years in one or more communities in eleven states, as well as three southern military reservations. Many tax-supported colleges and universities — including those in thirteen southern states — have admitted Negro students.

It is noteworthy that at Ft. Bragg, N.C. only one family complained when 1175 white students were integrated with Negro students. Upon the parents' threat to withdraw their daughter, the southern-born principal advised them to refrain from taking an action which would make their child feel ashamed of them when she grew up. The child remained in school.

Some well-informed sources believe it possible that this time, the Supreme Court will underwrite integration in the public schools. But lest we be too optimistic about the chances of an uncompromising Supreme Court decision against school segregation, we must remember the conservative composition of the Court and its past adeptness at sidestepping questions of the greatest social and political implication.

DICK LEFTROWICZ

Dick Leftrowicz is a student in Washington, D.C.

Washington Summer Inter-racial Workshop

The Fellowship of Reconciliation (FOR) and the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE) announce their sixth Summer Inter-racial Workshop, to be held in Washington, D.C., throughout the month of July. Strategically convened at the gateway to Southern jimcrow country, the Workshop offers a practical as well as theoretical training in the philosophy of non-violence. Members participate in carefully planned campaigns to end discrimination in specific areas of community life. The past five Workshops have been instrumental in ending segregation at the Hoover Playground, the Greyhound Bus Terminal Restaurant, the Methodist building cafeteria, and the YMCA coffee shop. The Workshop's efforts with the Dept. of Interior helped significantly in opening Anacostia swimming pool on an integrated basis. Largely as a result of last summer's Workshop, the Rosedale Playground is now open to all children.

The Summer Workshop reinforces the campaigns conducted by the permanent Inter-racial Workshop (which grew out of the first Washington Summer Workshop) and other inter-racial action groups operating the year round in Washington. The jimcrow pattern of Washington has cracked at many significant points over the past few years, and the Summer Inter-racial Workshops have played a major role in this development.

Besides participation in action projects, Workshop members attend discussion sessions led by authorities in the various areas of race relations. The educational program concerns itself with such topics as segregation in housing, employment, schools, and public places; organizations and agencies working in race relations; educational, political action and legal techniques for combatting discrimination; and the philosophy of non-violence in dealing with racial tensions. The group arranges its own daily schedule of activities and determines the scope of its discussions and projects. Members of the Workshop gain first-hand experience in inter-racial living. The group will be housed in a building located in the Negro community. Needless to say, besides the rigor of serious talk and serious action, Workshop activities include picnics, parties, square and social dancing and singing.

Participation in the Workshop for the full month of July will cost \$85, including food and rent. This amount will be lower if food cost and rent permit. Each participant will be responsible for his own travel expenses. Prospective participants should apply for financial aid if they think they will need it. For more information or for application forms, write to: Inter-racial Workshop, 513 W. 166th St., New York City 32. The deadline for application is June 15th, unless special arrangements are made.

Inside the Industrial Relations Racket

How Colleges Help to Sell Free Enterprise

THERE ARE few things so distressing yet comic about the current educational scene as the way in which respectable academic people are being prostituted by universities to the pleasures of businessmen. "Industrial relations," as this new educational enterprise is generally called, has proved of increasing interest to industry, and has become a very substantial help for the foundering finances of higher education. A good many universities have set up quasi-independent industrial relations "institutes," "centers," and so on. Through these, avid promoters engage their academic staffs in propagandizing the American business ideology — using the imposing machinery of "conferences," visual aids, tests and counseling.

Industrial relations is thus a business and an art, but it is also a science. A certain amount of legitimate sociological and psychological study as well as some union-oriented research, is carried on by some of these organizations. But industrial relations on the business side (where the money is) is a different sort of animal. According to one definition current in the field, its aim is to "promote industrial peace." To this idol are offered up all the knowledge of the economist, sociologist and psychologist, plus the arts of the salesman, advertiser, visual-aids man, and writer. It is peace of a rather special kind which is meant, of course. Fundamentally, the aim of industrial relations is to make the best of the present industrial system: the emphasis is on amelioration, not reform, and psychological gimmicks, not the correction of underlying social problems. (The idea, as one wag put it, is to make workers "contented cows.")

For part of its guidance, industry turns to its own sources — the American Management Association and private consultants. But of recent years, in addition to the growth of genuine academic interest in the problems of our industrial society, universities have begun to compete seriously for this trade. An extreme and farcical example of what can happen is found at Harding College, the most disreputable of these academic propaganda mills, producing films, comic books, etc. But a more representative example can be found in a large and respected Midwestern university, and we will describe the main aspects of its work in more detail.

First, there is the attempt to gain support for the capitalist scheme of things in general. The staff engaged in this sort of work offers programs of education toward acceptance of the creed of free enterprise and lower corporation taxes. Second is the attempt to improve intra-management relations. This type of work goes under the general name of human relations, and employs psychology and sociology to reduce conflicts and increase two-way communication. Third is an attack on the immediate tactical problem of retaining foremen within the manage-

ment group. Fourth, there is in some cases an attempt to develop democratic status-relations in the plant. This element is usually part of a more general human relations program. This type of democratic and psychological manna, however, like the economic variety, never falls to the workers, who do not participate in any of the programs.

The Side Show

The attempt to teach foremen and supervisors their capitalist catechism is the funniest, if not the most significant, aspect of the whole program. Generally, the gospel is presented to small conference groups each led by a member of management trained for the job by university personnel. The material to be presented is produced co-operatively by the university staff and the particular company with which it is working. This procedure militates against omission of particular penchants of the contracting employer — whether it be the ardent belief that we are living in a classless society, or the opinion that socialism, whatever its various forms, is actually a vile conspiracy perpetrated by malicious and irresponsible men to thwart the real good of their nations.

The resulting materials are not notable for sophistication or perspicacity. They "accept neo-classical or free-enterprise economics as opposed to collectivism," and test acceptance of the doctrine through such admirably discriminating questions as:

Which statement is more correct?

- a. Business is out to beat the consumer.
- b. Business benefits consumers by supplying quality goods at low cost.

Get the idea?

There is, of course, a constant struggle within these organizations between the "academicians" and the "businessmen," with the outcome always more or less in doubt. Tenuousness of administrative contact with the main faculty organization gives an advantage to aggressive pushers of company propaganda; on the other hand, the generally liberal sentiments of professors prevent things from going too far too often. Thus, in one case which came to our attention, a booklet on socialism was prepared which was subsequently quashed by a faculty review committee. This document advanced the admirably economic argument that:

1. The British economy is backward compared to the U.S. economy.
2. The British economy was run by Socialists from 1945-50; the U.S. economy was never run by Socialists.
3. Therefore Socialism is bad for an economy (and hence hard on the average man.)

Other pamphlets (and the conferences based on them) explain the orthodox view of such things as the alleged "prof-

it yardstick of efficiency," the allegedly automatic operation of the "free market," and the benign influences of capitalism generally.

Mens Sano in Corporation Sana?

Human relations is much subtler. Its aim is to improve communication among levels and departments within management, enabling management to "work better as a team." (Though when human relations and productivity conflict, it is *not* productivity which is sacrificed.) Here also small conferences are utilized, but this time the conferences are composed of representatives of many departments and levels of management, and each member is granted a theoretically equal voice in discussion. Depending on the situation, these conferences are partly propaganda, partly genuine education and partly attempted therapy.

It is in this area of industrial relations that selling gimmicks are most used. Since the practical value of human relations may not be immediately apparent to prospective customers, additional selling pressure is put on them by using catchy words and titles to describe the content, construction, and miraculous benefits to be found in a test or program. Scientific and pseudo-scientific language overwhelm the ordinary business man — and sell the projects. The sociologists, etc., employed on such projects slip their own "research" over on the company, so a veil of academic legitimacy clouds the pristine practical atmosphere of the business world. (Nevertheless, these people — often graduate students — suffer a good deal of guilt, with a morale level that sinks to nothing.)

The attempt to develop democratic procedures in the conference room and in preliminary planning committees makes this aspect of industrial relations particularly interesting to democratic socialists. Democracy *is* found in the processes of therapy, particularly non-directive therapy, used in interviews and in group work. But there is no attempt to institute democratic relationships within natural work groups, and in any case democracy is not easy to hand down from above. A curious schizoid logic sometimes appears here; the hucksters who sell "programs" and "packages" to bulldozed businessmen have brought the word "democracy" into fairly prominent use among top management people — but the word is used cautiously so that none of the unwashed get the wrong idea.

Foremen generally are under considerable pressure both from their work groups and the upper levels of management. From the latter's point of view, it is essential to keep the foremen properly oriented. Ten or twelve years ago there began a wave of organization among foremen which cost management a great effort to defeat, though the battle is now over. (witness the Taft-Hartley statute outlawing foremen's unions). Management has no wish to be caught offguard again. Foremen are therefore courted through elaborate "self-development" sessions, committee work bringing them into personal contact with higher-ups, and disguised entertainment sessions including introductory dinners, movies, coffee, and so forth.

What does a company expect from industrial relations programs? Identification with and acceptance of top-

management beliefs and policies is obviously the main aim. However, tests designed to measure the impact of such programs on individuals show that neither upper and middle management, teachers, nor college students change much in either information or attitudes; foremen do show some "improvement" — though it is doubtful, because of the simple construction of the tests, whether this reflects more than a desire to give the answers endorsed by the powers-that-be. As for the human relations programs, it is difficult to measure their accomplishments, although the manipulatory propensities of certain supervisors are certainly encouraged.

In view of the intangibility of the returns, something more is needed to explain why industry jumps at the stuff. One such reason is the excess profits tax: the money spent on industrial relations programs would be largely consumed by taxes anyway. But even more basic is a general trend in American industry under the permanent war economy — the full-scale stable production which has prevailed since the beginning of the Korean War. Constantly devaluating dollars overflow from profitable corporations which, furthermore, are plagued by a tight labor market. Even minute improvements in supervision which might tend to give a more "reliable" and dependent labor force are eagerly sought. But it seems likely that the end of excess profits taxes will somewhat curtail this paternal interest in employee's psyches. A severe recession would probably result in throwing industrial relations overboard altogether, which was the fate of the New Capitalism "reform" of the 'twenties (when, as now, industry occupied itself with painting comfortable pictures of the American way). In such a disaster, the loss would be little noticed. Meanwhile, liberal students are confronted with the rather demoralizing spectacle of another area in which the genuine research facilities of their universities are being infiltrated — and used — by the forces of "enlightened conservatism."

— G. Marteau

(G. Marteau is a graduate student formerly employed by an industrial relations organization in the Midwest.)

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

The Play's the Thing . . .

THE MALE ANIMAL

by Thurber and Nugent

AN INTERESTING phenomenon on Broadway this season was a box-office hit revival, the work of neither Shakespeare nor Sophocles, but of a cartoonist and actor.

The *Male Animal*, by James Thurber and Elliot Nugent, is the story of an English professor at a midwestern college who unwittingly involves himself in a free speech battle. He has casually announced to his class that he would read to them some examples of literary art penned by men who were not writers by profession, including letters of Abraham Lincoln, General Sherman, and Bartolomeo Vanzetti. One of Professor Turner's students, in writing an editorial for the student magazine, makes capital out of Turner's politically innocent intention and, for all the world to see, rejoices that there is one teacher left who is not afraid of the trustees.

This editorial starts off a chain reaction, not the least result of which is the domestic problem which Turner faces because of his wife's inability to understand why he does not deny his intention and call off the hounds, chief among them the Babbity trustee, Ed. The trouble is that Turner isn't sure himself, and can therefore hardly explain to his wife. In fact, when the fuss first started he was rather willing to end it, but when told explicitly by Ed that he couldn't read the letter, his hackles, such as they were, rose at being ordered around. In the last act he prepares to leave for class to read the simple and moving statement by the anarchist Vanzetti.

A Domestic Comedy

That this problem takes three acts to resolve is understandable only in light of the fact that the domestic problem pads the play — at times to the exclusion of the original theme. One scene is solely concerned with the reaction of a male animal (hence the title) when his nest is threatened by another male animal. The conclusion that Turner reaches, in a drinking bout with the youthful and fiery editor, is that he should fight. When Mrs. Turner's ex-boy friend comes in, (a football-star who is back for the homecoming game), Turner fights him, and ends up with a near-concussion. This domestic comedy of errors is somewhat involved and not necessarily indigenous to the more important aspects of the play. Suffice it to say that Turner and his wife dis-

cover that they love each other after all, and they end the play embracing.

The *Male Animal* is pleasant, clever, and satisfactorily tied together at the end. However, it has glaring faults which are strong enough to require a closer analysis of what makes it a hit today on Broadway. These faults are, namely, artificial construction, two-dimensional characterizations, and an inability on the part of the principles to come to grips with their problems in any articulate or consistent manner.

In the construction of the play, the relationships between the characters are so parallel as to be boring. The hero, Professor Turner, has a wife who in turn has an ex-boy friend, who was a football star and can't forget it. Mrs. Turner also has a young sister whose two boy friends are the student editor and the present football hero. These two triangles are, so to speak, not congruent but similar, the lesser characters duplicating the personal problems of the major characters. These problems revolve around the exciting conflict of brain versus brawn, and which is more desirable in a Man. Both females are quite inept and annoying, so it is well for them that after considerable soul-searching, they finally latch onto their mental superiors. The sequence of events is so confused between the two issues, political and domestic, that it is not quite clear when the climax occurs, although a likely spot would be the aforementioned fight scene. The director has inserted many clever bits of theater which add considerably to one's enjoyment of the play but which cannot conceal the fact that the actual script is barren of adequate action — although not lacking in amusing dialogue. The whole is rather like a series of Thurber tableaux, with appropriate captions.

The characters are also typically Thurber in that they are bewildered — about themselves, what they are doing, why they are doing it, and what the results of their actions will be. This bemused state is especially characteristic of the hero who, when about to give up his wife to another, does not know whether or not she wants to be given or whether the man wants to take. Also, when about to read Vanzetti's letter, he hardly understands any of the implications of his act. Through no fault of his own the problems are blundered through to a more or less correct but no more clear solution.

Unbeknownst to Turner a petition is sent around to protest any threat to fire him if he reads the letter (the most powerful weapon being the names of

two football stars, who threaten to quit playing) and this allows him to go ahead without fear of reprisal — although to his credit let it be said that he wasn't going to let the threat deter him. It is interesting to note that this organized activity, which actually accomplishes the major job of retaining some semblance of academic freedom on campus, is brought in at the end and resembles nothing so much as a *deus-ex-machina*.

In the last act, Turner reads the letter to the assembled cast in order that they might know what all the fuss was about; everyone reacts with "Why, that's not bad at all!" All but Ed, the trustee, who, in his unfortunately brief flash of insight into the problem, articulates the more sophisticated conservative point of view that, even if the letter contained no anarchistic philosophy, it would make the students sympathetic towards Sacco and Vanzetti and thus more open to radical ideas when they did encounter them. This is almost the only point in which a character acquires any depth at all. In a more profound and serious analysis of this theme one might consider Ed as torn by the problem, but resolving it in this manner. However, Ed has shown no such conflict, and the idea merely descends on him and then departs, leaving the fussy little man as shallow as before. Ed is such a caricature of a crass businessman that it is easy for businessmen themselves to laugh at him, and this is a gross mis-handling of the problem of the reactionary. For it is not the ludicrous Babbitts on the school boards that present the threat to civil liberties — it is the school-board as a whole, the state in which it functions, and the government over the state.

What Is Academic Freedom?

The central problem itself is so contrived as to make one wonder if Messrs. Nugent and Thurber are not confusing "academic" freedom with an "academic" problem. Sacco and Vanzetti were legally murdered many years ago and most liberals and semi-liberals have posthumously vindicated them — that is to say, it has been not unfashionable in the past few years to defend their memory. Thus, the problem of whether or not to read a letter by Vanzetti, one which contains no "agitation," presents no real difficulties. The audience can titillate itself by identifying with Turner in a brave defense of academic freedom, only to go out into the world of reality and declaim against the awful spectacle of subversives in schools.

But the question of academic freedom is not the academic one presented here. It is not merely a case of a man's not wanting to be bullied into teaching what he is told to teach, although such indi-

vidual stands are not to be belittled and are, indeed, the mainstays of any democratic fight. Nor is it a case of a short masterpiece by a now almost romantic figure intruding itself into a classroom. Freedom of speech is the right of anyone to hold any political ideas and express them, be he Stalinist or Fascist, Socialist or Liberal.

The Stalinists do not understand this — they are against such liberality being bestowed on “Trotskyists and Fascists” (in their minds a logical combination). Fascists and reactionaries do not understand this — they would deny civil liberties to those who disagree with them. These political groupings are, unfortunately, to be expected to hold such views. It is more regrettable that many a liberal and even a “socialist” here and there does not understand the nature of democracy — although they have been the self-styled bearers of its banner. They do not realize that when one has drawn a line on a sheet of paper, it is no longer a plain white sheet of paper. It has a line drawn on it. One cannot squint and say, “Oh, but such a little line. It is exactly the same as before, exactly the same, only a little bit different.”

Indian-Givers

Those same liberals who draw the line at Stalinists are to be hoisted with the petard that is perhaps not of their original making, but to which they have given their seal of approval. For to have democratic rights is to have them for all, friend and foe alike. Once they have been circumscribed, they become not democratic rights, but largesse from the state. And since governments are notorious Indian-givers, the liberals will, in time, find Santa Claus taking back the presents, not only of the bad boys, but of those who thought that they were good boys all along.

These liberals' sensitivities are at present numb in this respect. Thurber, who is not himself a matinee-liberal, but a sincere exponent of civil liberties, bemoans this. In an explosive backstage statement which the press carried he attacked the head-fixers in Congress and the weaklings who allow the process. He stated that the audience would once roar and applaud a line in the play which says that in America we still have freedom of speech. Today that line passes unnoticed.

However, Mr. Thurber and Mr. Nugent should examine their play more closely to decide why the audience reaction determines the character of the play, and why this reaction is so different today from what it was in the early forties. If the authors wanted a thesis play, they should have written one in clear and unequivocal lines. But they failed to do so, and in a sense their fail-

ure ends where Broadway's success begins. For it is debatable whether or not a clear-cut free speech problem would be as acceptable today as is a frothy farce. Thus in box-office terms, the play's faults are turned into assets. The playwrights should not blame their audience entirely for confusing The

Male Animal with a domestic comedy to which a little political nonconformism adds spice — this confusion is almost unavoidable, since one's conception of the play depends on one's sensitivities and point of view. You pay your money and you take your choice.

Priscilla Read

The Film Brought Into Focus

NOTES ON 'LIMELIGHT'

IT IS DIFFICULT to review Charlie Chaplin's new movie “Limelight” out of the context in which the Immigration Service's action against Chaplin has placed it, and perhaps there is no reason to do so. Chaplin's pictures, like anything that is true and alive, are always relevant to all things people do, and that includes politics and class-conflicts. Like Lorca's poetry, Chaplin's films derive their social significance primarily from their deep and direct involvement with the actual process of life. It is this involvement that places them in a historical and social context where they become politically significant.

It must be remembered that “politics” is always relevant to the other aspects of human activity. “Politics,” of course, is not necessarily the “part of public activity directly concerned with the struggle for power” (1), what people so conspicuously engage in every four years, or what political organizations do by means of their press, organizers and meetings. In a much wider sense, politics is also “the totality of all guiding principles, methods, systems which determine collective activities in all domains of public life” (1) — in other words, everything that groups of individuals do to secure those things for themselves that make life possible and worthwhile.

No Unpolitical Actions

There exists no “un-political” action; abstention from politics is in itself a political attitude, and many of the common daily activities that we consider essentially outside the realm of politics are only so under a very special combination of circumstances: cultural factors, social factors, economic factors, all of which have produced the American society of 1952. Should any of these factors change, the significance of many of our actions would also change. To take concrete examples from contemporary experience: for a Negro the act of voting has a different significance

(1) These definitions are Trotsky's, from *Problems of Life*, Chapter I: “Not By Politics Alone Does Man Thrive.”

in Georgia than in New York; to put on lip-stick and make-up in the Germany of Hitler — behavior supposedly “beneath the dignity of the German woman” — was often a demonstration of opposition to the regime; in a society where the official propaganda machine recommends an extra shift in the coal-mines as a fitting way to spend one's wedding night (2) it may eventually become a subversive action to spend one's wedding night in bed.

The reason for this is simple: under certain conditions, any one of the possible forms of human activity can involve concrete political consequences and become a threat to the existing social order. Orwell suggests in 1984 that love-making can become a direct threat to a totalitarian state; the same is true for leisure. All societies based on exploitation and hence, to a certain degree, on oppression, are threatened by those actions that affirm human freedom. The more totalitarian and repressive a society is, the more it is threatened by those aspects of life that escape it — not merely by those that are in opposition to such a society, but even those that simply ignore it and thus become potentially hostile aspects. In this manner, as the crisis sharpens and our governments thrash about wildly like drowning men every human action assumes more and more direct political content, one way or the other, and the sphere of possible neutral behavior becomes smaller every day.

Humor Is Subversive

In a highly repressive society, free artistic creation is subversive, love is subversive, humor is subversive. What these activities have in common is that they are essentially unpredictable, in a special sense irrational and “absurd.” Wherever they exist, they create an

(2) The Czech paper *Pravo Lidu* reported that Vera Hamolkova, a 21-year-old student at a mining college, “spent her wedding night in a true people's democracy fashion.” According to the paper, the girl “took her bridegroom down into the Stalin Mine, where the couple put in a voluntary night-shift to increase coal production.”

opening for the spontaneous, the unforeseen, thereby creating at all times the possibility of freedom. Humor in particular is incompatible with a regimented state, and it is no accident that the last resort of political opposition has always been the political joke.

In another one of his books (3), George Orwell discusses this essentially subversive nature of humor. I shall quote the passage in full, even though it is rather long, because it is uncommonly penetrating and illustrates very well what has been said above. "Codes of law and morals," Orwell says, "or religious systems, never have much room in them for a humorous view of life. Whatever is funny is subversive, every joke is ultimately a custard pie, and the reason why so large a proportion of jokes center round obscenity is simply that all societies, as the price of survival, have to insist on a fairly high standard of sexual morality.

"A dirty joke is not, of course a serious attack upon morality, but it is a sort of mental rebellion, a momentary wish that things were otherwise. So also with all other jokes, which always centre round cowardice, laziness, dishonesty or some other quality which society cannot afford to encourage. Society has always to demand a little more from human beings than it will get in practice. It has to demand faultless discipline and self-sacrifice, it must expect its subjects to work hard, pay their taxes, and be faithful to their wives, it must assume that men think it glorious to die on the battle-field and women want to wear themselves out with child-bearing.

"The whole of what one may call official literature is founded on such assumptions. I never read the proclamations of generals before battle, the speeches of fuhrers and prime ministers, the solidarity songs of public schools and Left Wing political parties, national anthems, Temperance tracts, papal encyclicals and sermons against gambling and contraception, without seeming to hear in the background a chorus of raspberries from all the millions of common men to whom these high sentiments make no appeal."

And so, when such attitudes become politically significant because political opposition has retreated to areas not hitherto connected with "politics," the totalitarian state also finds it necessary to extend its control further and further, until it dominates every aspect of personal and social life.

Chaplin vs. U. S.

Charlie Chaplin's art has always magnificently expressed the "unheroic" outlook, that is the human outlook, as op-

(3) The essay "The Art of Donal McGill" in Dickens, Dali and Others.

posed to the manifold ideological devices of human oppression. His humor goes well beyond the instinctive, inarticulate protest which Orwell describes, and most of his great movies are virtually revolutionary manifestos. It is wrong to say that the action of the Immigration Office against Chaplin is not justified. From the point of view of the Immigration Office and everything it stands for, it is not only justified, it is long overdue. Chaplin is a threat to the social order in America; not because he wants to be, or in the stupid, narrow sense which the Immigration Office is so worried about, but because his art is so intensely involved with the real feelings and aspirations of millions of people, so intensely human, that in an increasingly inhuman society it becomes a challenge and a rallying point for political dissent.

One might say that, were it to pursue its own logic to its last consequence (which, luckily, it is unlikely to do) the U.S. government would still be acting too late and too hesitantly. From its own point of view, which has to be increasingly the point of view of the policeman, not only should it have jailed Chaplin long ago, but also it should have banned James Thurber's satires as well as Saul Steinberg's cartoons, and it certainly should have seen to it that such subversive documents as "The Man in a White Shirt," "Passport to Pimlico" or "Kind Hearts and Coronets," be prevented from challenging the innocent world-view of the American middle-class.

Story of Limelight

It may be that "Limelight" is not a well-chosen illustration of the point I am trying to make, and perhaps not even a good pretext. "Ideologically" as well as technically, the picture undeniably has many weaknesses: as in "M. Verdoux," Chaplin talks too much, there is too much explanation and editorializing about things we might understand even better if they were left unexplained; there is also at times a feeling of isolation, of bitterness, a spoiled-child attitude towards the public — or the "masses," or simply humanity — on the part of the misunderstood artist. Sometimes this feeling is mingled with undertones of self-pity and becomes frankly embarrassing. But there are shortcomings only in the light of Chaplin's own past achievements. — We can say, for instance, that he talks too much only because we know that he is more articulate by means of pantomime. In "Limelight" itself his representation of a stone, a pansy or a Japanese tree is probably more meaningful than any number of his reflections on truth, love or success.

The story of "Limelight" is a simple

one: Calvero, an aging clown who has lost the capacity to be funny and has taken to drink, saves Teresa, a young ballet dancer, from suicide and makes it possible for her to live a successful life. While she rises to a brilliant career, he remains a failure. Not wanting to become an obstacle in her life, he refuses to accept her offer of marriage and leaves her. He becomes a street musician. While passing the hat around in a tavern, he meets one of his former impressarios, who is shocked to find the "Great Calvero" in a state of destitution and arranges a benefit show for him. The benefit show turns out to be a tremendous success but Calvero dies shortly afterwards of a heart-attack while Teresa dances on the stage.

What this movie has in common with the earlier Chaplin movies is that it restates once more the value of persons, of human beings; that it draws our attention once more to the fact that the only problems that are ultimately important are those that affect the individual directly. In short, it is a document "in favor of people." If we were trying to view it as such a document alone, we would have to say that it does not pose the problem as fully as it should. What does it involve to be "in favor of people"? Calvero says that what he wants above all is truth — but what is he to do with this truth, since all awareness has consequences and since he will have to live with this truth if he finds it?

But even though "Limelight" and the other Chaplin films do not tell us what to do, they are excellent statements of an attitude. This attitude is the common one to all those who value man highly enough to want to recreate the world in his own image — the artist and the revolutionist. It is an attitude which involves struggle today as it always had in the past, and which has motivated the revolutionaries of all times to "recreate the phantom heritage which lies about us, to open the eyes of all the sightless statues, to turn hopes into wills and revolts into revolutions, and to shape thereby, out of the age-old sorrows of man, a new and glowing consciousness of mankind."

A. D. VOGT

ANVIL and STUDENT PARTISAN ADVERTISING RATES

\$50.00 for a full page

\$25.00 for a half page

\$12.50 for a quarter page

\$6.25 for an eighth page

THE YOUNG AND DAMNED:

Modern Horror Picture

LUIS BUNUEL, director of *Los Olvidados* (*The Lost Ones* — shown in the U. S. as *The Young and the Damned*) first came to the attention of the film world with *Un Chien Andalou*. He made this film in 1929 with the then uncommercial surrealist painter Salvador Dali. It is perhaps the most sensational thing ever done in the epater-le-bourgeois line, opening with a sequence showing the judicious slitting of an eyeball by a straight razor and after that working its will upon the audience without let or hindrance. The rest of the picture, intended as a savage cinematic dream, consists of a string of undigested semi-Freudian symbols, allegedly comprising a psychic allegory on adolescent love. If it is a hodge-podge, it is at least a telling one, which may well have been the extent of Bunuel's ambition at the time.

Again with Dali he next made *L'Age d'Or*, which I have not seen but which is considered by Brunius to be "an attack on the ethics of the . . . society we live in, in the face of which it defends a great forbidden love." (The hero forsakes his "mission" and the heroine her family's respectability.)

Then Bunuel went back to his native Spain and made *Terre Sans Pain* (*Land Without Bread*; 1932) — a documentary of sorts about the Hurdanos, who are an exceedingly backward people inhabiting an isolated section of the Pyrennees. This picture, though a long period of commercial work intervened before Bunuel made *Los Olvidados*, is quite relevant to the latter picture — degradation being the subject of both, though the structure of *Terre Sans Pain* is expository rather than dramatic.

Terre Sans Pain shows the pitiful ledge- and -gully agriculture of the Hurdanos; their incredibly cramped and filthy dwellings; their deformities, diseases, and inbred imbecilities; their irrelevant and meager schooling; their church-bound aspirations. It shows death by starvation, disease and violent accident. Images and commentary move on in a passionless dead march, exposing the most ghastly inhumanities. Like *Un Chien Andalou*, it is a shocking film; but it acquires sledge-hammer impact because it deals directly with obvious reality. It is also a nasty film, in the original sense of the word; for it becomes apparent in time that all this is not really being presented for its own horrible sake, after all — that Bunuel is still fundamentally trying to shock his audience, and that the Hurdanos just happened to come to hand.

Urban Depravity

In *Los Olvidados* Bunuel turns to urban depravity and degradation. An introductory title says that the film is based upon actual happenings, which there is no reason to doubt; it adds that society fights, without complete success, against the delinquents in the slums of great cities.

The film itself, however, has little to do with society's fight. The story centers around Jaibo, an older boy who leads a gang of teen-agers in beating and robbing a blind man, robbing a legless cripple and rolling his little cart off downhill, etc. Besides Jaibo, another gang member, Pedro, is also characterized in some detail — largely through his relations with Jaibo and his rejecting mother (who refuses him food and allows Jaibo to seduce her). Pedro gets a job with a knife-maker, then loses it through Jaibo stealing a knife; blamed for the theft, Pedro is sent away (by the mother) to a reform farm. The atmosphere of this farm is worth considering, for it may be intended as the institutional solution in "society's fight." For example, when Pedro blindly beats some chickens the other boys say "We'll get the Director!" instead of making a democratic response like "We won't let you do that around here!" The Director himself is a kindly, rather skillful authoritarian; he interprets the chicken-killing as a symbolic act, gets acceptance from Pedro, then adds: "Who knows, sometime the chickens might fight back!"

Pedro is intercepted on an errand, like Oliver Twist, and does not return to the farm. He finds out that Jaibo stole the knife; and he has a remarkable dream, done with a cinematic effectiveness that makes *Un Chien Andalou* seem labored, of Jaibo appearing from under the bed in ghoulish slow motion to grab a huge steak held out to Pedro by his leering mother. But even before this Pedro has been falling off from Jaibo because of the latter's uncontrolled blood-thirstiness, as for example in the scene when Jaibo kills the hardworking son of a drunken father because he had informed on Jaibo and sent him to the farm. Finally Pedro resolves to stab Jaibo — but gets stabbed himself in the attempt.

Another strand of the plot concerns a country boy who loses his father and attaches himself to the blind man; he meets the farm people in whose barn Jaibo sleeps, and develops a genuine fondness (the only non-pathological relationship in the film) for the daughter whom Jaibo tries to rape.

Jaibo is finally shot down by the police in a desolate blighted area of the city. The blind man, who has been grotesquely twisted by the cruelty of the people round him, cries out "Another one dead — good! They should all be killed before they are born!"

But no resume can give much idea of the pathologic pall which Jaibo, particularly, casts over the film. One technique which contributes to this effect (it leaves violence-abhorring middle-class spectators shaky) is the repeated use of abrupt, visually unexpected physical aggression: the picture is filled with very skillfully presented scenes of dramatically unmotivated onslaughts.

Pathological Violence

Much urban violence seems just that way, of course: no one rolled by a junior hood hopes to understand much of the particular reason why. In fictional narrative this type of thing is "horrific" — indeed, sudden violence is probably the chief technical device of the outright horror film. But Bunuel, instead of using it in a fantastic or "romantic" setting, uses it in an extremely realistic contemporary setting, with acting that is in the realistic tradition. The result is the most impressive horror picture that has come along for quite a while — a film of great cinematic force, technical appropriateness, and economy.

Brief, bloody and animal is man's life: this is the dominant and perhaps sole theme of *Los Olvidados*. It remains, after all, only a sensational portrayal of human depravity. Bunuel's approach is that of a bilious documentarian filming the life of a vicious, truculent, medium-sized mammal which happens to be called "man." *Los Olvidados* has been called a semi-documentary, and strictly speaking it is. But there is a great difference between Bunuel's use of the "factual film" and its use by film makers working in the Grierson tradition. Those men used film as a propaganda medium in the best sense; they tried to express and advocate an informed, humanitarian and often socialist view of industrial society. Bunuel, on the other hand, employs a "process-level" viewpoint; his film is simply a record of anti-social people involved in a series of exciting criminal or pathological events presented as mechanical happenings.

Loss of Humane Values

The interpretive problem this raises has never been solved satisfactorily, and may never be. Briefly, it is this: Given the above, we can neither evaluate *Los Olvidados* (1) as "pure" documentary, which deliberately gives knowledge and nothing else, "leaving the audience to draw their own conclusions"; or (2) as an expression of a fascination with mere processes, signifying the relegation of humane values to the garbage-heap. Considering Bunuel's brand of rather sadistic "surrealism," the second seems the more likely alternative here. (Nathan Leites, incidentally, raised this problem in connection with "The Rise of Affect-

lessness" that he saw in Camus' novels. It is tied in, he suggested, with the process of "fascization.") This seems especially true if *Los Olvidados* is contrasted with a film like *The Quiet One*, which also deals with pathological urban degradation, but from a viewpoint which is basically clinical, human, and (at the least) social-minded.

It is somewhat odd, in fact, that so ferociously amoral a film should have drawn no fire, so far as I know, from leftist critics. No Stalinist reviewer has yet realized that *Los Olvidados* is a manifest "libel of the proletariat," for instance. This neglect may be due to the prickly underlying dilemma such a film poses: in dealing with bad social con-

ditions, should we portray them as entrenched, powerful, and therefore requiring great effort to change; or as weak and crumbling already under the impact of the forces of Progress?

In any case, Bunuel has here given the horror picture a new subject-matter, which is worth notice whatever we think of the sensationalism which engrosses him in his gang fights, robberies, rapes, murders and so on. It is regrettable that with his great proficiency in film Bunuel has no more solid orientation for his work.

ERNEST CALLENBACH

Ernest Callenbach is a student at the University of Chicago.

BOOKS IN REVIEW

THE COMPLEX FATE

by Marius Bewley
Chatto and Windus, 1952

THE INTERRELATION of English and American literature represents one of the subtlest dialectics in the history of culture; a series of currents and countercurrents of influence and judgments, of creative ambition and advanced discrimination, that has persisted from Edward Taylor until the present time. It is a unique circumstance that two distinct nations (one is almost tempted to say civilizations) should have been able to register the friction and inspiration of literary interdevelopment in but one language, even granted that the language is spoken quite differently by people two thousand miles apart.

Indeed, it is the language held in common that makes this cultural phenomenon more interesting than the artistic intercourse between China and Japan, or France and Germany, where a bold linguistic contrast does not necessitate the sharper perception that the single language insists upon. To put it as simply as possible, it is more of a revelation to see the differences of separate cultures indicated in the same words merely rearranged in a slightly different order, than in two separate languages. It breeds subtlety. It has resulted in the English language's having the greatest variety of linguistic possibilities of any in the world.

England and America, then, have had an unusual opportunity, the opportunity of being a kind of spiritual mirror, each for the other, reflecting within their common language. Both have profited in moral perspective. I think it is not too much to suggest that moral sophistication is the most vigorous trait of Anglo-American letters. Certainly moral

sophistication is one of the chief glories of Marius Bewley's new book, *The Complex Fate*, which, albeit limited in scope, is of that central nature, that sheer relevance, best described as basic; basic in the sense of being an example of what literary critical vision is, and basic in the sense of being a permanent penetration of the fateful complexity of the adjective American applied to the noun literature.

Bewley's Critical Tradition

Before discussing the book itself, however, it is important to place Mr. Bewley in his critical tradition. His acknowledged master is Dr. F. R. Leavis of Cambridge, editor of the magazine *Scrutiny* and author of *Revaluations* and *The Great Tradition*. *Scrutiny* is much resented in England. The quarterly is a persistent sticker of pins into English literary balloons; or to use Mr. Bewley's own metaphor, a carter of corpses from the scene. It is quite true that there is a prevalence of corpses on the contemporary literary scene; that all of the creative arts are, in fact, in decline. But the critical arts, the interpretative arts, on the other hand, flourish to a magnificent degree. Of course, I include not only critics in the accepted sense, but all those trained sensibilities that take their place between works of art and the response of the public; such as translators, conductors, pianists, dancers, and so on.

The English genius is now concentrated in the analytical and the interpretative; it is an impressive thing, one of the finest manifestations of the English spirit, that rather than succumb to declining creative energy by lowering values, its representatives have gone to Japan, France, Russia, Austria, and inevitably to their own past to sus-

tain the fine exhilarations of the highest aesthetic standards. If there are some forces that would violate these standards in order to wave the vulgar flags of national pride, they do not do so without benefit of critical restraint. As I earlier indicated, *Scrutiny* is a rigorous check on unfounded relations of this kind.

Mr. Bewley, then, as an American has attached himself to the most distinguished impulse in contemporary English culture as specifically represented by Dr. Leavis, whose theory of criticism is actually, for all its being constantly misunderstood, quite simple. It is only that criticism is the disciplined use of intelligence and sensibility. The latter qualities are a matter of talent that no amount of effort can produce where the Creator has indicated otherwise. Discipline, however, can be learned, and one of the best places to start is with a close study of Mr. Bewley's recent book, which, like many another book based on a premise of startling simplicity, is deep enough to be ultimately complex, to justify a title such as *The Complex Fate*.

The American Quality

His book is divided into two parts. The first is devoted to the influence of Hawthorne on James, the second to studies of Kenneth Burke, Wallace Stevens, H. L. Mencken, and some young American poets. These latter essays are essential reading to anyone interested in the subjects. But it is the first half of the volume that here arrests our attention and concern. The theme is fruitful. T. S. Eliot has a most suggestive essay on the subject, *The Hawthorne Aspect*, and William James wrote to his brother Henry: "that you and Howell's with all the models of English literature to follow, should needs involuntarily have imitated (as it were) this American seems to point to the existence of some real American quality."

Under Mr. Bewley's touch, that impalpable esprit seems to emerge inevitably from the air, rather than, as in so many books of inferior patriotism that have arrived since the death of Whitman, being crudely forced into impossible texts, or appended in flurries of jingoist hysteria. Mr. Bewley, in revealing intimately what one American might, in the most profound sense, use of another American, has clearly demonstrated what they have in common, what, by theoretical possibility, the "American quality" itself might very well be.

Mr. Bewley analyzes the literary in-semination of *The Blithedale Romance* in the imagination of James, and its influence upon a masterpiece of James, *The Bostonians*; and the similar organic relationship between *The Marble Faun*

and *The Wings of the Dove*. These two discussions, long and thorough, are of considerably more pertinence toward understanding the art of fiction than any text-book on the subject I know of. The sensibility develops best by example, and these two essays are indeed such stimulating examples of fine reading, that they quite justify my earlier implied comparison between literary criticism and musical performance; such a book as Mr. Bewley's is a performance of the works he discusses in just this sense — which is to say that the book is full of continuous aesthetic pleasure.

Central Insights

It is the fourth chapter of *The Complex Fate*, titled "The American Problem," however, which is most relevant to aspects of Mr. Bewley's book that I have been underlining. Here, I think, the central insights are made. Mr. Bewley presents us with a most striking image. He writes of *The Scarlet Letter*, "This is not an allegory on the woman taken in Adultery, but a subtle exploration of moral isolation in America . . . and one feels that the richly embroidered breast might stand for Artist almost as easily as Adulteress. To that extent . . . *The Scarlet Letter* is autobiographical." The implication of this is clearer when the critic writes, "For both men [James and Hawthorne] the immediate presence of the American scene was the reverse of stimulating, and yet it was irrevocably their subject. But it was a subject that had to be seen at an angle and from a distance."

A third quotation, unhappily torn from a particularly necessary context (as were the foregoing) will, I hope, justify this abuse of the critic's prose by taking the insight a little further along in its development: "He [Hawthorne] kept before the later novelist the constant reminder that an American artist must be peculiarly concerned, at a serious moral level, with certain national and social problems, and this shared concern unfolded, in the writings of both men, into still deeper problems and resemblances that became in their turn the very texture and meaning of their art. It was Hawthorne, then, who helped make James into an American novelist . . ."

Irony and Idealism

I think the crucial phrase is "the texture and meaning of their art," for it is just Mr. Bewley's skill in examining texture and meaning that isolates for the attentive reader "the American quality." In part it is the strategy of transcending the "moral isolation" that is seen as the theme of Hawthorne's great novel: a transcendence admitting a delicate balance of irony and what

must be called, for want of a more appropriate expression, American idealism. But it takes a very small imbalance to lay waste many novels of Hawthorne, as Mr. Bewley shows, and to weaken sections, themes, and characters in James' work. This balance of irony and idealism which is so different from anything found in the literature of other languages, is a difficult idea to grasp, but one which grows in reflection.

Like most of what is valuable that we ever get to learn, it is only an awareness, an awareness of values in a certain juxtaposition, almost a hieroglyph; but once this level of perception is reached, the American quality, as William James puts it, or the American problem, as Marius Bewley puts it, is a reality in which national literature is not vulgar, but rather a part of the truth of experience. From this it must be clear that the ideas and observations of Marius Bewley cannot be condensed to any single slogan useful for manufacturing immediate batches of American literature. Yet I think the discipline of this book can have only the best effect on our sharper sensibilities, and hence on literature in general.

I should not like to conclude without mentioning an aspect of *The Complex Fate* that makes it unique among books of literary criticism: some of Mr. Bewley's opinions are challenged within the book itself. Dr. Leavis, who has provided the introduction, is also represented in an exchange of viewpoints on *The Turn of the Screw* and *What Maisie Knew*. There are replies and counter-replies, and just when you think it is over, and Dr. Leavis writes, "Mr. Bewley and I have not shaken each other. We must submit the case to others," Mr. Bewley returns with a final flash of plume and panoply.

The discussion, however, is of the greatest service to the life of the mind. First, it demonstrates that literary criticism is a speculative enterprise; and second, that Dr. Leavis' critical method is not a didactic system as it is often misrepresented as being. Imaginatively dependent upon the "disciplined sensibility," it is the free and open attempt to understand literature. As Dr. Leavis says in his introduction, "my disagreements are minor indeed compared with the major concurrence that makes me welcome his book with a wholly sincere warmth and with great relief." Let us hope that some of the erroneous impressions that Dr. Leavis is tyrannical will be dispelled by this book.

Written by an American in England, *The Complex Fate* holds the high possibility of complementing D. H. Lawrence's *Studies in Classic American Literature*, the work of an Englishman in America.

Charles Thayer

THE CATHERINE WHEEL

by Jean Stafford
Harcourt, Brace 1952

THE NOVELS OF Jean Stafford have been among the few welcome events in American fiction since 1940. Both her obvious talent and her actual achievement in *Boston Adventure* and *The Mountain Lion* have singled her out as perhaps the most accomplished of the younger generation of prose writers, — the one new writer, except possibly Saul Bellow, whom one might venture to predict could sustain and develop her gifts and produce a substantial body of work. *Boston Adventure* and *The Mountain Lion* are surely among the best novels to have been written by an American in the last decade. Along with Bellow's superbly subtle and ambiguous Dostoevskian study of guilt and responsibility, *The Victim*, Mailer's massive and impressive war novel and Warren's brilliant but confused and overwrought *All The King's Men*, they seem likely to be remembered after most of the ephemeral novels of the moment are forgotten.

Miss Stafford has demonstrated a comprehensive grasp of the fundamentals of novel writing that emphasizes her artistic distance from her fellow writers. Her style, precisely evocative and rhythmic, creates and defines like any good style, the meaning of character and situation as the lighting scheme of a room by its very nature establishes a mood and a tone. She possesses an unusual insight into, and trenchant capability in rendering the nuances of human relationships, an area where most American novels are weakest, and her illumination of character is economical and pointed, unveiled by an organic fusing of mannerisms, appearances, speech and thoughts until they blend into a distinct and incisive individual portrait. Miss Stafford also suggests what most American fiction with its reliance upon surface detail and external observation rarely does, and what seems to me to constitute the core of good fiction, namely something of the complexities and mysteries of human existence.

A Study of Human Loneliness

Miss Stafford's third novel, *The Catherine Wheel*, is a study of human loneliness and isolation, of two disparate beings whom life has passed by, in the connotatively-named Maine town of Hawthorne where rich, elegant, cultivated, admired and unmarried Katherine Congreve, famous for her garden and her summer parties and her

eccentricities finds herself that particular summer deeply and desperately unhappy. Katherine had not married, for her best friend had married John Shipley, her only love throughout the years, and now that John was equally torn by ennui and unhappiness he urged her to marry him and start a new life together. Recalling the vanished hopes of her youth and her hidden envy and malice toward John's wife, her inner calm and forbearance is shattered and the supremely radiant summer develops into a lengthening shadow of increasing doubts, longings and fears.

Juxtaposed to Katherine's emotional turmoil is the adolescent suffering of her twelve-year old cousin Andrew for whom the summers at her great house in Hawthorne have always meant an escape from his parents, John and Maevie Shipley, and the school where he feels friendless and unliked. But his idyllic summer escapades with his only friend, Victor, are at an end, for Victor's adored sailor brother is ill at home and he devotes himself to taking care of him in an exclusive, possessive, idealizing fashion which leaves no room for Andrew in his life.

The novel alternates between the story and situations of Katherine and Andrew thereby creating an ironic parallel between the sorrows of youth and the unfulfilled expectancies of approaching middle-age, achieving in Kenneth Burke's terminology "perspective by incongruity." For although the distressingly concealed thoughts of both Katherine and Andrew are not known to each other, Katherine suspects that he knows of her love for his father and Andrew fears that she has read his death-wishes toward Victor's brother.

Weaknesses of Novel

There are, however, disappointments in her new novel. Her handling of the narcissistic, irrational and enclosed world of childhood seen through Andrew's eyes and to a lesser degree through his twin sisters' is firmly realized and has an air of verisimilitude that far surpasses that of her contemporaries who have made the use of the childhood viewpoint so ubiquitous and so unconvincing a thing. But if Andrew's torments are recognizable and his reaction to experience commands our credence, Katherine is as unalive as the incredible paraphernalia accumulated in her legendary house. Miss Stafford has devoted too much space to cataloguing the contents of her rooms and her eccentricities, and has delineated her too obliquely in terms of the social setting and as seen through the eyes of the artificially drawn characters who frequent her household. Katherine is always an enigma not of the complexity

of character, however, but the enigma of a writer who has chosen to tell us less than enough to give us an inkling of the breathing woman beneath the anachronistic clothes and graceful mannerisms.

The tenuous texture of Miss Stafford's prose so skillfully carries one along with its imagistic mesmerism and tonal color that one expects a compelling resolution of the perplexing problem that besets Katherine that summer. But Miss Stafford abrogates her novelistic responsibilities and ends the novel by destroying her heroine in a meaningless way. It would seem that she has succumbed to the temptation of American novelists to finish off a character rather than face the artistic and moral problem of working out a probable denouement in terms of character and situation.

The *Catherine Wheel* is inferior to both *Boston Adventure* and *The Mountain Lion* although it contains some excellent passages. To some extent it falls into the category designated by Diana Trilling as "less representative of contemporary writing about women than of

contemporary writing by women." "Too carefully styled, too delicate in its perceptions, too thin in its narrative materials," *The Catherine Wheel* for all its exquisitely sculptured structure and prose has the air of a dead museum piece. Miss Stafford has matched her previous remarkable capturing of the special quality of the child's world, but her style which has become more laden with images and objects and is often not germane to the material at hand, and her inability to suggest the realness of Katherine as an individual or social symbol, a comparable defect to that which vitiates the impact of several of her short stories, makes it difficult to concern us with her fate, which failure is a considerable one in any novel. Few American writers are as keen observers of their fellow creatures and few can write with such refreshing, distinctive command of language, but in *The Catherine Wheel*, Jean Stafford has not succeeded in transmuting her insights and their stylistic presentation into a satisfying whole.

J. WILSON WRIGHT

IF you reject world capitalism as a dying social order

IF you repudiate the Stalinist alternative as modern barbarism

IF you are willing to work for peace and social justice through democratic socialism

YOUR PLACE IS WITH THE

SOCIALIST YOUTH LEAGUE

To get acquainted, write:

SOCIALIST YOUTH LEAGUE

114 West 14th Street

New York City

PROGRAM of the **NEW YORK STUDENT FEDERATION AGAINST WAR**

The primary aim of the New York Student Federation Against War is to organize all students opposed to the war drives of Russian and American imperialism which threaten the very existence of world civilization. We aim to prevent the polarization of the American student body into either of these reactionary war camps.

We are irreconcilably opposed to the totalitarian tyranny which rules over such countries as Russia, her Eastern European vassal states and fascist Spain. We advocate the overthrow of these regimes by democratic forces from within these countries and enthusiastically endorse all such forces. At the same time we do not accept the rationalization and apology for the war drives of American imperialism on the basis of militarily stopping Stalinism.

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

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

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

The New York Student Federation Against War

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

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

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

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

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

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

BUSINESS OFFICE NOTICE

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

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

SUBSCRIPTION

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

Name

Address

School

41 WEST 33rd STREET