

anvil

a student anti-war quarterly

Contents

DO COMMUNISTS HAVE
THE RIGHT TO TEACH?

•
HEMINGWAY AND MAILER

•
DYNAMICS OF RUSSIAN
ANTI-SEMITISM

•
MILITARIZATION OF AMERICA

•
and others

articles by: Richard Wright - Roy Kepler
 Julius Jacobson - E. Field
 Irving Howe - Parker Tyler
 Avel Austin - James Fenwick

FALL QUARTER

1949

Published By

The New York Student
Federation Against War



THE FEDERATION: A STUDENT REGROUPMENT

Students throughout the nation are beginning to realize that the cloistered campus isolated from the world is a dangerous myth. It is clear to most that the freedom and isolation of the campus is rapidly vanishing under the onslaughts of the cold war and the maturing American war-economy. The student finds himself apologizing every day for the crimes of either Russian or American imperialism. Some of those who have attempted to struggle against the polarization have grown apathetic and fatalistic because an alternative has not crystallized. Fortunately, not all were content to sit back and allow the enormous task ahead to demoralize them.

On April 29, 1949, ten New York campus clubs enthusiastically responded to a call for a discussion of the proposal, advanced by the Independent Socialist Club of Brooklyn College, for a federation of anti-war clubs in the New York City area, with the ultimate perspective of a national militant anti-war movement. Encouraging letters of support came in from prominent personalities in the progressive educational and literary world.

Out of the spirited and cooperative atmosphere of this conference came the plans that were to form the basis of the founding convention to be held later. It was plain that the delegates wanted an organizational structure that would reflect the broad and democratic character of the Federation; for the conference concluded that the Federation's structure should be loose, with local college affiliates enjoying a maximum amount of autonomy. The conference, after much serious discussion, decided that the Federation's anti-war program and basis for affiliation should be built around consistent opposition to the war preparations of both Russian and American imperialism and in its more positive vein around the "fight for the fullest extension of academic and civil liberties." The delegates were unanimous in their desire to see an inclusive rather than a narrow anti-war coalition; they wanted widely differing political views united the struggle against atomic war; they wanted an organization capable of reaching the student with a maturing but vague anti-war consciousness.

After the delegates carried the proposals back to their club memberships, a period of discussion started to decide which clubs were in basic agreement with the proposal made by the Brooklyn College organization. Eight clubs voted to affiliate and sent delegates to a founding convention where the New York Student Federation against War was launched.

The Executive Committee of the Federation is composed of representatives elected by the clubs in proportion to their membership, (one representative for every ten members); however, in order to prevent one club from dominating the Federation, each club is not permitted to have more than four representatives. Members at large are represented by a city-wide meeting which elects representatives on the same basis as the clubs.

Programmatically and organizationally the Federation will capture imagination of the progressive sections of the nation's campus. A deep-felt need exists for a militant student movement that does not owe its allegiance to any nationalism or political party; a movement that is uncompromising in its fight against the war drive.

HERE IS WHAT YOU CAN DO TO HELP BUILD THIS ANTI-WAR MOVEMENT:

1. Attempt to get your club to affiliate to the Federation by sponsoring such a resolution at the next membership meeting.
2. Join as a member at large if you are not a member of an affiliated club.
3. Circulate Anvil, the official publication of the Federation.

THE EDITORS.

OUR EDITORIAL POLICY

We are not without a tradition. The student movement of the 'thirties combined anti-war sentiment with militancy. The movement of the 'thirties, however, is now in ashes, gutted and destroyed by the political leadership which dominated it, the leadership of a ruinous, cynical, undemocratic caucus under the tutelage of the Stalinists. Out of the ashes of this movement, the honesty, militancy, and genuine anti-war sentiment is being reborn. It is a wiser group which prepares the new struggle to keep our generation out of the foxholes. This new movement cannot have any truck with Stalinism because to oppose a war for empire means to oppose not only the imperial court of the Wall Street combines but the Russian empire builders as well.

Rebirth of a student movement against war requires articulate people from the campus, those who have had direct contact with its tradition as well as those who came to the movement untouched by the defeats, the corruption and the despair that followed upon the fiasco of the American Student Union and other Stalinist-led groups. Anvil wishes to express the ideas, the criticisms and the program, nascent as well as developed, of these students, their traditions and the spirit in which they think and act. It welcomes contributions: articles, fiction, poems, letters, term papers. Nothing which has to do with the contemporary cultural scene is out of our ken. Ideas are forged on the anvil of tradition and in the fire of modern thought. Modern thought, almost by definition, includes both politics and literature, philosophy and poetry, and criticism in every realm.

We do not wish to adopt the policy of the "dogmatist." We have a point of view about war and we think that it is the right one. We do not believe, however, that from this it follows that we have the only standpoint from which to criticize philosophy, poetry, music, art, or the problem of the family. Even in the field of politics and economics our attitude toward war does not provide the sign used to blaze all trails. On the problem of the war itself we certainly welcome points of view other than our own; we are sure that ours can be defended successfully and we welcome any challenge which would enable us to do so. Above all, however, we venture into the arena of modern thought as does the student, with points of view, but open to criticism, discussion, and to new modes of thinking. We want to help to develop and lead a political movement. But we have not the hardness of a political party which has already formed and hammered its policies into definitive shape.

We do not want to adopt the tone or the style of the modern literary-philosophical-commentary on culture. That style is too full of a special jargon. It speaks the "cant" of the tired intellectual. Its tone is too often esoteric and somewhat cynical. It is written for those who have already been initiated into a select fraternity. When one of these critical reviews wants to discuss philosophy as philosophy it speaks of "philosophy qua philosophy." The simpler mode is more to our taste. We do not need the "ad hoc," the "qua" or the "dialectic" of the special disciplines to make our ideas clear. These words are meaningful but very special. Our audience is less specialized but just as critical. Nor have our readers passed through all the movements and become "superior" to them. We are still struggling for a genuine and militant anti-war organization. In that sense we want our style to be as our program, broad, critical and unwearied of the battle.

THE EDITORS

ANVIL A STUDENT ANTI-WAR QUARTERLY

FALL QUARTER - Volume I Number 1 - 1949

EDITOR:

Julius Jacobson

ASS'T EDITORS:

Sam F. Bottone

Laura Citron

Norman Eiger

Abe Victor

Published by:

THE NEW YORK STUDENT
FEDERATION AGAINST WAR
247 Lexington Avenue
New York City

IN THIS ISSUE

"Such Is Our Challenge"..... 1
by Richard Wright

An Editorial: Do Communists
Have The Right To Teach? 4
by Julius Jacobson

An Editorial: The Third Camp..10
by James Fenwick

Paisan Or Propaganda?14
by Parker Tyler

America's Growing
Militarization20
by Roy Kepler

The Dynamism Of The New
Anti-Semitism In Russia.....24
by E. Field

The Gun And The Rose.....30
by Avel Austin

Porkchoppers Prefabricated36
by Irving Howe

Single Copy15¢

Subscription Rate(Four Issues) .60

Bundle orders (ten copies or more)
can be purchased by individuals or
organizations for 12¢ per copy.

See subscription blank: last page.

"SUCH IS OUR CHALLENGE"

My body was born in America, my heart in Russia, and today I am quite ashamed of my two homelands. The American State of Mississippi gave me my body; the Russian October revolution gave me my heart. But today these two giant nations -- symbols of the nationalistic scourge of our times-- rival each other in their efforts to establish projects for the debasement of the human spirit. They are guilty of degrading humanity, guilty of debasing the culture of our times, guilty of replacing the value of quality by the value of quantity, guilty of creating a universe which, little by little, is revealed as the gas chamber of humanity.

These two nations, the American and the Russian, pretend to be the official representatives of human liberty and, between these two official pretensions, between the threats they hurl at each other, the human spirit finds itself crucified. Men are afraid. They are unable to choose. They cannot plan. They cannot think of the next day. They tremble in the night from fear and dismay. The imperatives of military and industrial life have so obscured and enfeebled the instincts of men that they no longer even know that they are lost.

You know that is true. I know it. Then, why not admit it? Why not grant it as a point of departure which determines our words and actions.

Certainly, as conscious men, we ought to know that the crisis before us is more weighty in substance than the combat between America and Russia. The truth is that these two nations make war on your spirit and my spirit, that contemporary spirit which books, culture and history have given us; that Dante, Shakespeare, Racine and Goethe have given us. Each step that America takes and each step that Russia takes brings us nearer to the point where free thought, free spirit and free action are not possible. We live in this vise.

America says that she alone is the champion of liberty; and Russia also says this. In fact, these two nations advocate ideals in which they really don't believe, which they even hate and despise. America is suspicious of you intellectuals; she has invented a whole terminology to express her disdain for the products of the human spirit: men who think, she scornfully calls Long Hairs, Pedants, Dreamers, Bohemians, Makers of Theory, Intellectual Bastards, Visionaries, etc. And in Russia, what do they call you there? Monkeys, Hyenas, Chimpanzees, such are the names they hurled at T. S. Eliot, at Andre Gide, and at the best living writers, at the recent cultural congress held in Poland.

* * *

Listen, writers and artists: the men who today lead the world have declared war on you! They have no need of you, they don't want you in the society they are trying to build. They think you are dangerous. They said it at Hollywood and they said it at Prague! Whoever is the conqueror, you lose; you shall be reduced to servile dependence, to slavery, to discs of a phonograph repeating the official doctrine. I ask you, you men of spirit: what is there for you to choose? Are you able to say yes, with all your heart, to these things that America symbolizes? If you are able

to say yes to one or the other of these points of view, that signifies that something has already died in you, that the battle which the Americans and the Russians wage for the conquest of your spirit is already won. If you are able to choose between them, that signifies that humanity is lost, that 2000 years of the history of man is ended, that the only conception of man that we have is buried.

I cannot answer the questions that I raise and I don't apologize. There are times in history when words alone cannot give an answer. There are times when action alone is able to answer. Such are our times. Acts, that is what you, intellectuals, must accomplish, acts with words, acts which express your needs, your wishes, your dreams.

Do you believe that I exaggerate the gravity of the problem? Listen and remember. There are two nations in the world today, where feeling has become politically suspect, where speaking of the subjective qualities of man is a crime; where the mere act of speaking about freedom is smeared and spied upon, where servility is made noble, falsehood worshipped, double-dealing sanctified, false testimony binding, spying patriotic, and where the scientific laboratory is guarded by bayonets.

These are not isolated cases which affect some dishonorable individuals. No, these are the official beliefs of governments that lead hundreds of millions of men. To oppose this flood of opinion is to risk a brutal death or to endanger your means of earning a living.

The war against man is declared and, if you don't know it, if you are not conscious of it, you will be unable to set an example for those who are caught in the situation, but who still don't know that it is almost too late.

Freedom of speech is not enough. Freedom of religion is not enough. Freedom from hunger and fear, they are not enough. A nation, which is not able to give its citizens the right and freedom to exercise their natural and acquired abilities is founded on fraud. Man ought to have the freedom to remain a man. Freedom is not negative, it ought to be not only the possibility to be free "of" something, but to go freely "towards" something. It ought to let men create new values for life, otherwise it was not created for man.

America and Russia are full of machines which strangle living more than they protect. America and Russia are full of educational institutions for whom the goal is not the formation of independent individuals, but of standardized human types who are loyal to the State.

The intolerant, harsh nationalism of America and Russia deprive the millions of men who live in these countries of having normal human sentiments and they are forced to become propaganda projectors.

In America and Russia, the right to an individual destiny is sacrificed in the name of a compulsory national ideal. The hysterical political atmosphere, in America and in Russia, already has removed from man the means of objectively and reasonably resolving the problems of food and shelter. The present nationalism, in America and in Russia, forces a man

to abandon his human heritage. America and Russia pretend that their action is in defense of the lives of their people; but, in truth, it kills the life of man on earth.

In rejecting all this, what can we do? Fortunately, the situation is not completely desperate. I believe that we still have a chance. It is not a question of our fighting these national giants on their own ground. Our weapons are not their weapons. For us there still exists room for liberty, and that room is your spirit and mine, your ability to speak and write the words which hold attention and make men stop, look and listen. For some time yet, we shall have this liberty; for how long? We don't know.

But that tiny space of liberty is surrounded by threats, ersatz culture (fed to the masses, and impoverishing the spirit), false values, governments of gangsters, books which confuse more than they clarify, crime which speaks the language of the revolution, and revolution which speaks the language of crime.

Nevertheless, we can make ourselves heard. And that ought to be enough for us. We have only a few allies. For centuries men like us have worked for the bosses, the lords, the masters. But that is ended. Today the masters are afraid of you; they no longer want you. From now on, you are alone and you are your own masters.

You must find a way of making your words a goad to incite men to decide for themselves. You must find words and images which make men feel life in the most direct, most immediate, keenest way. Your words must drive man by powerful blows from passive existence to real life. Your words must instill faith into men, but a faith which is not based upon superstition. The strength of your words must empower men to escape their daily impersonal, big city routine and fill a new need of expressing themselves, of believing in themselves, of fulfilling themselves. Your words must stir up in man the desire to be a man.

Your words must be a prayer addressed to man for man. They must arouse a desire in man to remain human. I speak not of heaven or hell, but purely and simply of our sad and sweet earth, with its men who suffer and have their moment of bitter human triumph.

The great danger is that the threads of history, which we hold so feebly in our hands, may break asunder in our lifetime; that the past which has nourished us and the future which we seek should escape us and leave us in a barren present denuded of all human significance.

In order that our universe not escape us, a single man must speak with the tongues of ten, each of your acts must equal that of a thousand. Such is our challenge. If we fail, not only shall we lose our puny individual lives, but we shall lose all that is human in the world, all that history, however imperfect she is, has bequeathed us. The world is greater than America or Russia. Humanity is greater than America or Russia. That is a fact. If we believe in it, we shall conquer.

(Translated from French by Mary Coleman)

RICHARD WRIGHT

Richard Wright, novelist, delivered the above address at the International Writers Day meeting held in Paris this year. It first appeared, in English, in The Student Partisan.

A n E d i t o r i a l :DO COMMUNISTS HAVE THE RIGHT TO TEACH?

Ten years ago the response to the question, "Do Communists have the right to teach?" would have been a distinct and unequivocal "No" from the Hearst editorialist and the Coughlinite pamphleteer; an equally forceful and categorical "Yes" from a heterogeneous mass of educators, liberals, trade unionists and radicals. That was ten years ago. Today the lines have shifted. The Hearst editorialist has held fast and the heirs of Coughlin have been consistent; but the ranks of those who defended the academic and civil rights of the Communist Party have been thrown into disorder. A large number of the latter are either admittedly confused or else have seen fit to pass into a vari-complexioned camp of those seeking to deny academic freedom to teachers holding membership in the Communist Party.

This re-alignment does not mean that yesterday's radicals who are today's intellectual exponents of restricting the Communist teacher have surrendered to the ideology of the most backward, reactionary sections of American life. Both William R. Hearst and the ex-socialist, Professor Sidney Hook, may answer the above question with a common "No," but one must recognize that the motivation, the argumentation and the objectives of each are different. The former is a crude apostle of reaction whose views on academic questions will have little effect on anybody except those who are already predisposed to accept them as an indispensable part of a more general and simplistic reactionary ideology. The Hook school, however, is refined and subtle. It does not consist of sensational, chauvinist exposes of "The Red Menace to Americanism in Our School System." Its point of departure for prohibiting Stalinist teachers is an avowed defense of academic freedom. Its language is not hysterical. It is the language of traditional liberalism. It is the "Hook approach," consequently, which presents the more important intellectual challenge and is the one which, with slight variations, has already provided the rationale for dismissing real and alleged Stalinist faculty members.

In the past ten years, the direction and tempo of the migration of liberals from the camp of principled defenders of academic freedom to the Hook school has paralleled the direction and tempo of the world political re-alignment. Except possibly for the short-lived period of the Hitler-Stalin pact, the American liberal felt until recently a minimal compatibility with Stalinism. The Russian behemoth did not hold the same terror for him ten years ago that it does today. The American government and its compliant liberal apologist looked upon the Russian state as a potential military ally in the pre-war years. He was always kindly disposed to collective security. When this potential marriage was consummated after Pearl Harbor, the American liberal showed little compunction about hallowing the Russian police state or rubbing shoulders with American Stalinists in committees and front organizations. The fact that Russia, "The Country of the Great Lie," had already demonstrated its totalitarian nature meant little to the liberals during the American-Russian alliance. The Russian frame-up trials and the murder of thousands of anti-Stalinists, the total destruction of political rights by Stalinism, Russia's refusal

to grant Jews the right of asylum, and even the green light given the Nazi blitzkrieg forces were either largely condoned or grossly ignored by the liberals during the war years.

Today, however, when the bubble of an American-Russian alliance has been pricked for three years, and its Utopian vision replaced by the overwhelming reality of their imperialist rivalry for global power, the liberals have reacted with an unprecedented vehemence to the horrors of Stalinism. The last ten years have thus proven that basically the values of contemporary American liberalism find their limits within the values of American imperialism. The fear of Stalinism that the liberal and ex-radical exhibits is clearly the political product of his identification with the fundamental drives behind American diplomacy.

It is on this point that Hook and his followers display an initial intellectual dishonesty. Hook denies that his exclusion policy is a matter of discriminating against a political party. Still affected by the healthy traditional taboo against persecuting political minorities (a cultural hangover for Professor Hook), he justifies his position by presenting an artificial, evasive educational theory as his apologia for anti-Stalinist discrimination. This educational "philosophy" we shall discuss shortly, but what is important here is that, despite denials to the contrary, the Hook school's objection to Stalinist teachers is a political position and has a political origin.

The present campaign against the Communist Party in the school system can be analyzed and understood only in the context of current Russian-American rivalry. The need for greater conformity among faculty and students is indispensable to an American imperialism preparing for atomic war. The high degree of mechanization and specialization demanded by a modern war economy gives an increasingly important role to the individual with college-bred skills. Thus, as the cold war is intensified, legislative restrictions against intellectual latitude in the academic field are made more severe. The liberals and ex-radicals, kneeling to meet the needs of their government, provide an intellectual facade for academic repression.

For the anti-war individual, i.e., for the person who is opposed to the character and objectives of both Russian and American imperialism, it is sufficient to know that the present drive to oust the Stalinists from the school system is organically joined to the war preparations of American imperialism. For then the fight to defend academic freedom is more than a defense of the democratic rights of political minorities: it becomes transformed into a larger struggle against imperialism and war.

The causal connection between the Atlantic Pact and Professor Hook's totalitarian-infested liberalism becomes clear to the anti-war student who must consistently oppose both cause and effect. The pro-Washington liberal who cannot see his way to supporting the Hook thesis on Communist teachers is in a difficult position. For it cannot be denied that, on the surface, there appears to be a certain validity to the reasoning that given a pro-Washington political perspective today it is necessary to suspend the right of a member of a party devoted exclusively to the interests of the Russian state to teach.

The liberals who favor anti-Stalinist restrictions are usually emphatic in their defense of academic freedom for other critics of American diplomacy. They maintain that it is only the faculty spokesman for Russian totalitarianism who must lose his professional privileges. Here, too these liberals are thinking in a vacuum. They fail to see that politics develops a logic of its own far more powerful than rhetoric and phantasy. They fail to see that once the government embarks upon a policy of restricting the Stalinist teacher it cannot and will not be limited to the Communist Party member. The inevitable development of this policy if employed by the school authorities, the government and its ex-radical advisors, will be its fanwise extension and application to broader sections of the faculty and student population.

It is naive to think that a policy of excluding the Stalinists from the school system can be kept within bounds. The Stalinists are only one source - a reactionary one - which threatens the interests of American imperialism. There are other existent and potential opponents - progressive ones - who will be the target of presumably anti-Communist Party curbs. Neither the government nor the business interests behind so many of our educational institutions will make the distinction between Stalinist and non-Stalinist critics and opponents of American imperialism. Not even Professor Hook can logically make that distinction for any length of time, having put all his chestnuts in the Washington bonfire. The law-makers and law-enforcers, given their political interests and their social psychology cannot weed out only the Stalinist teacher and allow the other campus iconoclasts a free hand.

This logical development is hardly a prediction; it is already an unfortunate fact. In the present drive by various local legislatures and school authorities to enforce a patriotic school front, every genuine left-wing political tendency has had its victims. It is not only the Stalinists who have suffered, but along with them pacifists and socialists have been dismissed and discriminated against, and even liberals have been threatened and forced to resign their jobs.

Professor Hook denies that he wishes to discriminate against the Communist Party for its political ideas. He has developed the theory that membership in the Communist Party per se is inconsistent with competent teaching. Therefore he advocates the passage of a law which will make membership in the Communist Party prima facie evidence against the right of a CP member to teach. Hook, and many like him, argue as follows: The Communist Party is an agent of a totalitarian state and is itself a totalitarian organization. To become a member of the Communist Party means that one is no longer a free agent and must give up all right to think independently and critically. Because the Communist Party demands absolute conformity while the teaching profession requires intellectual tolerance and flexibility, the two are inconsistent.

That is a succinct but fair summary of an increasingly popular "Educational theory" provided by Professor Hook for ousting most Stalinists from the school system. It looks convincing on the surface, having the polished finish of an air-tight syllogism. But the problem it attempts to answer cannot be found so easily within the scope of formal logic.

There are a number of things wrong with Hook's reasoning. Above all,

it is not true that the American Communist Party member is not a free agent. He joins the Communist Party voluntarily and frequently leaves that corrupt organization on the same basis. In Czechoslovakia, on the other hand, a nation where the Stalinists have state power, a teacher, following his instinct of self-preservation will join the Party and preach Party doctrine under compulsion. What is there to compel an American teacher to preach Stalinism in the classroom? The Communist Party is a small discredited party in the United States which can exercise no coercive power over the member who does not really believe in "the line." It has neither power nor influence in American educational institutions to use as a threat over a teacher. On the contrary, it is now being subjected to an attack which will leave no one but the most convinced Stalinist teacher within the ranks of that party. In this atmosphere, the teacher who remains a member of the Party must be one who is doubly convinced of the correctness of its program.

There is another aspect to Hook's educational theory related to the above. He attempts to demonstrate that not only has the Stalinist surrendered his free will upon joining the Communist Party, but that he must use the classroom for Party indoctrination and recruitment. Therefore, Hook concludes, it is not a free teacher who leads the class but one influenced and dominated by an outside totalitarian agency. To enforce this argument the Professor has dug out quotations from the American Stalinist press of the 'thirties. These quotations are usually taken from resolutions and other official party documents instructing the party teacher to use the classroom as a propaganda agency. These facts are decisive evidence for Hook that the Stalinist teacher cannot allow the necessary free exchange of ideas between student and teacher, thus disqualifying him as a competent teacher on educational grounds.

This argument, too, looks impressive - even if the reasoning is faulty. One wonders, though, why men like Hook use these arguments today. They were well aware of the nature of Stalinism on and off the campus ten years ago; the quotations from the Communist Party press passed off as revelations today were no less familiar to the Hookmen during the war. Hook was no less aware then than he is today of the Communist Party's demand on its teacher-member. The answer to this is that the Hookian style of liberals are more concerned with the current political needs of the State Department than their suspiciously sudden horror of Stalinism.

What Hook implies about the Communist Party controlling a classroom through a teacher is simply not true. At best it is half true which means that it is false. It is true that the Communist Party would like to have its teacher-members utilize the classroom as a pure and simple propaganda agency. They make this amply clear in all their resolutions about the "role of the Communist teacher." But more important than what they would like to do is what they can do. Hook, with slight reservations, gives one the misleading impression that what is projected for the Communist teacher in his Party's resolution is an accurate description of the actual state of affairs. Fortunately, this is completely false. The Stalinist teacher for the most part does not and cannot turn his classroom into a Party school. He does not write the textbooks, he does not determine the curriculum and he cannot conduct himself in class in a manner even reminiscent of a course in the Stalinist Jefferson School. Naturally, the Stalinist will color his courses. Particularly in the social sciences he

will angle his discussion. But this is a far cry from what the Communist Party would like to see on campus and from what Sidney Hook implies is almost the case. Is there any instructor in philosophy and history, for example, whose courses consist of an unbiased presentation of names, dates and places? Happily not. Every such instructor has a point of view and it is to the benefit of the student that it is expressed. If in the course of his college education the student can become acquainted with varied points of view, that is all to the good. If it is legitimate for textbooks and teachers to present history from a bourgeois point of view (we do not hear Hook demanding the expulsion of the teacher who tells us that the Civil War was fought to free the slaves) then why the ferocity with the Stalinist instructor who gets his licks in too?

There are fanatical Stalinist teachers who feel it their duty to give the Party line from the moment they walk into a class until it ends. An instructor who is supposedly teaching mathematics yet is preoccupied with haranguing his students about the alleged wonders of the Russian paradise is perhaps unfit to teach; just as another instructor who is supposedly teaching a physics course but is instead preoccupied with exposing the perils of Stalinism may be unfit to teach. But in neither case should the charge of unfitness be made on the basis of political conviction.

Hook as another favorite argument which goes as follows: no one objects to firing a fascist or an anti-semitic. These people are recognized as totalitarians and the demand is always raised to dismiss them. But aren't the Stalinists totalitarians too? Why then demand the dismissal of one type of totalitarian and not the other?

There are a number of weaknesses in this argument. First of all, it is not to be granted that a fascist should be fired for his beliefs. Especially in the light of the present anti-"subversive" drive it would be wrong for a militant student to advocate firing a fascist merely for his ideas. To do that would open up the possibility of a more general attack on all those who fall afoul of Washington's politics. Even on more general theoretical grounds, a case can be made out against firing a fascist - or anyone else - for his point of view.

If the injection of reactionary ideology by an individual instructor into the classroom will have a harmful effect on members of the community (such as a professor teaching racism in a Southern institution which might incite Jim-Crowism), then that individual's right to teach should be challenged as "a clear and present danger" to democratic rights and institutions. But in these cases, investigations should be carried out on an individual basis and must not be used as a springboard for the generalization that "all individuals who believe in these ideas or are members of this organization thereby lose the right to teach."

However, the question of the right of the fascist to teach is largely an abstract one. There is no movement afoot today from either government or independent sources demanding the expulsion of all fascists from the school system. This fact is further proof that the present campus witch-hunt is an integral part of America's anti-Russian campaign and has nothing to do with consideration for the student's educational needs.

There is another important fallacy in this argument: the lumping

together of the Stalinist and fascist under the common heading "totalitarian" and then proceeding to discuss the two as if they were identical social twins. This is an overly simple, mechanical approach and therefore an incorrect one. There is a tremendous difference between the two genres of totalitarians.

A fascist movement is an action movement which makes no pretenses about its bigoted and anti-labor character. The K.K.K., the Christian Front, the Black Legion and the Gerald L. K. Smith's openly function as Jew-haters, Negro-baiters and anti-labor gunmen. In consonance with this, they recruit their members for the most part from the most backward and ignorant sections of the population: the Georgia "cracker," the mid-west Babbitt, the bitter southern storekeeper and the young hoodlum.

The Stalinists, on the other hand, have a completely different social basis and mode of operation. They demagogically parade under the banner of democracy and socialism, they pose as the champions of the labor movement and the fight to end discrimination. They organize campaigns for lower rents and against Jim-Crow. Consequently they succeed in winning support from sections of the working-class, students and intellectuals who have an abstractly democratic outlook on life. They are individuals who can play a healthy, progressive role in society if broken from their Stalinist illusions. The method of Hook, however, will only tighten the Communist Party hold on these people. These are important differences and their implications should be taken seriously. Hook glosses over them in an unscientific way not in keeping with his reputation.

The specific nature of Stalinist totalitarianism also helps us to understand the nature of the anti-Stalinist legislative campaign. The Stalinists who parade under the socialist banner and claim to be the legitimate heirs of the socialist tradition are attacked not only for being totalitarians but for being "socialists," "Marxists," "Leninists," etc. None of these latter labels fit. But what concerns us here is that the government utilizes them and its anti-Stalinist legislation is subsequently reformulated to include all genuine socialists and opponents of exploitation. We have already seen how the New York state legislature, motivated mainly by anti-Stalinism followed this pattern in the Feinberg Law which threatens the right to teach of all left-wing, anti-Stalinist opponents of American imperialism.

* * *

A college must be regarded as a special institution: a giant intellectual laboratory where students come into contact with a variety of ideas and can freely learn and discuss them. How can the student learn the truth about Stalinism if he is forbidden contact with it. Stalinism is a powerful force in the intellectual world today, a much more dynamic one than capitalism, and it cannot be kept in check by laws and quarantine. The fact that American capitalism is resorting to legal coercion to fight the Stalinists is proof of how fundamentally insecure this system really is. A society which must increasingly resort to physical and legislative force to protect itself is a weak and sick one.

JULIUS JACOBSON

Julius Jacobson is the editor of Anvil and is the Vice-President of the Eugene V. Debs Society of Brooklyn College.

A n E d i t o r i a l :NEITHER WASHINGTON NOR MOSCOW!

In the "Politics" Aristotle alludes to the fable of Antisthenes in which at a council of the beasts the rabbits begin demanding equality. The lions turn coldly on them and ask: "Where are your claws and teeth?"

It is not a bad expression of the morality prevailing in international politics today. Two kings of the world jungle, the United States and Russia, having brought down the other leading aspirants to power in World War II, stand uneasily opposed to each other, waiting only the opportune moment to rush at each other's throats. The lesser beasts, those whose industrial claws and political teeth are weaker, are dominated by the main contenders and lined up behind them.

Neither side is motivated by an ounce of idealism, as the most cursory examination of recent history will show. Neither side should command the support of anyone except those who find self-fulfillment in the economic, political, or social domination of other human beings.

Modern Russia begins in 1917 with the Russian revolution. Under the leadership of a cadre of politically gifted and culturally enlightened men and women, the young state immediately found a sympathetic response within the ranks of the world working class and among the most politically acute and morally sensitive of the young, post-war intelligentsia. The high resolve with which the movement began was, however, destined not to survive the realities of Russian industrial and cultural backwardness and the failure of the revolutionary movement to spread to other and more highly developed countries. A new, 'reactionary' class deriving from the upper echelons of the party, the GPU, the army, and the factory managers was able to seize power. Its continued existence is based, on the one hand, upon the material goods and power which membership in the bureaucracy provides, and, on the other, upon the use of terror on a mass scale.

Outside the ranks of the bureaucracy a very low standard of living prevails. 1944 was the year that Russian soldier-peasants marvelled at the wonders of Balkan Europe. 1945 was the year that a child's Mickey Mouse wristwatch could be sold to a Russian soldier on the Berlin black market for \$400. Lateness to work in a Russian factory can result in slave labor at the machine or a prison sentence. The basic purpose of the trade union in Russia is not to protect the living conditions of the worker but to augment production. The speed-up system is state policy. Complementary to this method of production is the slave labor camp, wherein, it is estimated, upwards of twenty million people engage in the most primitive sort of work on a less than subsistence diet. There is less political freedom than there was under Czarism--which the nineteenth century universally considered the most reactionary regime in Europe. There is only one political freedom: the unrestricted right to adulate Stalin. Culture, which burst into flower after the revolution, has withered away. Painting is literal and official. The novel has become an adjunct of the propaganda bureau. Music is whistleable and policed. Problems of political economy and science are adjudicated by the NKVD. Everything has become debased over the past thirty years. Even the language has degenerated. The sanctioned mode of expression is the language of the slum, the

backward peasant, the police, and the barracks. To the modern Russian the Voice of America comes from a point even more distant than the United States--its literary, polished Russian comes from a past dead for at least these ten years.

World War II brought Russia under the closer scrutiny of western eyes. Every event gave renewed witness of its reactionary character. First came the Hitler-Stalin pact, which permitted the Nazis to unleash the war, secure in the knowledge that they were in no danger from the rear. For one and a half years the destinies of the two countries were joined. Russia supplied the German war machine with raw materials. It was the season of bon mots: "Fascism," said Molotove, "is a matter of taste." It was the season of the congratulatory telegrams over the victories in the West. It was the season of the...next-to-the-last...partition of Poland. It was the season of the engulfing of Estonia, Lithuania, and Latvia. It was the season of dreams of empire.

Her appetite whetted, Russia began to cast eyes upon the Balkans and the Near East. Hitler became alarmed at the possible economic and military consequences. In June, 1941, Germany attacked. That act instantaneously put Russia among the ranks of the "democratic, peace-loving peoples" whom she had been denouncing as war-mongers. Now opportunities to observe the reactionary role of Russia ensued. She launched a violent campaign against Germans as Germans, a policy as false as the Nazi anti-semitic campaigns, and one calculated to unify the whole population behind Hitler. In such an atmosphere German nationalism flourished. Every country that the Russians overran in the later phases of the war was recast on the totalitarian model or put under heavy pressure to follow the Stalinist line. The satellite countries became the victims of predatory Russian imperialism, which sought to appropriate as much of their national product as possible and keep them in a non-industrialized, colonial status. Titoism emerged. Within Russia itself whole peoples such as the Kalmycks were uprooted and distributed elsewhere in Russia. Resistance movements sprang up, especially in areas like the Ukraine. But these internal and external movements of resistance to Stalinism remain unfinished phenomena. Today Stalinist influence extends from the Pacific ocean to eastern Europe. Any Czar could envy such a structure.

The United States government played its part in creating this monster over which the pale hands in the State Department are daily upraised in holy horror, with occasional special performances for the newsreel cameras. If, for instance, Russia is powerful in China today, one of the reasons is that she was granted a sphere of influence there by the allied powers, just as she was conceded similar spheres of influence in Europe. The United States concurred with Russia in all major policies affecting the Germans: war guilt, unconditional surrender, occupation, territorial revision, dismantling, reparations. During the war the Russian regime was whitewashed. Books critical of Stalinism, such as those by Alexander Barmine and Leon Trotsky, were withheld from the public until after the war. Russian-oriented propaganda such as "Mission to Moscow" was ballyhooded throughout the country.

But with what credentials did the United States itself enter the war? We entered the war under the banner of democracy, yet ten per cent of the population, the Negroes, were likewise subjected to a form of racial dis-

crimination. Puerto Rico and the Philippines enjoyed a colonial status. We entered the war allegedly as victims of aggressor nations, yet who can fail to be impressed by the evidence marshalled by the historian, Charles A. Beard, revealing the provocations employed by Roosevelt to involve the United States in the conflict?

And who were our friends in this crusade against fascism? Not democratic and peace-loving Great Britain which shortly after the war had 600,000 fully armed troops in Palestine deployed against 100,000 Jews guilty of the crime of wanting to govern themselves? Not France, which has been waging a full-scale colonial war in Indo-China since the end of the war? Not nationalist China? Not...not Russia, of which we are now told so many hair-raising things--all equally true ten years ago? There is a little problem of ends and means here which doesn't require a background in metaphysics to resolve.

However, let us grant that the alliances made by the sometimes naive, sometimes hypocritical, State Department were necessary expedients. The question is: how did it all work out? Is there anyone who will say that the world is better off than before the war -- that there is more economic security, more freedom, more hope for the future? One half of Europe is being integrated into the Russian economy, a major determinant of which is present and planned war production. The other half of Europe is under the thumb of the United States. Still weak after their revival by Marshall Plan funds, the countries of western Europe are forced to struggle for an export market almost completely dominated by the superior technology of the United States. What unity there is in Western Europe is provided by the Atlantic Pact, an arrangement by which the United States quite cold-bloodedly plans to use European manpower and materiel in the initial operations against Russia. Already talk is current of rearming Germany. History is belatedly realizing Hitler's program! And within the United States--the only real victor in the war--unemployment is already a cause for worry, civil liberties are slowly but surely being nibbled away, and the military continues to strengthen its hold upon the government. Everywhere an all-pervading anxiety. Everywhere slight hope that another war can be ultimately avoided. The price of all this? It cost 30,000,000 lives alone. Does anyone want to say it was worthwhile?

What is happening to us?

We are the spectator-participants of the end of an epoch. It is an epoch which began in the sixteenth century in small Italian seaport towns and soon swept the whole western world along with it. This early capitalism developed classically in England. From her we got the steam engine and the Protestant ethic, cheap textiles and political economy, the differential calculus and the industrial proletariat, the bourgeois novel and colonial policy. For nearly 200 years England dominated the world market. In the nineteenth century her place was contested by a dynamic Germany. Later, the influence of the United States began to be felt. Germany's influence was liquidated in two world wars. England, however, was weakened in the process. The United States, with its superior industrial plant and its alienation from European destruction, emerged the strongest industrial power on the globe. All other large capitalist countries are cracking up under the technological superiority of the United States. The current global dollar crisis is one of the most visible evidences of it. England

is doomed to the same decline that beset Genoa, Florence, and Venice when the Mediterranean trade shifted to the Atlantic coast. She is rounding out an historical epoch. The United States alone remains erect confronting Russia, a country which is herself the malformed issue of a small and late capitalist development superimposed upon an overwhelmingly peasant economy.

Events all but articulate the platitude that the world is an economic unit, that national frontiers and competitive economies play nothing but a reactionary role in the modern world. Monetary tinkering such as took place at Bretton Woods, the tariff agreements reached in Geneva and Havana, or the activities of the United Nations--all were doomed to have only the most superficial effects. The disease is systemic. The times cry out for larger integrations. One such integration would be a Western Union comprised of the leading west European powers. With tariff barriers removed, non-duplicating production, a common currency, etc., a bloc of such countries could take the first step toward independence from the gravitational pull of the two big power masses.

If this is not achieved there can be only one result--World War III. Whoever survives will have to rule, in Europe and very possibly in the United States, over piles of radioactive rubble. If Russia comes out on top of the heap, society will be totalitarianized and the world's production funneled into the home country. If the United States wins, the rest of the world will find itself in colonial dependency of varying degrees of harshness. Occupation troops will have to be maintained everywhere in an attempt to restrain legitimate national aspirations. To sustain such an effort as will be required by World War III and to enforce the peace, authoritarian controls will have to be imposed upon the country, of which the Taft-Hartley Law is a mild foreshadowing. The world will truly have entered an era of capitalist barbarism.

Neither of the two powers can be supported in their war preparations. Neither is the road to life. Simply to understand, however, is not sufficient. Alfred North Whitehead in one of his lucid, and less perverse, epigrams once said, "Sensitiveness without impulse spells decadence...." An older generation has exhausted itself. Too much happened too quickly for it to be assimilated. It is primarily the youth who must stand up to "the gale of the times." Upon them lies the task of reasserting the same belief in the dignity and inexhaustible potentialities of the individual which animated western Europe at the beginning of modern times, a spirit which is daily being further and further crushed under the calculated totalitarianization of the times.

JAMES M. FENWICK

James M. Fenwick is a graduate student at the New School of Social Research.

* * *

PAISAN OR PROPAGANDA?

What are the movies when they are not (as they rarely are) truth or the truths of art? The only things left are propaganda and the half and quarter truths of journalism. But propaganda is a word about which much debate has been held when applied to art, especially to literature, for the twenties and thirties saw the rise of the social-realist novel, the class-conscious novel which declared itself as an apostle of truth. Assuredly, certain novels of Zola, Dickens, Frank Norris, and John Steinbeck have been vehicles of truth, however limited or superficial.

Usually, then, propaganda is assumed to mean politico-economic propaganda. But the fluid, ever agitated realm of politics tends to exhibit a short-term reality, the American time-norm of which is four years. The New Deal government under Roosevelt influenced Hollywood movies, not only by certain documentaries and automatically through newsreel publicity, but also by means of so-called fictional scripts -- for example, Mr. Smith Goes to Washington, Mr. Deeds Goes to Town, and however belatedly, The Grapes of Wrath. These movies showed the operation of, and implicitly sued for, liberal ideas in economic government and a good-fellow policy toward labor unions and what Lincoln optimistically called "the people."

Now we may notice, in regard to these three movies, that while they were propaganda for Roosevelt's twelve-year policy, they had an ambivalent relationship to a more radical conception of politics: Mr. Smith, Mr. Deeds, Tommy Joad, and also John Doe were movie heroes designed to sop up as much as possible of the quasi-liberal sentiments of the Average Guy and make him feel he was fighting the good fight; if one takes a more revolutionary view of political and economic reform than the late Mr. Roosevelt's adherents, these movies provided only an abortive propaganda for the political and economic interest of the "average guy" whose backbone is the working-class. We may be sure of this much; all propagandistic aspects of American movies are cultivated under a status quo, inflected either liberally or conservatively according to the political party in national office, but obeying the status quo nevertheless.

Now one theory of art is that its truth is eternal, that however much it may seem to reflect the surface of social reality, its interest is in a permanent ethics, a permanent norm of human nature. Obviously, without deciding this question of theoretical truth, the fact is that so-called propaganda art shifts emphasis from the presumed "eternal aspects" of human society to those aspects manifestly of the moment, to those issues which have to be decided in terms of daily bread as though you were to read "daily bread" as "daily fate." If a moral problem is to be decided immediately, all the relevant facts should be marshalled and studied. Officially sponsored propaganda, and we get no other in the movies unless by hook or crook, is propaganda not from beneath, where the people really are, but from above, where the government administrators are; it is up there that the relevant facts are studied. The New Deal government asserted again and again in tacitly propagandistic movies that one's daily bread was being administered as well as possible by the arbiters of one's fate. And certainly there was a modicum of truth in this because the New Deal did make the bad better, instituted reform; not that, as a democratic type of government, it could reasonably have done otherwise -- but it did

what it did, as art does what it does.

What does art do, primarily, non-propagandistically? It tells the truth as seen by the author regardless of the moral judgment to be made of it by the reader, either from a narrowly individual or a widely social point of view. But the world is made up of a number of things, and among the masses of society with its variegated groups and interactive strata, a great many extraordinary elements have turned up; these elements in their native outlandish aspect are known as the inspirations and profound divinations of artists of all kinds; often, as with abstract painting, they have seemed to have little to do with social interests, even little reference to human values; so their truth, however deep and permanent, seems somewhat limited in scope. At the same time, the recent traditions of romantic painting and all kinds of modern poetry carry highly individualized and emotive values, have made grave moral criticisms of society without showing a propagandistic purpose, and have asserted defiant attitudes of exemption that are loosely and incorrectly classed as art for art's sake.

I don't want to try to decide any of the issues involved in these descriptions of modern art. I merely want to point out that when the movies are not politico-economic propaganda, they are at least entertainment or pseudo-art; perhaps some of the comedies approach being a kind of art; the dramas nearly always fizzle. This failure to speak a significant kind of degree of truth is generally held to be the result of lack of seriousness, and certainly this is actually the case. The film business is far too complexly commercialized for much art to seep through it.

But take filmdom's kid sisters, uncouth radio and video, they might be thought neither truth nor propaganda in the least, but sheerly entertainment . . . whenever they are not, that is, the moral instruction rashly termed "popular education." But look more carefully. Does the term "soap opera" exist for nothing? The sob-dramas of radio are propaganda for soap, or whatever other commodity is advertised. Mr. Anthony's clinic, unless I am much mistaken, used to be sponsored by a laxative company. Here certain "facts of life," certain real human data, were being exploited for propaganda reasons. The inference was beautifully simple and ingeniously flexible: the conscious identification of the radio audience with the victims of circumstance who told their trouble in public meant that their troubles (which Mr. Anthony summarily settled) were eliminated as easily as though they were spiritual constipation, and if on the other hand, the listener congratulated himself that he had avoided such moral ailments as he heard about on this program, then he could think of his afflictions as physical only, and if constipated, he need not fear so long as Ex-Lax or something was to be bought at the corner.

How can we be sure that modern soap-operas with their chains of tears don't serve the same function as did the tragedies of Aeschylus and Sophocles for the people of Athens? Soap operas may well be spiritual purges; when they come flanked by Wheaties and Rinso, Pepsi-Cola and Campbell's Soups, the effect is to reinforce popular belief in the daily fate of daily bread; in all those means, namely, necessary to keep the wolf from the door and as far away as possible.

Movie entertainment is propaganda of a similar if more elevated and authentic order of art. After all, the greatest function of propaganda is

to keep up the faith in the material world, the world of immediate comfort and the buying power of the weekly pay-dirt. Abolish this faith and the economic world would crumble before WCBS could sign off for the night or the word Fine would come around to tell you that a showing of Paisan was over. If a movie with Danny Kaye in it keeps you doubled up in your seat for half the length of the film, is it not propaganda for the laughter that gets rid of all worries like Dale Carnegie's 21 magic words? And if Ingrid Bergman is on the screen in Joan of Arc almost from start to finish of the film isn't that propaganda for what will power and hard work will do for a big girl with a plain face? Make no mistake. It is.

Because, in brief, this is a time of propaganda as well as of assassins. That is what Paisan tells us, the truth that Paisan tell us: this is a time, a carnival time, of propaganda and death; propaganda for death as well as for other things. No, Paisan is not orthodox Hollywood pseudo-art, even of the more nobly realistic kind, such as Gentlemen's Agreement pretended to be.

It is interesting to note, by the way, that when the producer of Gentlemen's Agreement risked half his fortune in order to treble it, his "realism" was nothing more than a specific form of propaganda -- this movie by mirroring the universally recognized fact of anti-semitism was putting Hollywood solidly behind liberalism and one of the four freedoms, something which hadn't been done previously (Crossfire, which came on the heels of Gentlemen's Agreement, was far too ambiguous to compete with it). How strange it is to consider that merely by registering an omnipresent truth (anti-semitism) Hollywood made a supremely propagandistic gesture. And how was this made possible? Simply by the basic propagandistic, or we might say favoritistic structure of movie art. Jews as despised objects hadn't been admitted to the world of film art save in the most oblique ways; for all propaganda purposes, Hollywood's favorite children were all Gentiles. As many successful Jews as exist in all spheres of Hollywood commerce, both overt and covert as Jews, public prejudice against them was not assumed to exist. Thus, mere statistical truth took on the mask of propaganda in Gentlemen's Agreement. The bare implication that a Jew is also a human being, with equal rights under the American Constitution, became a propaganda fact in this movie, and it is a significant point (I don't know if it has been made previously) that one of the most forceful and at the same time dubious aspect of the movie was the motivation of the anti-semitic crusade: it was tied up with an exploit by a popular picture magazine; indeed, it was the exploit of that magazine, and no matter how idealistic the publisher, the primary impulse was commercial: what has been known since Hearst went into business as "muck-raking."

However, I won't go into the structure of this propaganda picture because the film I want to talk about is Paisan. A very revealing fact about Paisan -- which, as I say, is not orthodox pseudo-art, is that it makes a big hero of a Negro G.I. in one of its episodes and rank-and-file but true-blue heroes of Protestant and Jewish chaplains. Most of you have probably seen this film. It was praised by the press as a realistic triumph. Certainly the photography is fuzzy enough to have news-reel realism. But what surprised me even more than I expected to be surprised was the manner in which those underdogs, the Jew and the Negro, were given roles glorifying the most orthodox Hollywood art; not foreign film art, mind you, but Hollywood art.

This film is 'straight international propaganda. If taken seriously as token of the spirit of Italian film producers, it would indicate, and does in itself mean, that Italian filmdom is prepared to carry on American popular propaganda through a liberal-minded "naturalistic" means. This means may not be so much optional as convenient; the bombed-out homes and the natural, authentic backgrounds, such as the Coliseum, the Uffizi Gallery and many Florentine streets, make real but exotic stuff for American customers and cut down the expense of studio sets and lighting. Moreover, that this film was partly American-inspired is proven by the fact that as much English is spoken in it as Italian.

In the film's favor, I grant this much: technically well-turned plots and a refreshing realism among the actors. Rossellini, the director, is patently a man of talent. But talent is amazingly cheap in the world today; it spreads like a rash. The important thing is that talent is overwhelmingly abused and carried amiss. Paisan is a strong example. However ingeniously the six sequences are gauged to depict novel episodes that were plausible under the conditions in Italy during the American military advance, the fact remains that the human art conceived is third-rate and worse if judged by enlightened standards.

Take the sheer structure of these episodes, and every one is a stark stereotype borrowed from the moral-costume department of Hollywood and given a mardi-gras make-up circa the American conquest of Italy. The mardi-gras make-up, however ragged, is as novel and exciting as the latest news-reel or news-story from Europe. It assumes certain crude realities that Hollywood would disguise more literally, that is, in terms of luxury treatment and a cowardly bad faith toward the statistical facts; for instance, Paisan assumes that a once-nice Italian girl may yield to prostituting herself to American soldiers if she is hungry and lazy enough. No American movie would put such a story in the center of its stage; Paisan does so, but the G.I. who comes back to find his Italian dream-girl has yielded to the temptation of necessity and "done it for money," brutally turns his back on her with all the puritanic chivalry that any American hero could hope to convey. The American myth of decent manhood has been given a twin boost because the first episode has shown G.I.'s who wouldn't rape a defenseless Italian girl and German soldiers who would. The fact that the G.I. in the first episode talks the way a G.I. would in a William Saroyan play doesn't distract from his propaganda value. What could be a better advertisement for the Marshall Plan in Italy and better reassurance of American respectability in the United States than this chaste treatment of the G.I.'s abroad?

And what is the full length, in the round portrait of the American soldier derivable from this movie? Including three common soldiers, an M.P., and three chaplains, he is a pious, automatically liberal, humanly vulnerable, chummy, and narrowly romantic soul without the faintest visible degree of irony or ethical personalism; his reflexes are strictly normal in the clinical sense. The Catholic chaplain (who takes the lead with his cronies) handles the alarm occasioned by the presence of his brother Jew and brother Protestant under the roof of a Franciscan monastery with an eclat that would almost do credit to G. Aubrey Smith though without the impish irony that Charles Laughton would have brought to the part. Unprofessional acting-and-looking actors were ideal here simply because the accent was on the experience not on the individuals involved.

Thus the "human actors" within this veritable "theatre of war" behave as such participants are supposed to behave according to military rules and strict humane conventions; the only one shown out of military line is the Negro G.I., and after his reeling drunk (during which a street boy steals his shoes) he returns on the scene as a very efficient-looking and alert M.P.

Every change on the emotional cash register is rung while exposing the orthodox results flowing from the experience of war: the beastly-cruel, mechanical enemy, the heart-bleed for child war-orphans who turn to petty crime, the almost equal heart-bleed for the decent girl tempted out of her decency, the all-men-are-brothers-within-shooting-distance-of-the-enemy motive for religious toleration, the "natural" chivalry of American manhood, the love of home and sweetheart carried even to the foot of the enemy's guns. In comparison with this quiet rah-rah for the exemplary conduct of human nature under the trial of warfare, many a native movie of ours was a paragon of psychological realism and moral seriousness.

Now why have a number of movie-goers (I would know they existed even if I were blind-folded) been deceived so utterly by the material and the presentation of Paisan? Only, apparently, because of the newsreel envelope in which all this balderdash is conveyed; only because of technical realism that is as much made-to-order as Charles Boyer's toupee. If there were a God, the first spiritual sin he would punish today would be belief in the form of truth rather than its substance; today, the form of truth is worshipped not as Science or even as Religion but as Journalism.

It is easy, not hard, to get fuzzy visual edges and a realistic effect by casual lighting; it is easy, not hard, to get further realistic effects by unprofessional faces, unprofessional acting manners and unprofessional voices. And all this ease never penetrates in Paisan a quasi-journalistic surface. Granted, as I said, clever plots and good continuity; the Po Marsh episode is very good film narrative. Also, the purely visual aspect of the streetboy's physical bullying of the drunken Negro soldier, when he virtually shanghai's him amid the wreckage of Rome, has an excellent cinematic quality and a charm of its own that the rest of the film utterly lacks. But even here one has to note the purely sentimental, conventional climax of this episode and a bad detail such as the mechanical psychology of the Negro's drunken raving, which sounds like second-rate Clifford Odets.

So: Paisan is international good-will propaganda in the shape of post-war propaganda for American supremacy in the popular or "people's-front" emotions, and as for being "proletarian" (in case someone should press forward that consideration) it is no more so than the shabby-bourgeois inevitably must be. By stating this view, I am not being in the least contemptuous of any of the human truths which Paisan may incidentally reveal. I haven't the least doubt that common soldier and commander, prince and paisan, is capable of courage and loyalty to his own in the stress of war. But art is not limited to showing that man can still be brave, be human; if it is so limited, then it is practically dead on its feet. To be important, authentic, art must show a kind of struggle which is entirely omitted from Paisan: an internal moral struggle, a testing of values in practical crises both prolonged and sudden, simple and complex, and the triumphant value is finally to be judged by the calibre and the

beliefs of the man who opposes it in himself or in others. Even from the statistical viewpoint, Paisan is a most limited form of the truth, so it cannot even pretend to be an epic of naturalism.

Yes, human sacrifice is a great thing, but it is also a profoundly and mysteriously complicated thing; an "animal," so to speak, very very hard for the camera to find in its natural habitat. To assume, as Paisan implicitly does, that human sacrifice is eloquently enough portrayed by the simple, routine acts of loyalty required and fulfilled by soldiers and citizens in time of war is to slander the truths of man's great spiritual history and to slander thereby the truths recorded by art. Of course, if Paisan does not even pretend to be art, then it is merely a glorified newsreel, but if we are to take it as that, then we have every right to cry: "Fake!" For obviously it is not only fabricated in an obviously fictitious mould but deals as much with spiritual values as it does with empirical facts.

PARKER TYLER

Parker Tyler is the author of Hollywood Hallucination, Magic and Myth of the Movie, Chaplin - Last of the Clowns, and a book of poetry, Yesterday's Children.

B O O K S F O R Y O U R L I B R A R Y

Labor:

HOWE and WIDICK - The UAW and Walter Reuther 3.00
 POWDERLY - The Path I Trod. Autobiography. (Reg. Price 4.50).. 3.00
 BIMBA - History of American Working Class (1937). (Out of Print. Reg. Price 3.50) 1.75

Politics:

LYONS - The Red Decade. The Stalinist Penetration of America.. 2.00
 YPSILON - Pattern of World Revolution. (Reg. Price 4.50) 2.00
 TROTSKY - History of Russian Revolution. Three Vols. in One...15.00

Chess:

Capablanca's 100 Best Games of Chess. (Reg Price 4.00).....1.00

A l l I n N e w C o n d i t i o n

Send For Booklists on: Labor and Economics, Social Science, Chess

UNIVERSITY PLACE BOOKSHOP

69 UNIVERSITY PLACE
 New York 3, N. Y. ALgonquin 4-5998

AMERICA'S GROWING MILITARIZATION

While Americans are generally aware that their government is engaged in a great program of armament and is carrying out a policy of "containment," relatively few of them have comprehended the whole meaning and impact on their individual and social lives that this program is having and will have in the future. Scattered newspaper reports of this or that expenditure, of new rocket research, of mobilization plans do not blend together into a whole so that people can understand the full significance of living in a society wherein every major government decision is measured ultimately by the criterion of "military necessity."

In a remarkable report issued in the spring of this year, the National Council against Conscription presented documented evidence of growing militarization in the U. S. This report, in an opening phrase, said: "Never before in American history has the military establishment had so much money to spend, so many officers or ex-officers in important civilian government posts, so much influence in the formulation of foreign policy, or such an ambitious publicity department as it does today. Never before have we seen such careful plans being prepared for control of labor and industry, nor such widespread influence exercised in the field of public and higher education as is true now."

American students concerned about the continuing crisis of the Cold War, and who want to work to prevent a third world war should acquaint themselves with this pamphlet of the NCAC. Here the isolated facts of militarization are drawn together until a clear pattern emerges; the subtle interrelationships and coordination of all of the programs growing out of military policy are exposed for all to see. The documentation abounds and sources are provided abundantly in the footnotes.

The most recent development in American military plans which has been made public is, of course, the Military Aid Plan which calls for providing armaments and other military supplies to Western Europe while continuing to supply Greece and Turkey with such aid. The step-by-step pattern of American policy, or the "package-by-package" pattern, has become clear during the past three years with the Military Aid Plan the most recent "package." Thus we have had something like the following sequences: The Truman Doctrine accepted in Greece and Turkey (and providing the "containment" idea), the National Security Act of 1947 which set up the National Security Council to integrate military policy with foreign policy. The Selective Service Act of 1948, the North Atlantic Defense Pact, and now the Military Aid Program.

Interspersed with these larger packages were many small ones. The general public is largely unaware of the small packages which have only to be "sold" to special groups. Included among these some of the most important have been:

1. Military training in the schools and colleges; here we have ROTC, NROTC and Air ROTC.

2. Research and other educational projects supported by military funds and therefore controlled by military policy. For example, the Of-

Office of Naval Research spent approximately \$20,000,000 on about 500 projects at colleges and universities during the year 1948-49.

3. In June, 1948, Congress approved the enlistment of women in the Regular Army, thus extending to a permanent peacetime basis what was begun as an emergency wartime measure.

4. The development of a corps of publicity and propaganda experts with full access to the mass media. For instance, Variety magazine pointed out in 1948 that the military was "radio's No. 1 music sponsor." At that time the military had five major network programs, along with two National Guard shows, all for the purpose of recruiting.

5. The Army has developed across the country in various communities what it calls Army Advisory Committees made up of distinguished civilians. These committees have been used as "fronts" advocating certain military policies, as for instance UMT.

6. The Army, Navy, and Air Force have each developed their "Day" which allows them to gain public attention under the heading of patriotism. The Navy more zealous than the others, has a whole week set aside for propagandizing the public.

7. Plans for Labor and Industry have been outlined, or are in process. The Army Industrial Mobilization plans are reported to provide a compulsory job for everyone after a classification test determines each one's abilities. The Army's Affiliation Program would put the organized reserve into active drilling units among factory employees throughout the country. "Each unit will have a commanding officer, a colonel, major, or captain, depending on its size. The War Department says he shall be a regular reserve officer and believes it can find at least one such man in each business...."* Thus this program would have the employer-employees relationship jelled. The employers would act as officers and the employees as subordinates. Another development is the participation of industrialists in the Industrial College of the Armed Forces.

8. In the area of Civilian Defense, the now infamous "Hopley Report" was drawn up by army officers and civilian consultants at the order of former Secretary of Defense Forrestal. This report was so blatantly authoritarian, providing even for the setting up of concentration camps and immunizing the deputized wardens from any responsibility for their acts, that it was quietly dropped and no new proposals have been forthcoming. We can depend on it though that such plans are somewhere in the making.

9. CIA -- Central Intelligence Agency which was brought into being by Act of Congress without the Congress knowing what the bill provided since it was considered too secret for them to know. It provides both for national and international espionage. Many Americans are unaware of its existence.

* New Evidence of the Militarization of America, p. 48.

Nothing has been said so far about atomic bomb production and further research in the field of atomic weapons of mass destruction. Readers are referred to a reprint of articles from the Christian Century by Cuthbert Daniel and Arthur M. Squires.** These two ex-atomic scientists have made a proposal for unilateral atomic disarmament which they support with intelligent and informed discussion of the technical as well as military aspects of the problem. One of their chief points with regard to present atomic research and production is that, despite Lillienthal's reports which play up the "peacetime benefits" of atomic energy, 90% of the work under Lillienthal's direction is solely military. They contend that Lillienthal is wrong when he says "The peacetime and military aspects of the development of atomic energy are, as a matter of physical fact, not possible of effective separation." On the contrary, Squires and Daniel hold that "only the power aspects of atomic energy are impossible to separate from the military...a single laboratory pile can produce enormous quantities of the radio-isotopes which are used by research workers in physics, chemistry, biology, medicine, agriculture, and industry...Laboratory piles...depend in no way upon the existence of the large-scale atomic production plants at Oak Ridge and Hanford."

The "security" problems which grow out of present atomic research and production are, of course, prime factors in the program of hysteria and fear which has led to loyalty tests and spy investigations of many varieties. These are the fruits of militarization, "top secrets," and reliance on counter-espionage and "controls." Scientists throughout the country are increasingly aware of and disturbed by this trend. The Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, June-July, 1949, contains a series of articles under the heading "Scientific Truth and Freedom in Our Time." The discussion centers around the controversy over the admission of Communists or suspected Communists to nonsecret research fellowships of the Atomic Energy Commission. Eugene Rabinowitch, the editor, calls this "the first invasion of the scientific and educational life of America, outside the circumscribed field of secret research, by government-imposed political discrimination....We might easily be led to a situation in which most, if not all, students entering advanced training in the fields of physics, chemistry or biology will have to be investigated and cleared by the FBI, to weed out 'poor security risks.'"

Later in the same editorial he says "We live in a period in which a series of world-wide wars, the progress of military technology, and the emergence of a variety of totalitarian political systems, partly forces and partly induces even those nations which have created and long maintained the standards of freedom and equality, to accept discriminatory police-state procedures....If the arms race is to continue, many more such concessions will have to be countenanced in the years to come."

The final effects and results of an ever-increasing policy of armaments and military direction and controls is, of course, an acquiescing to the idea that if there is to be any peace it will come through superior armed strength to the point of saturation armament. But further, one is driven finally to the conclusion that war is inevitable anyway. And a

** Road to Atomic Peace (reprinted from Christian Century).

step beyond this is the idea that if war is inevitable, then the time to strike is before Russia reaches the stage of saturation armament too. (Saturation armament being that point when the possession of rocket-atomic-biological weapons has produced a condition in which the defenses of a nation can be "saturated," that is, enough atom bombs and enough instruments to deliver them -- whether B-36 or super-sonic rocket -- so that even if the opponent knocks out 90% of the attacking force -- this has never been done -- 10% will get through. With the "improved" atomic bombs and dusts, only one bomb has to get through to destroy a city.)

The dilemma of a country and a world which are succumbing to the crude logic of militarism and "inevitable" war in this era of total and atomic war is that all of the controls and totalitarian practices implicit in such a course are inevitable unless the course is changed. The examination and criticism of American militarism and war preparation in this paper in no way condones the militarism and war preparation or authoritarian practices of the Soviet regime and its satellites. The same kind of analysis can be fitted to their practices. The problem for those who would prevent war and who seek to build a free and economically sound society is to find the way out of this program of catastrophe.

Those who still accept war, however reluctantly, are caught in the trap of the logic of modern total war and total preparation. If you accept war, then you are forced to accept and go along with the control by national governments of the total population and of the resources of the nation. A vigorous student anti-war movement has the job and the responsibility of meeting this dilemma head-on. If it would oppose war, it must then present alternative programs and policies which will make a break with the war system and which will meet the real needs of men and women everywhere in the world. It will have to show how human freedoms can be maintained and extended while fundamental human needs are being cared for. This is a job for young people who have a deep sense of responsibility for their own actions and their results, and who see the necessity of making choices as to action and methods of action which will implement their policies.

ROY C. KEPLER

Roy C. Kepler is the National Secretary of the War Resisters League.

<u>Killed in World Wars I and II (soldiers and civilians)</u>	
Killed and died in World War I	8,538,000
Killed and died of U. S. Army and Navy in World War II ...	326,000
Killed of other nations in World War II	44,172,000
	to 47,172,000

	53,036,000
taken from the <u>World Almanac</u> , 1949	to 56,036,000

THE DYNAMICS OF THE NEW ANTI-SEMITISM IN RUSSIA

The fixed idea that the USSR, regardless of its other defects, is still a land of essential racial and national equality is so deeply imbedded in the consciousness of even the most convinced anti-Stalinist liberal and radical that he tends to approach any disclosure of anti-semitism in Russia with a good deal of skepticism and disbelief. It is for this reason that the press exposes, in the Spring of 1949, of the widespread Russian purge of "homeless cosmopolitans" with its distinct anti-semitic overtones and the revelations of the ruthless, thoroughgoing campaign to suppress all remaining Jewish organizations and all forms of Jewish culture in Russia - did not evoke spontaneous waves of indignation and protest. There was a noticeable tendency to shrug these reports off as "atrocious propaganda" of the "cold war" or to see in the new anti-Jewish practices nothing but the revival of traditional CP anti-Zionism and excesses of a forced assimilationist policy.

A careful observer would, however, have noted that pro-Stalinist apologetics - an outstanding example was Tom O'Connor's series in the New York Compass - could not and did not refute the specific facts cited in the well-documented press exposes. There was no denial that the Yiddish press (Einikeit, Der Shtern (Kiev)) of Russia had been virtually liquidated or that the Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee (only Jewish organization in Russia) was arbitrarily dissolved, its leaders and many outstanding Yiddish writers arrested, or that approximately three-fourths of the purged "homeless cosmopolitans" were Jewish intellectuals. The pro-Stalinist defense merely claimed that the press expose was a Wall Street plot to discredit the Soviet Union and used the blackmail approach by threatening American Jewry (Tom O'Connor, New York Compass) that exposure of Russian anti-semitism would aggravate anti-semitism in this country. According to O'Connor, news of Russian anti-semitism enables native American anti-semites to point out in glee that "Even the Russians tried and could not get along with these people."

Also characteristic was the public reply in the form of an article by M. Buchenwald in the Morning Freiheit, June 2, 1949, to the Yiddish writers in the United States who inquired about the fate of the five top Yiddish writers in the Soviet Union reported to have been arrested and deported to Siberia. "These writers have aligned themselves with the Wall Street magnates of the American Jewish Committee and the Forward band, and they have no right to ask us for an answer in connection with the reported events in the USSR.... True friends of the USSR will not ask us for an accounting nor will they ask us to deny these anti-Soviet fabrications..."

The U. S. Stalinist press could not and did not deny the fact that adjectives like "rootless," "homeless," "alien," "passportless wanderers," "traders," were invoked by the Russian press to characterize "cosmopolitans" with Jewish sounding names. Entirely ignored, however, was the fact that these were traditional stereotypes employed in Central and East European anti-semitic propaganda.

In a societal framework in which these slanderous characterizations have been used to stir up hate against Jews, for official agencies to stress the Jewish origin of the "cosmopolites" denounced in these stereo-

types, is tantamount to active dissemination of ill-will against the Jews.

Some attempt was made to deny the anti-semitic intent in this procedure by citing a recent instance where Jewish and non-Jewish family names had been added to pseudonyms in official press announcements of Stalin prize award winners. In the past the act of citing both pseudonyms and real names was customary only for official decrees - when recipients of promotions or rewards had to be identified by their family names. However, in literary and political polemics, the original Jewish names had never been added to the pseudonyms. This new departure from a traditional custom must therefore be presumed to have a special purpose.

That the identification of the pilloried "alien cosmopolitans" as Jews involves more than a desire to correctly identify the individuals concerned can be seen from the one instance in which the Soviet press gratuitously added a Jewish "real name" to the name of a denounced American writer. P. Kromov, attacking several Jewish "cosmopolitans" in economics in the journal Bolshevik emphasized that their views were suspiciously similar to those contained in the book The Spirit of Soviet Economics by Dr. J. F. Normano, a Russian-born refugee in the U.S. He carefully added the name "Levin" in parenthesis after Normano. Dr. Normano had in 1933 been accused by the Nazis of being a fugitive German-Jewish banker, Izaak Lovin. Normano denied that he was Izaak Levin. After an investigation by the American authorities, the extradition requests by the Nazis were denied. Yet, the Russian press takes up the Nazi accusation and in 1949 still refers to him as Normano (Levin). Why?

Further evidence that the Russian government views the Jews as at least a potentially "unpatriotic" element is furnished by the recent security-motivated, forced mass population transfers of Jews from the Western frontier areas of Russia. C. S. Sulzberger, in the New York Times, September 11, 1949, reports that "reliable information has been received that a mass deportation of Jews from the Ukraine and Byelo-Russia on the Soviet Union western border is under way. Before the present wave of forced transfers it is believed about 20,000 Jews have been shifted by command to the Far East. How many more are being sent to Asia cannot yet be estimated."

The Yiddish press in New York has carried many similar reports of very extensive deportations. As early as July 6, 1949, the Jewish Morning Journal carried a report by L. Aryeh: "New reports that will cast terror into the hearts of all Jews all over the world have reached Paris through the same channels as the information concerning the arrest of the Jewish writers in Moscow. Then, too, people waited for denials...but they never came. Now the new information reports barbaric actions in the sequences of a policy of neutralizing the Jewish population of Soviet Russia. According to these reports, two Soviet republics, Ukraine and White Russia, are being cleared of Jews." The reports arrived by way of Poland "which to some extent acts as a bridge between Russia and the world."

It is true that this forced deportation involves other small, "non-socialist," non-Slavic peoples of the USSR. This does not detract from the fact which the mass deportation of Soviet Jews from border areas establishes, namely, that the rulers of Russia now view the Jews, en masse, as poor security risks in case of a war with the West. A government which

so distrusts a minority people that it deports them far away from potential contact with the enemy can hardly be expected to entrust high posts in the army and diplomatic service to the very same people. It must be remembered that these reports of evacuation of Jews from their traditional centers in the Ukraine and Bukovina follow recurrent and persistent diplomatic and press reports that Jews are silently but effectively barred from entrance into various fields of employment.

Igor Gouzenko, a former clerk in the Russian Embassy in Canada, informs us in his book, The Iron Curtain, that "in 1939 we were privately and individually 'warned' at the Architectural Institute (in Moscow) that Jews in general were 'in disfavor.' We were told of a 'confidential' decree of the Central Committee of the All Union Communist Party which had been passed at that time. The decree was sent to all directors of educational institutions and schools throughout the Soviet Union. It established a secret quota of admission for Jews with a view toward curtailing their attendance at Soviet educational institutes."

The same Russian author refers to another secret anti-Jewish directive: "In the summer of 1945 Aleksashkin, Chief of the secret division (Soviet Intelligence Headquarters), arrived at Ottawa and told us that the Central Committee of the Communist Party sent confidential instructions to directors of all plants and factories to remove Jews from responsible positions and under any pretext whatever, to place them in less important work."

The evidence seems to point to it (here we have cited only a fraction of the evidence) and yet the idea that the government of the USSR has adopted and is carrying through a systematic anti-Jewish policy is hard to accept. This is true even for those who have little or no illusions about the brutal and suffocating nature of the prison-house equality that prevails in Russia. The decisive consideration seems to be: "What has the Stalin regime to gain from pursuing an anti-Jewish policy? What advantages accrue to it? Why should the Kremlin be willing to chance the incalculable loss of prestige and influence that the end of the legend of Soviet racial and national equality would bring in its wake?"

These are serious questions that must be tackled and to which answers must be sought. An attempt will be made in this brief article to advance tentative answers. In the nature of the situation they can serve only as initial hypotheses. Whether or not the present attempt to explain and interpret the why of the new anti-semitism in Russia is successful and convincing, the stubborn reality of anti-Jewish policy and practice in the USSR cannot be brushed aside or ignored by any honest friend of national and racial equality.

First of all, it is necessary to understand the nature of "grass-roots" anti-semitism in Stalinist Russia which is new in causation and unique to the social framework of bureaucratic collectivist society in Russia. Present day popular anti-semitism is, in the final analysis, a by-product of the intensified competition within a bureaucratic framework between more and less privileged strata of the society for power, prestige and better living conditions.

It is not simply a renewal of Czarist anti-semitism, from which it

differs in many respects. Under Czarism anti-semitism was principally a rural phenomenon limited to the Pale. Under Stalin it has become an urban phenomenon spread all over the USSR.

The shattering of the Ghetto and its economy under the impact of the October Revolution was followed by attempts at normalization and productivization of the socio-economic structure of Jewish life. While the "agrarianization" of Jews was a relative failure, at most involving only 200,000 Jews, the industrialization and proletarianization program was very successful. According to the census of 1939, over two-thirds of Soviet Jews lived on wages and salaries.

Unfortunately, the changed economic structure did not, under the circumstances of Soviet economic backwardness and scarcity, reduce intergroup competition. The near starvation standard of living of the masses produced a mad, bitter struggle for the better jobs, advancement and status. A tendency to shift from manual wage labor to non-manual salaried work became universal. Jews, who were of urban and middle class origin with a significant cultural baggage, held an initial advantage over most of their competitors who yesterday were illiterate peasants. As a consequence, the ranks of Jewish salary workers increased, with government employees as the largest category. Jews became concentrated to above average extent in highly conspicuous professional, managerial, academic and artistic posts - all very visible positions and high in social prestige value. This stimulated a tendency to identify the Jews as "profiteers of the revolution" and "special wards of the regime" and inevitably attracted to them the mass hostility felt against the government.

This, together with the new Jewish dispersal all over Russia, which brought them into contact and competition as an "alien" group with wider and wider sections of the Russian masses, made them especially vulnerable. On the one hand, the "outs," the masses, hating the regime, sought outlets for their hatred. On the other, sections of the "ins," competing groups in the bureaucracy, engaged in a rivalry with Jewish contenders for bureaucratic posts with a savagery and barbarism that only life in a totalitarian bureaucratic society can engender.

In this frame of reference it is not surprising to find that the regime did not hesitate to make concessions to anti-semitic trends or even to directly exploit the anti-semitic tendencies of the country. As far back as the latter half of 1920's, in the struggle against the Opposition tendencies in the Russian Communist Party, the bureaucracy led by Stalin did not hesitate to exploit popular anti-semitic moods by emphasizing in many instances the Jewish character of many oppositionist leaders. "Beat the Opposition" after a while took on the complexion of the old slogan, "Beat the Jews and save Russia."

The purges in 1936-1938 emphasized Jews as traitors to the country and at the same time did very little to reduce the identification between the regime and "Jewish Commissars" and "Jewish GPU men" as special wards of the regime.

As World War II approached, the Kremlin realized that it was no longer able, after a decade of totalitarian rule, to evoke social messianism or harness the class struggle drives of the masses, as stable props for

the war effort. As a consequence, Soviet nationalism and a "neo-jingoism" was the new force Stalinism used in fighting World War II. Hand in hand with this went a tolerance for popular prejudices in the areas of religion and anti-semitic prejudice.

The government did not hesitate to cater to anti-semitic moods and to sacrifice Jews whenever it felt that a "pro-Jewish" attitude would cause any embarrassment for the regime. "When in 1940 the Soviet government annexed the territories on the fringes of the Western border of the Soviet Union, from the Baltic to the Black Sea, which were infested with the anti-semitic views, its newly established authorities made it a special point to emphasize their neutrality on the Jewish question.... Many Polish and Lithuanian restrictions on the Jews were not revoked as were other laws." (A. Sternberg in a paper read to the British Section of the World Jewish Congress, February 1944.)

It was inevitable that these and other concessions to anti-semitic trends should have resulted in the infiltration of anti-Jewish moods into the ruling elite itself. Especially when we keep in mind that various strata and individuals of this ruling machine were regularly locked in a bitter struggle against Jewish rivals for power and influence, and that a socialist superego had long been overwhelmed by the barbaric impulses released in the bureaucratic jungle. Innumerable accounts of Jews who since the war have emigrated from Russia testify to this.

At the end of World War II the privations and dislocations, the shortages and scarcities all tended to increase the subterranean antagonisms between the privileged bureaucracy and the masses. For the isolated bureaucracy, which resorted more and more to a jingoistic ideology, it was a stroke of good fortune to be able to throw to the wolves a new scapegoat in the form of those "alien intruders" in the bureaucracy, the Jews.

In view of the new "grass roots" anti-semitism, these "Jewish Commissars" and "Jewish NKVD" men could be made to serve as objects of hostility and thus deflect the hate of the masses from the regime as a whole. Hence, in part, the current "homeless cosmopolitan" campaign against Jews who occupy conspicuous and highly valued prestige positions in the arts and academic professions.

The usefulness of this clever maneuver is that it gratifies at the same time the ambitions of aspiring strata of the ruling elite who could enthusiastically and with a great deal of spontaneous fervor spearhead the campaign.

This follows a well-developed pattern. Ever since the purges, the rise to dominating positions in the bureaucracy has often been attended by the exploitation of anti-semitic prejudice by position hungry, parvenu bureaucrats against the most vulnerable "ins," Jewish intellectuals and technicians.

But how does the mass deportation of Jews from border regions fit into this picture? The answer to this is to be found in the traditional treatment by the bureaucracy of all political, social or ethnic groups it mistreats. It reasons in a paranoid fashion that these groups, which it has trod upon and mistreated, burn with a desire for revenge and wait im-

patiently for an opportunity to betray it to the enemy. Hence its characteristic reaction - imprisonment and exile of these potential traitors.

This "revived bureaucratic anti-semitism" gains, I believe, its real motive power from the post-war development of super-chauvinism and xenophobia as the dominant ideology in Russia. This inculcation of super-chauvinism is in preparation for World War III. The struggle against the West will not be and, in Russia, cannot be marshalled under the banner of social revolution. The masses have little illusions on this score. Hence the effort to repeat the technique employed during World War II but this time on a vaster and unprecedented scale.

A Key feature and basic need of totalitarian propoganda is to find internal symbols and representatives of whatever enemy the masses are being aroused against. As long as Stalinism could evoke social and class forces during the '20's and early '30's, the internal enemies were vestigial representatives or those who could serve as symbols of the overthrown capitalist and feudal classes. The new nationalist course requires new internal symbols of the foreign, Western enemy, who can be pilloried and against whom the hatred of the masses can be directed. As symbols of the West, no people in the Soviet Union is as eminently fitted as the Jewish people, the bulk of whom live in the West; in the U.S. and other countries within the Anglo-American orbit. Hence, the frequency of the plausible charge in the continuing campaign against cosmopolitanism in Russia that Jews have too many ties with and too much sympathy for the Western world and are lacking in Russian patriotism.

A typical criticism is the remark made by the general secretary of the Byelo-Russian CP on February 17, 1949. "Only one theater in the Byelo-Russian Republics - a Jewish one - puts on unpatriotic plays in which life in America is praised." Hence also the central charge against the Jewish cosmopolitans that they "are devoid of the natural feeling of Soviet national pride" and their cosmopolitanism "is advantageous now to world reactions, to the instigators of a new war." (Simonov, Pravda, February 27, 1949)

The tragedy of the situation is heightened by the fact that the Stalinist regime apparently believes that it can carry out this program without openly admitting anti-semitism. It appears confident (and not without good reason) that it can hold on to its Jewish and other oppressed minority supporters outside of Russia just as it was able to hold the allegiance of German Stalinist cadres despite an internal anti-German policy against the Volga Germans whose republic was arbitrarily dissolved and who were shipped to Asia like cattle.

Stalinism is unique in that it can pursue a policy which is in direct contradiction to its avowed aims. Parading under the banner of democracy it can attract large numbers of socialists and use them as unwitting defenders of reaction. Similarly, it is conceivable that Russia can continue to mouth democratic slogans while pursuing an anti-semitic campaign within her own state and retain her Jewish followers. It is our responsibility to understand and expose this pattern.

E. FIELD

THE GUN AND THE ROSE

In much of the world's literature the seeds of human feeling, of sensibility, have been found to grow near a battlefield. The capacity for sensation and rational emotion, discerning judgment, responsiveness to pathos, or to value seem to be found in proximity to violence often enough to make an ideal situation for the writer. The gun beside the rose...they seem to symbolize what is aesthetic and what is brutal, particularly in our own epoch, and one adds ironic shock to the other. Nevertheless, they occur together in life as they do in art, just as do the clouds which never seem so serene as the moment before an artillery barrage rips the sky apart.

It is something peculiar to our times that in spite of the application of scientific method with increased energy to certain phases of life, the world remains a disorderly and brutal mess, in which it is hard to find people who possess a sure scale of values. The poet and the novelist, therefore, keep their sensibility focused on the demands created by fundamental situations; those which involve sex, love, danger, and death; situations in which man's instincts are primary, especially in periods when social conventions or intellectual affectation gloss over or falsify the instinctual drive.

All wars in our time have provided the focal point for fiction. The Naked and the Dead, among the most recent novels has several ancestors which might be called war novels for the sake of discussion although not all of them were intended as novels primarily devoted to a discussion of the war itself.

After the first World War, a series of novels appeared, one of which managed better than others to discover an element of human integrity amid the chaos of war. This novel was A Farewell to Arms from which the following passage is quoted. This incident occurs on the Italian front while the army is awaiting an Austrian barrage. Lieutenant Henry is the narrator.

"I...sat down in the dugout with the four drivers.... They were all mechanics and hated the war... We sat on the ground with our backs against the wall and smoked. Outside it was nearly dark. The earth of the dugout was warm and dry and I let my shoulders back against the wall, sitting on the small of my back, and relaxed.

* *

"Were you there, Tenente, when they wouldn't attack and they shot every tenth man?"

"No."

"It is true. They lined them up afterward and took every tenth man."

* *

"If everybody would not attack the war would be over," Manera said.

* *

"You should not let us talk this way, Tenente, Ev viva l'esercito," Passini said sarcastically.

"I know how you talk," I said, "But as long as you drive the cars and behave----."

"---and don't talk so other officers can hear," Manera finished.

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

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

"Defeat is worse."

"I do not believe it," Passini said still respectfully. "What is defeat? You go home."...."We think. We read. We are not peasants. We are mechanics. But even the peasants know better than to believe in a war. Everybody hates this war."

* *

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

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

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

"Do we eat yet Tenente?"

Perhaps the first thing which is clear from reading this passage is that the point of view of the Lieutenant is politically naive and that the Italians sense it. They sense it enough to believe that their point of view is stronger and that they can convert the American Lieutenant. Perhaps they feel that his argument lacks subtlety. He wants merely to get the war over with. The war seems to have no meaning for him in terms of "democracy" or any of the other slogans under which his country later went to war. Yet he is months ahead of his own government in joining the war. There is evidently a personal element in his attitude toward the experience of war which outweighs the political one.

If we examine the political element first, however, it becomes apparent that there is something very similar in the development of American politics in general. Why is it that all the labor movements in western European countries have formed labor parties of their own while on the Am-

erican scene the labor unions still maintain their traditional alliance with one of the two major parties? We might also question the fact that movements for the reform of monopoly capitalism call themselves New Deal in America while movements with similar programs call themselves Social-Democracy in Europe, and identify themselves with the theories of Karl Marx even though they are often to the right of those theories in practice. Lieutenant Henry, then, exemplifies to some extent, the traditional American isolation from the concern of the European worker and peasant with radical politics. He has not been "initiated," as have the Europeans since their youth, into the complexity of anti-war socialism.

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

In all those novels of Hemingway which deal with the chaotic and brutal world of war the heroes are usually tough men, experienced inhabitants of a hard world and apparently insensitive. Lieutenant Henry (A Farewell to Arms) and Robert Jordan (For Whom the Bell Tolls) are excellent examples. They are, in addition, defeated men. They have managed, however, to salvage something out of their defeat in the practical world. And this is, perhaps, the root of Hemingway's fundamental interest in such circumstantial occurrences and in such personalities. They accept defeat, they have courted defeat only on terms which allows them to maintain, even in the teeth of the defeat itself, an ideal of themselves, consciously expressed or not, an ideal by which they have lived and worked and loved. Perhaps it is an ideal of decency to which they would rise if it were at all possible, or a limit of shame, below which, if it is at all possible, they will not stoop. They may consider themselves as marked for failure, consider that the best efforts consistently miscarry, but believe that one must continue to strive. The romantic hero finds this struggle of man against his chaotic society in any corner or depth of the human world: among gamblers or whores, among already defeated bands of soldiers or revolutionists, in the discard of society, among people who live mainly on liquor and are fed with affronts, people who are fools, thieves, the comrades of thieves who yet keep the point of honor and the touch of pity, often repaying the world's scorn with service, often standing firm upon a scruple, and at a certain cost, rejecting riches. This romantic hero finds wherever he searches hard enough, some virtue cherished or affected, some flag of man's ineffectual goodness flying under every circumstance of failure, even when hope or health or thanks are absent, and it continues to fly over some obscure struggle in the lost battle of virtue; human beings still clinging in the brothel or on the scaffold to the tattered emblem of honor, the meager treasure of their spirit. However, they may seek to escape it, they find it impossible; it is not merely their honor and their proud ethic but also their inevitable defeat. They are doomed to remain the aristocrats of spirit.

For Hemingway, the world in which these struggles occur is, observed from the outside, a violent and meaningless world. But those of its characters upon whom he focuses his fiction-producing eye, make an heroic effort to salvage something out of this incoherence and meaninglessness:

they try to impose some form upon the disorder of their own living, the art of the bullfighter or the sportsman, the discipline of the soldier or the revolutionist, the code of the gangster, brutal and inhuman though it may be, nevertheless having an ethic. This form or discipline is never intended to be adequate enough to change the world. Hemingway is far from being a positivist. The fidelity which his characters display to their own code, however, is part of the nobility with which they go down to defeat. This is the rose which Hemingway finds beside the gun.

Ten years have elapsed and a second world war has been fought since Hemingway produced a novel. The Brooklyn College student who began an unfinished poem with the line "I am a young man in search of a new Spain," expressed perhaps as clearly as Hemingway's silence, the absence of any cause which might attract the young man of courage and idealism during that uneasy period. Rushing in to fill this vacuum is a different kind of writer who tackles the war of the forties with a different background, Norman Mailer. "Brooklyn, Harvard, Loyte," are the words of the jacket blurb to describe his education. He comes to literature out of the well-stocked wine cellar of the intellectual. He has tasted of Freud, Marx, Spengler, Nietzsche and is not quite over the intoxicating effect of such delicious, aged vintages. The prose is somewhat like the garrulity which follows intoxication; a certain unbalance betrays the state of emotion somewhat sloppily and much of it seems like the loosening of the tongue over the wineglass. It is in its more sober moments somewhat reminiscent of what might be a discussion in Harvard classrooms about politics, emotion, and the behavior of the lower classes. The chaotic brutality of the war is all here, reported with merciless accuracy and resplendant in its detail down to the last phonetic reproduction of the soldier's curse as he hurls a grenade. But little or nothing is salvaged from the chaos. There are no human beings of integrity anywhere on the landscape. This might be said to be the gun without the rose. Not only are the soldiers incapable of any effectual personal discipline but the style itself lacks discipline.

In The Naked and the Dead, as in A Farewell to Arms, we have a defeated band of soldiers. They come to the army so punished by life that any ideals they once may have had have since been thrown overboard as so much ballast in the struggle to keep existence itself afloat. They come from the poverty-stricken anti-semitic Irish of South Boston, Dorchester and Roxbury, from the squalor of Mexican communities in the deep South, from some middlewestern Polish community where the slum tenement has a broken downstairs door, the mailboxes are looted and the hallway smells like a urinal; or from a salesman's life stalled in the rut of drinking, whoring and a dull marriage.

At this point any similarity between them and the defeated social outcasts in Hemingway's fiction ceases to exist. Mailer's characters seem tough and are insensitive. They lack fidelity to any code, to any discipline and because of their lack of sensitivity, are never able for a moment to see their true plight. In times of stress they prove to be so lacking in any personal or social ethic that they are not tough at all, and are unaware of the pathetic or tragic nature of their lives.

To them the war comes primarily as a break in an otherwise meaningless existence and the war increases the meaninglessness of life. Army

life becomes a lonely misery which produces very little in the way of courage or honesty among any of the men. When, by chance, they come under the leadership of a Lieutenant who has been educated at Harvard and in the New York publishing world, he merely articulates for them the cynicism and worthlessness of things which they themselves feel but cannot see objectively.

This officer, Lieutenant Hearn, is not politically naive as were Lieutenant Henry or Robert Jordan. He has read and discussed Marx and Freud with the radical intellectual, rebelled against a nouveau riche bourgeois father, and feels that everything in life is hollow, everything phony, that everything "curdles" when you touch it. He is on the verge of joining the Communist Party out of desperation and then realizes that he is not very serious about that either.

Perhaps the most remarkable thing about Lieutenant Hearn is his emotional immaturity. He has certain intellectual concepts about democracy which might serve as a private discipline and which might give him a genuine toughness. When these concepts conflict with his more spontaneous feelings, and discipline should eventually triumph, he finds himself yielding to emotional needs. He never quite succeeds in keeping his grasp on "honor," on individuality, on human order itself which is threatened by the brute chaos of his world. He cannot really live by his code. His one achievement in the face of brutality is to try to assert himself. Self-assertion, of course, can be the beginning of a code of behavior. It is, in fact, the first step of the adolescent toward the discovery of his own personality and integrity. In this case, however, the development is arrested.

What is offered, instead of the insight of the hero into his own plight, is the Freudian obligatto played by the author over the development of his main character. "The addled womb".... "The dominant patterns are usually unanswerable" --- "If I'm afraid of having my dick cut off or something like that I don't care to know about it." This cynical world weariness is both the style and the man and it salvages nothing from the situation.

The same is true of the amateur Marxism which finds its way into the pages of this novel. The Irish fascist soldier is "the Revolutionary Reversed" and Marxist enlightenment comes in the classroom during a lecture "... Under the water the giant kelp form veritable jungles of plant life where they live without movement, absorbing their nutriment from the ocean medium.... The bourgeois of the plant species...." Those clever mis-metaphors of Marxism dot the prose and explain the meanings which the actions themselves fail to do. Here is indeed the brutal chaotic violence of the war, but without the craftsmanship which is necessary to weld it poetically to the story.

What Mailer's characters betray, of course, is not merely that a certain element of artistry is lacking in the development of his novel, but that he finds his own generation unable to establish its loyalty to any code. The easily deflected devotion of Lieutenant Hearn toward his liberalism would make a liberal himself shudder. Perhaps the normal feeling of Mailer's graduating class was a shudder at itself as well as at the world. It remains to be seen what his second attempt at fiction will make of this

problem. A generation which is utterly unable to find any discipline for itself, must dissolve finally into the chaos which surrounds it. The death of a rifleman is of small consequence when placed beside the death of spirit.

AVEL AUSTIN

Avel Austin is a graduate student in the Philosophy Department of Columbia University.

SEND US YOUR MANUSCRIPTS NOW

ANVIL asks for stories, poems, critical articles and letters from students in all New York colleges and universities.

All contributions should be typed, double spaced and mailed to:

New York Student Federation Against War
247 Lexington Avenue. New York, N.Y.

UNKNOWN AND UNPUBLISHED WRITERS ARE WELCOME AS
CONTRIBUTORS

SEND US YOUR MANUSCRIPTS NOW

PORKCHOPPERS PREFABRICATED

Back in the 1930's, when radicalism was not necessarily taken as a sign of eccentricity and many students felt that there might be more to life than merely steady rations, a considerable number of college graduates went into the labor and radical movements on a full-time basis. Some of them were, perhaps, a little starry-eyed and Bohemian, others a little irresponsible; but the overwhelming bulk of them were motivated by deep and sincere feelings of social idealism. The depression had destroyed the myth that America could remain immune from the diseases of senescent capitalism; the era of labor careerism and cultural bureaucratism had only just begun; temptations were few and disillusionments many.

Most of the college students who went into the labor movement -- as factory workers or volunteer organizers, only rarely as paid officials -- were radicals of one hue or another. They felt that they would stir things up a bit, would jolt the complacent bureaucrats whose mindlessness was reflected in the painfully unimaginative life of most unions. Though many of these young people belonged to radical groups, some did not; as one thinks back on it, one is surprised to recall how many "unaffiliated radicals" made the transition from the classroom to the picket line. One reason this transition could be made with a certain degree of ease was that the CIO was then in the process of formation, and John L. Lewis was searching for organizers who had a mite more vision and imagination than the old-line business agents. The "walking delegate" had been good enough in the AFL craft locals, but in order to organize hundreds of thousands of industrial workers the CIO needed young men and women willing to work for fairly low wages, willing to risk their necks, and able to express themselves in terms of larger social goals and values.

Perhaps the most moving portrait ever written of this migration from the schoolroom to the union hall appeared in John Dos Passos' U.S.A., in which Ben Compton, a New York Jewish boy who had gone to a city college, threw himself into strikes and radical activity. Compton went to jail, came out a broken and bitter man, alienated from the Communist Party because he could no longer agree with its views, and unable to reorient himself to a life of political and personal isolation. His tragedy was symptomatic of the experience of a whole stratum of that generation which reached maturity in the early thirties. (Others, of course, managed to "adjust" themselves to the status quo.)

Now it is easy enough to sneer at such people, but those who sneer from their cold little caves of cynicism should remember that the Comptons at least were willing to take chances with their lives, to commit themselves to their hopes and dreams; they did not accept a living intellectual and moral death as the price of creature comfort. Today it has become fashionable in certain circles to look back at the thirties as an era of childish enthusiasm, of naive and rather silly illusions -- but this is an attitude which is its own condemnation.

As it happened, most of the young radicals who went into the labor movement either dropped out of it or were absorbed by the union bureaucracy. Why this happened is not hard to understand. For one thing, the radical movement was suffering a process of disintegration, partly as the

result of the terrible blows it had received at the hands of fascism and Stalinism, partly as the result of its inability to orient itself to new political situations. And equally important, the belated appearance of reformism in American politics -- not in the form of a Social Democratic party but rather as a liberal governmental apparatus -- deluded many of those who had gone into the unions to turn them topsy-turvy but were now being turned themselves. The gradual process of social defanging and intellectual corruption by which European capitalism had strangled the original revolutionary impetus of Social Democracy was concentrated into a short period of time in the U.S.

As a result, there is today a whole layer of the labor bureaucracy made of ex-radicals, who have proven useful to the old-line labor leaders because of their ability to combat the Stalinists and to subordinate to some invisible future their own "criticisms." The socialist movement has been a particularly fertile source for labor bureaucrats -- "smartened up" to anti-Stalinist tactics, parliamentary procedure, factional shrewdness, and a certain articulation of vague but impressive radical terminology. The number of ex-radicals who are today comfortable labor bureaucrats -- the kind who tell you that they too were once socialists (when they were young, you understand) or that they are still, in a sort of a way, perhaps, socialists (but one must be practical, you understand) -- is appalling, the mark of the suicide of a generation of Americans.

In recent years, as a consequence of the developments here briefly sketched, the American colleges have gone into the business of producing labor bureaucrats just as they produce business managers -- what might be called porkchoppers prefabricated. Courses have been offered which advise young hopefuls, their noses sniffing the delights of officialdom, how to become either "labor leaders" or "labor-relations" men in the employ of the government. In these projects the leaderships of unions often cooperate with the economics and sociology departments of the colleges, with the result that whatever sparks of intellectual independence and rebelliousness may still exist in these students are snuffed out.

There are significant objective reasons for such courses. The old hurly-burly, rough-and-ready loud-mouth is becoming obsolete in union circles, especially in the CIO; a new kind of labor leader is necessary. Both the "walking delegate" of the AFL craft locals and the militant unionist of the CIO are being supplanted by "labor statesmen," smooth and well-educated, who know how to get along with both the employers and the government in Washington. This new sort of labor leader is adept at that peculiarly moaly-mouthed and soft-shoe dialect of the American lib-lab, who uses language neither to communicate nor to evade but simply to blur. He is about as rebellious against injustice as a county clerk, and has about as much intellectual independence as a well-trained sheep. But he is a skilled man at his job; no getting around that. His job, of course, is keeping his job.

Second cousin to the labor statesman is the "labor relations" man who works for one of the governmental departments. Sometimes he is secretly sympathetic to labor, though he usually does a pretty good job of keeping his secret. He tells one that whenever he can he "gives the unions a break," and intimates that all this stuff about strikes and picket-lines may have been all right years ago but that now the unions prosper mainly

because people like himself are strategically placed for endowing "breaks."

It is an astonishing and distressing experience to talk to such people. A few months ago I met a young fellow who was planning to go still one step further -- not merely to labor leader or labor relations man, but actually to labor-relations agent for a large industrial corporation. Now the curious thing about this man is that he considers himself a radical, reads the radical press, is strongly possessed by guilt feelings about the career he has staked out for himself, and without provocation told me that he is extremely unhappy about what he is doing. But what really astonished me was that in order to be trained for his job as a labor-relations man for the corporation he will have to work in the factory for a year or so. Imagine that! -- getting to know the workers, their outlooks and habits, so that he, who considers himself a radical, will be able the more efficiently to bargain against the unions. Surely this is about the last step possible in the age of opportunism.

Now I hope it is understood that what has been said here is not written from any superior heights of purity. In capitalist society it is sometimes necessary to make compromises, to do unpleasant things in order to earn one's bread. But there are compromises -- and compromises. One may have to compromise in order to be free to be able to do what is really important; one may have to take an unpleasant job in order to have the time or the opportunity to give oneself to a movement for social betterment. But one cannot, or should not, make the compromise into the end of one's life, even if one must sometimes take the dangerous and distasteful step of making it a means. And, from the point of view of any sort of radicalism or even of common intellectual independence, what does it mean to become a labor bureaucrat or a labor-relations man if not to surrender one's integrity, one's very reason for existing at all?

Of course, some people think they can take jobs as labor bureaucrats and then somehow, "cleverly," put across dissident ideas. But such a notion is fatally to underestimate the people who run the labor movement, people who, whatever else, are shrewd and who know that they can either absorb young dissidents into their ranks or get rid of them whenever they wish to. The idea that one can "do some good" by becoming a governmental functionary mediating between capital and labor is even more pernicious. If one wants to do good, one must decide on which side the essential right is -- and stay there.

These remarks should not be construed to mean that it is eternally wrong for radicals to take union leadership. Quite the contrary; it is very desirable for radicals to become union leaders -- at least, if they remain radicals. But they can do so only when they rise to leadership on the basis of support from the ranks and a programmatic union campaign which educates workers to their views. That means that when a dissident union leader wants to buck a section of the labor bureaucracy he can do so because he has behind him the support of the membership. But no one can expect to hire himself out as a flunkey to an established union leadership and then be anything but a flunkey.

The situation of those intellectuals and semi-intellectuals who work for unions in various secondary capacities is extremely unhappy. They enjoy neither the privileges of genuinely free intellectuals nor the satis-

factions of labor leaders who "rest" on the ranks. Their function is often humiliating. A labor leader needs a speech or has to work out a certain problem. Why bother doing it himself? Call up one of the "smart boys" to do it. That means, however, that one man has the power and the other man does the thinking for him. But the intellectual employee of the union, while he is supposed to defend it in public controversy and to articulate its ideas, will find that if, for any reason, he does not toe the line set by the union leadership, he may be dismissed from his job and have no possibility of appealing that dismissal to the ranks. Too often he is wanted more for the use to which his skills may be put than for the ideas his mind may produce. This separation of the powerful leaders from the powerless intellectuals is both a sure sign of bureaucratic degeneration and of the self-surrender of the intellectuals.

* * *

The labor movement can be looked upon as a place in which to carve out a career -- young fellows with glib tongues, weak spines and fairly agile minds can find it a convenient market-place: a regular salary in exchange for rusty convictions. But for those students who are interested in the labor or radical movements but who yet wish to remain true to themselves, there are only two honest roads: either to get into the union as a rank-and-filer working together with the other workers or to try to function politically and intellectually as a friendly critic on the outside. But to become a porkchopper prefab., a government "labor-relations" man -- how humiliating a fate for anyone who thinks of himself as both radical and honest.

IRVING HOWE

Irving Howe is a frequent contributor to Partisan Review, Atlantic Monthly, Commentary and other magazines. He is co-author of the book, The U.A.W. and Walter Reuther.

Are You Interested In
 HELPING THE TRADE UNION MOVEMENT?
WOMEN'S TRADE UNION LEAGUE
 (Founded in 1903)
Needs Your Volunteer Help Now

Write to: Bess W. Kaye, Exec. Sec'y.
 Women's Trade Union League
 247 Lexington Ave. N.Y.C.

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 threatens the very existence of world civilization.

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

We do not believe that the threatening war is inevitable. We believe that a militant anti-war student movement can be an effective force to prevent a 3rd World War.

I. Against War Preparations

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

Therefore, we oppose:

1. The 15 billion dollar war budget.
2. Conscription, Universal Military Training and the ROTC.
3. The use of atomic energy for war purposes.
4. The growing militarism of the American government.
5. The North Atlantic Pact and the American subsidization of the military machines of Western Europe.
6. The bolstering of reactionary regimes in Greece and Turkey.

Therefore, we favor:

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

II. Academic Freedom and Civil Liberties

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

Therefore, we oppose:

1. The attempt to straight-jacket the American campus through legislation like the Feinberg Bill.
2. All forms of racial and religious discrimination among students and faculty as attempted through the quota system and segregated schools.
3. Faculty and administration supervision of student organizations.
4. The suppression of political minorities through the use of such legislation like the Smith Act.

Therefore, we favor:

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

III. Education

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

IV. Labor

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

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

Enclosed find 60¢ for a one year subscription to ANVIL.

Name

Address

School

Mail to: New York Student Federation Against War
247 Lexington Ave. New York, N.Y.