

most apparent to the unlearned and the non-analytical was the employment of regular army troops to enforce court orders and police American cities. Can this be the outward and visible sign of that inner and moral fault foretold by Burke, deplored by Kraft, and diagnosed by Hand? As to that, it is clearly for time and the course of full-flowing events to tell. But the evidence will certainly include Professor Mason's account of a new *curia regis* whose fisc is administered with the Tudor-like caprice and rapacity that Mrs. Scheibla reports.

Reviewed by C. P. IVES

Apostles of the New Left

A NEW LEFT school of radical history has emerged, one which disparages both the present political "establishment," and the consensus school of history. Its advocates are confessedly subjective, announcing, for example, that their purpose is to write "radical" history rather than balanced or impartial history. Their simplistic and "devil" view of American history views liberals as well as conservatives as part of a plot to enslave both Americans and the world ("imperialism"). United States foreign policy has long been based on a capitalistic society's drive to capture markets and find ways of investing its ill-gotten gains. Middle class reformers such as the early twentieth century Progressives are seen by the New Left as wily conservatives who pushed for government intervention in economic affairs in order to advance their selfish interests.

Arthur Schlesinger once said that the time had come "to blow the whistle before the current outburst of revisionism regarding the origins of the cold war goes much further." Yet the outburst of revisionism

shows no signs of subsiding, judging from such books as Ronald Steel's *Pax Americana* and *Containment and Change* by Carl Oglesby and Richard Shaull, to take but two examples. These books are reminiscent of some of the revisionist books of World War Two which suggested that we, not the Japanese or Germans, were responsible for starting the war.

Liberals viewed the Cold War within the framework established by George Kennan's *American Diplomacy*, which described the reality of Communist expansionism and the Free World's attempt to contain it. As late as 1960, a radical like Staughton Lynd could still accept the general framework of Kennan's critique of American idealism, while noting merely that Kennan had failed to apply it to the specific events of the cold war and to the policy of containment which he had helped to articulate.

But beginning with Carl Marzani's *We Can Be Friends: Origins of the Cold War* (1952), revisionism came into its own. It developed that we, not the Communists, had started the cold war. Then came D. F. Fleming's *The Cold War And Its Origins* (1961), David Horowitz's *The Free World Colossus* (1965), Gar Alperovitz's *Atomic Diplomacy*, and the afore-mentioned *Containment and Change*. For these authors, Truman, not Stalin or Mao, started the cold war. The dimensions of a capitalist plot against the Kremlin and Peking began to take shape.

Perhaps typical of the New Left's rewriting of history is André Fontaine's *History of the Cold War* (1968). This neutralist (not neutral) foreign editor of *Le Monde* finds that the chief villain of the international scene is the United States. Thus: "On May 22, 1947, the President [Truman] signed the law that placed his country, only two years after the death of Roosevelt, at the head of the anti-Bolshevik crusade." And we are told: "One day perhaps it will be known who assumed the responsibility for the crime (of Katyn) and what his purpose was." How would M. Fontaine know that this day came twenty years before he

wrote his book? Why should the foreign editor of Europe's "most serious newspaper" join the rest of the world in believing the established truth: that thousands of Polish officers were murdered in Katyn, on Stalin's orders, to destroy the one and only conceivable cadre of a true Polish renaissance?

It is all too common for leftist intellectuals to base their opinions on totally emotional premises which are then rationalized, extrapolated, and presented as the result of thought without the slightest attempt at comparison with surrounding reality. Such activity on the part of intellectuals neither receives nor deserves respect. "I have heard it confidently stated, for instance," wrote George Orwell in *England, Your England* (1954), "that the American troops had been brought to Europe not to fight the Germans but to crush an English revolution. One has to belong to the intelligentsia to believe things like that: no ordinary man could be such a fool."

A poster on the main door of the Sorbonne soviet (May 1968) read: "The revolution which is beginning will call in question not only capitalist society but industrial society. The consumers' society must perish a violent death. The society of alienation must disappear from history. We are inventing a new and original world. Imagination is seizing power." The liberal form of bureaucratic-industrial society—"consumers' society"—makes a big play about toleration of dissent and writes the freedoms of speech, press, and assembly into its constitutions. But it is all a sham, according to the New Leftist. Tolerance is itself a subtle technique hiding the existing tyranny and lulling potential rebels into conformity (*Repressive Tolerance* is the title of one of Herbert Marcuse's most influential essays). The masses—except for the blacks—are so drugged that they do not realize they are slaves.

The New Left concludes that "true" or "liberating" tolerance does not mean equal rights to all sides. True tolerance should be "discriminating" and excludes "movements

which are obviously and objectively aggressive and destructive" (Marcuse). This means, as Marcuse has elsewhere put it more plainly, "intolerance against the movements from the right, and tolerance of movements from the left."

By shouting, shoving, sitting, and creating general disorder, the New Leftists deny "a forum" to Robert McNamara, Hubert Humphrey, government and business recruiters, etc., for such persons are "obviously and objectively aggressive and destructive." Or as Marcuse told Arthur Schlesinger, Jr.: "Similarly, you can very well decide today (in Vietnam) who is the aggressor and who is not the aggressor. Again, not in terms of personal preference, but objectively." (*New York Times Magazine*, May 26, 1968, p. 98).

The New Left thoroughly approves of violence. Regis Debray suggests killing a couple of cops to show that the system isn't absolute. Frantz Fanon, writing in the perspective of the Negro struggle, declares violence to be the only way in which the victims of the system can regain self-respect and dignity. It is this romantic cult of violence that turned New Left writers to the "theater of cruelty" and the vogue of the romantic revolutionary, the Marquis de Sade.

But violence also has a more pragmatic role; through it the revolutionaries break out of the embrace of repressive tolerance into freedom. Through a violent confrontation—the coming of the cops or the soldiers—the drugged masses are awakened to realize the totalitarian nature of the system that deceives, manipulates and enslaves them. The main business of the New Left, therefore, is not to win reforms and concessions nor to build a disciplined party, but to provoke the system to violent confrontations.

For Marcuse, though, the universities alone do not have to be destroyed: "I have never suggested or supported destroying the established universities and building

new anti-institutions instead . . . American universities, at least quite a few of them, today are still enclaves of relatively critical thought and relatively free thought. So we do not have to think of replacing them by new institutions. But this is one of the very rare cases in which I think you can achieve what you want to achieve within the existing institutions." (*New York Times Magazine*, May 26, 1968, p. 104).

The American Left has proved out Dostoevsky's epigram about starting with liberty and ending with despotism. Parading under the banner of "freedom," leftists have been busy demonstrating their partiality for the rule of force.

Like the "establishment" liberals against whom it says it is rebelling, the New Left talks a great deal about freedom. But its performance makes it clear that New Left freedom is of a very peculiar sort. It does not mean the equal liberty of everyone to go about his business peacefully. It means instead the liberty of the New Left to do exactly as it pleases, but to deny that right of anyone else to oppose the New Left program. It is the liberty of the despot.

Thus in the name of "liberty," the New Left invaded Columbia University, seized buildings, destroyed records and held officials hostage, while disrupting the education process for the great majority who took no part in the violence. It was an exercise in disruption parallel to those staged a few years before at Berkeley in the name of "free speech." At the University of Wisconsin the New Left demanded that Communist theoretician Herbert Aptheker be allowed to speak at the Madison campus, while at the same time denying the right of Dow Chemical to talk to students. In fact the leftists declared that if the Wisconsin administration didn't expel the Dow representatives from the campus, they would take matters into their own hands.

Professor Lewis A. Feuer has described

Berkeley as "the first 'political university' in the United States." ("The New Tyrants of Berkeley," *Atlantic Monthly*, September, 1966). "The new intellectual class," he wrote, "is feeling its way toward a technique of exerting political power through a variety of devices—stopping troop trains, massive demonstrations, open-ended illegality," and the university is in the "strange position of being the 'staging area' for all these actions." He concluded: "The twentieth century has shown how the intellectual class can become a primary force for an assault on democratic institutions, and we may yet witness this phenomenon in America disguised under such slogans as 'participatory democracy.'"

In his book *Negations* (Beacon, 1968), Marcuse explains his commitment to pure intolerance. Here all past prudential, legal, moral, and ethical conceptions are abandoned for a hedonistic interpretation of history, seasoned with arrogance, contempt, and self-righteousness. Troubled, nevertheless, by the question, "Who is qualified to make all these distinctions, definitions, identifications for the society as a whole?" if the majority of its representatives are not qualified to do so, Marcuse replies: There is but "one logical answer, namely, everyone 'in the maturity of his faculties' as a human being, everyone who learned to think rationally and autonomously."

And who are these autonomous thinkers? Well, for one, there is Marcuse, of course. Another candidate might be his academic colleague Barrington Moore, Jr., of Harvard, "who is all for Robespierre against Burke and for revolutionary terror." (Max Geltman, in *National Review*, July 16, 1968, p. 701). Other candidates cited by Geltman include Dr. Arthur I. Waskow of the Institute of Policy Studies in Washington who believes in "creative disorder," Stokely Carmichael, and H. Rap Brown.

Marcuse is for "people's democracy," not

“democracy.” He wants to establish “the democratic dictatorship of free men.” To achieve his “dictatorship” he would demand the withdrawal of tolerance “from regressive movements.” Moreover he would demand “intolerance even toward thought, opinion, and word,” especially against “self-styled conservatives,” by which he seems to include everyone except the New Left.

In our society so full of imperfections, violence is not only necessary but just, and “no third person, least of all the educator and intellectual, has the right to preach . . . abstention.” Thus by an Orwellian distortion of language, democracy becomes dictatorship and dictatorship means freedom. His appeal is to the “outcasts and outsiders,” those “outside the democratic process,” the student rebels, the intellectuals, and the “damned of the earth.” They, he affirms, shall be the saviors of our civilization, but in order to save it they will first have to destroy it.

When the Left creates an epistemology enthroning violence as virtue (Frantz Fanon and Jean-Paul Sartre); when it elevates to a high moral commitment students’ attacks upon existing educational institutions to convert them to “counter-educational” seminars for the teaching of revolution and destruction (“socially useful destructiveness”), as does Herbert Marcuse—then the consequences may well be just those predicted and desired.

Herbert Marcuse, a seventy-year-old professor of philosophy at the University of California’s San Diego campus, propounds the message of Marx with a strong admixture of Freud. He is credited with helping to spark the radical leftist student violence in Germany as a result of his lectures in Berlin during the summer of 1967. Marcuse’s books emblazon the apartments and arguments of the New Left, even more so than such admired leftists as C. Wright

Mills, Paul Goodman, Norman O. Brown, and Erich Fromm.

Marcuse’s contemporary Marxism suggests a conspiracy theory which purports to see a purposeful ruling-class behind our involvement in Vietnam, racial injustice, and perpetuation of the slums. By means of the technological revolution, capitalism has survived under a new guise. The American system (according to Marcuse’s *One-Dimensional Man*, 1964) succeeds in seducing and traducing its citizenry with the result that the status quo is granted a spurious consent. “The fact that the vast majority accepts this society does not render it less irrational and less reprehensible,” says Marcuse. “Individuals identify themselves with the existence which is imposed on them and . . . are indoctrinated by the conditions under which they live and think and which they do not transcend.”

The radical intellectual alone knows the true needs of the underclasses for he has been given (by Marcuse) the task of defining political goals for those who are unable to perceive their own historic interests. The task of the enlightened philosopher king (Marcuse) is to achieve the “intellectual subversion” of the established social structure. And that end can only be achieved by striking an alliance with classes having the least in common with the “establishment.” Marcuse is willing to consider not only the “right of resistance,” but also pushing that right to “the point of subversion.” (As quoted by Andrew Hacker, *New York Times Book Review* section, March 10, 1968, p. 37).

Another favorite of the New Left is the late terrorist Che Guevara, sometime comrade-in-arms of Fidel Castro. He is regarded by his admirers as a sort of Robin Hood, defender of the masses, friend of the underprivileged, and advocate of direct and violent action. Early in 1968, Macmillan published *Venceremos*, a book of Guevara’s

writings, edited by John Gerassi. The book jacket asserts that Che "stands alone . . . as a revolutionary, for his prime concern was non-nationalistic. He was for the oppressed everywhere." Nothing in the jacket indicates that Guevara was a Communist terrorist, responsible for the death of thousands of Cubans.

The back of the jacket is also misleading with respect to editor Gerassi. Described as an "expert on Latin American affairs" who "teaches Nationalism and Revolution" at San Francisco State College, Gerassi, according to Macmillan, has edited an "authoritative and moving book." But Gerassi is more than just an interested observer of Che Guevara. He is part of a "Guerilla warfare oriented group, called Revolutionary Contingent, an openly Communist organization with headquarters in New York City." (*Human Events*, May 18, 1968, p. 4).

Gerassi is also an adviser to the Radical Education Project of the Students for a Democratic Society, served with the Bertrand Russell "war crimes tribunal" which accused the United States of engaging in genocide, and is sponsor of the draft resistance movement.

Until President Johnson removed himself from renomination on March 31, 1968, New Leftists reserved their most bitter denunciations for him. Pamphlets and the book and play *MacBird* alleged that Johnson engineered the death of John Kennedy. In October, 1966, when President Johnson spoke at the East-West Center of the University of Hawaii, Vietnicks unfurled a banner which read: "You are the aggressor." One of the many placards charged: "LBJ murders my Asian brothers." In January, 1967, the student paper at John Hopkins University described President Johnson as "Last year's top mass murderer . . . whose hobby is bombing defenseless people." New Leftists circulated buttons and placards

around the country during 1967 saying: "Lee Harvey Oswald, where are you now?"

"This is not enlightened social change or legitimate dissent," UPI White House correspondent Merriman Smith declared to the 1967 meeting of the United Press International editors and publishers in New York City. "It is anarchy, born of a highly permissive atmosphere in this country."

One of the most incisive analyses of the New Left, by Dr. Robert E. Fitch, appeared in *U.S. News & World Report* (June 10, 1968). This former dean of the Pacific School of Religion cited statistics indicating that many of the younger leftists come from homes that tend to be affluent, permissive, and egalitarian; there is little or no paternal authority. When these youngsters come to college they run into authority for the first time, they resent it, and become rebels. With respect to the "hippies" Dr. Fitch said: "They pretend to be adults, but they are desperately afraid of growing up and assuming responsibilities. They pretend to be nonconformists, but in speech and dress—even in odor—they are the most rigorous conformists you could wish for." They pretend to have contempt for our economic system, "yet they sponge off it." They pretend to be apostles of love, "but they do not understand its sacrificial and redemptive side." Dr. Fitch said: "I know some sentimental clergymen at a distance like to compare the hippies with St. Francis, or even see them as little Jesuses walking about disheveled and aimless with their not-so-virgin Marys. This is a monstrous distortion of the facts."

Following a trip to the Middle East, Dr. Fitch noted that "if there were any hippies in an Arab country they would starve to death—and in Israel they would be put into a work force." He believes that when an affluent society reaches the point where the good things of life are abundant and available to a lot of people without much effort,

they begin to wonder why they shouldn't have whatever they want immediately. Thus demands for instant racial justice, instant sex, instant peace in Vietnam, etc.

The problem in higher education, according to Fitch, is that universities are run by rationalists and liberals—"men . . . peculiarly unable to understand violence." The liberal temperament, which believes that everything can be solved by good will and right reason, is unable to cope with situations where force is involved.

The dissenters, the Vietniks, have no use at all for free speech. Evidence of this came during the "teach-ins" of 1966. They howl down government officials and defenders of South Vietnam; they prevent business and government recruiters from holding interviews. "They are bully boys," says Dr. Fitch. "They are a small minority who have made up their minds that they are right, and are entitled to impose their will on the majority," He describes most of the dissenters as "political existentialists," whose prime passion is to wreck and to ruin.

Fitch ridicules the devil theory of the New Left, which ascribes all of our ills to the "establishment" or the "military-industrial complex." He asserts that there is no such thing as *the* "establishment." Citing the 1964 "Eastern Establishment" of Rockefeller and the "Arizona-Southern California Establishment" of Goldwater, and also the Meany versus Reuther factions in labor, Fitch concludes that "the same situation prevails in the academic world, in business and industry, among the churches."

Thus the New Leftists are talking about some mythically monolithic power "that simply does not exist in our pluralistic society." Young people who claim to be victims of the "establishment" set up imaginary bogeymen to justify whatever they "must" do to get their way.

Asked about the role of liberals in the growth of violence, Dr. Fitch cited two

kinds. One is the "hysteric" who is always warning that if you don't do something or other, there is going to be a riot. "He tremulously anticipates violence before it occurs, celebrates it while it is happening, and justifies it when it is over. . . . He is a nice, sweet, rational liberal who does not understand force and is really both afraid of, and fascinated by, violence." The other is the masochist "who is eager to prostrate himself before violence." Fitch cited the white liberals around Stokely Carmichael nodding knowingly when Stokely described all the violent things he was going to do to whites. Fitch also mentioned the 1967 National Conference for New Politics convention in Chicago, where the white leftists completely surrendered to the militant blacks, even to the point of accepting an antisemitic resolution.

Fitch believes the same masochism is at work in some of the church groups: "It is rather shocking when upper-middle-class churches eagerly support any violent cause advanced by the less desirable leaders of the black revolt." Typical of the irresponsible is a statement by Rt. Rev. James A. Pike that Jesus was a revolutionary like the Vietcong (*New York Times*, April 9, 1968, John Leo).

Commenting on this tendency, Rabbi Arthur Herzberg noted that "the nervous scurrying for 'relevance' by politically active clergymen may represent the sickness, not the health, of American religion." Religion as an ongoing force, he said, cannot be saved by "making it relevant." A large part of what passes for liberal religion in America, according to Rabbi Hertzberg, "is a rewriting of the *Nation* and the *New Republic*." (*National Review*, 1968, p. 486).

The relationship between leftists and liberals on the matter of violence is an intriguing one. According to William P. Gerberding (*The Reporter*, February 8, 1968), lib-

erals are drawn toward radical prescriptions "only in periods of great stress and Johnson administration is determined to exploit and suppress the Negro population, as is "the establishment" in general, and all talk of the search for assistance and cooperation with legitimate Negro aspirations is deceitful; the war on poverty is not only unsuccessful, but was designed to be so; there are no real differences between American political leaders; and our great universities are really nothing more than willing and corrupt instruments of the guardians of the status quo.

Mr. Gerberding believes that "much of what passes for a redeeming and healthy idealism among today's youth is based on these and related grotesque distortions of truth and on virulent anti-intellectual and anti-rational bias." He concludes: "For liberals to indulge these fantasies, to congratulate every adolescent rebel on his (fictitious) moral superiority, to applaud each new millennial prescription or apocalyptic vision, to deny or ignore the positive aspects of American politics and society, is to become what the radicals claimed we were all along, i.e., dishonest, cowering, sentimental, irresponsible, hollow men." The radicals at Berkeley were encouraged by "blindly permissive, intellectually sloppy, and morally confused professors, administrators, and politicians, most of whom were liberals."

When a historian like Staughton Lynd proclaims Hanoi to be the model for the achievement of freedom by small nations, he is perverting both the use of his intellectual discipline and his mandates as a thinking man. When the organizers of a movement to withhold federal income tax in protest against the defense of South Vietnam draw up a statement which identifies the United States with Nazi Germany, they are, while pretending to appeal to the moral sense, perverting that sense. When Susan

Sontag, wishing to express her horror at the fruits of modern technology, launches an attack upon the Faustian spirit of the whole of Western civilization ending with the observation that "the white race [is] . . . the cancer of humanity," she undermines the very ground on which she is entitled to speak or write. When Andrew Kopkind, the journalist, describes the fascist tactics used by Negro militants at the "New Politics" convention in Chicago (1967) as a necessary, even a hopeful experience, he reveals a carelessness toward the virtues of freedom that a writer may indulge in only at his peril. When Robert Brustein, dean of the Yale drama school, indiscriminately and in a tone of deepest self-gratulation lends his sponsorship to any and all works of art whose intention is subversive, he is in fact subverting nothing so much as that artistic integrity to which he professes devotion.

The above examples, cited by Midge Decter ("Anti-Americanism in America," *Harpers*, April, 1968) abound in the liberal weeklies, in the highly influential *New York Review of Books*, in some of the quarterlies, and are to be heard from the platform of every symposium, teach-in, and round table on peace.

In his address at Williamsburg, June 1, 1968, Mr. George Kennan declared: "I doubt that there can be any of us present whose senses have not been repeatedly sickened over these recent months by the spectacle of angry, disorderly people; milling about, screaming, shouting other people down, brawling with the police . . . obstructing other people in their normal pursuits." Referring to the violence at Columbia University of the previous month, he stated: "The American student of this day and age has the finest educational facilities ever offered to any students at any time and at any place in history. For the actual cost of what is offered to him at these places he does not, on the average, pay even the half.

The rest is given him by the very American society—that American “establishment,” if you will, for which the student-activist professes such contempt. It is the student who is under obligation to the university and its sponsors, not vice versa.”

ANTHONY T. BOUSCAREN