

THE KEY REPORTER

THE PHI BETA KAPPA NEWS MAGAZINE

VOLUME X · NUMBER 2

This issue goes to the more than 90,000 members resident within postal service

SPRING · 1945

House Committee Surveys Effect of War on Colleges

The House of Representatives Advisory Committee to the Committee on Education has issued a statement that it feels that the present state of institutions of higher learning does not justify Congressional consideration.

The Advisory Committee, acting on House Resolution 592 authorizing a study of the effect of the war on colleges and universities, has issued 1700 questionnaires and consulted many widely distributed representatives of higher education.

Several facts are evident from this testing, states the committee. It feels that there is little likelihood that there will be any rapid increase in the number of students enrolled until months after final victory, since veterans now being discharged are not returning to college.

The committee finds that "faced with the fact of shrinking enrollments and consequent loss of student fees, institutions made many types of adjustments, many of them detrimental to the effectiveness of the education provided and others which have built up an unprecedented back-log of needs." Since the majority of colleges and universities carried the adjustments through, the Advisory Committee feels that "no emergency exists which justifies Congressional consideration for this period."

The committee also concluded that "on the basis of estimates for the academic year 1944-45 only comparatively few colleges are facing an emergency, and that these are primarily men's colleges and the smaller coeducational institutions which will suffer more severe cut-backs in their financial returns and hence are facing a critical situation," and that "according to the statements of educational leaders, if the war continues and students are not returned to the institutions, a more critical situation will develop for an ever increasing number of colleges and universities."

The Advisory Committee is not yet ready to submit its final report to the Committee on Education or to submit its specific proposals for legislation.

Leaders Protest Homer P. Rainey's Dismissal; ΦBK Investigates Situation at University of Texas

Φ B K, in the interests of its chapter at the University of Texas, is investigating the reasons for the dismissal of Homer P. Rainey. The Association of American Universities, the American Association of University Professors, the Southern Association of Colleges, and the Southern University Conference are also investigating the controversy.

The Committee on Qualifications, which will recommend a course of action for Φ B K, is composed of Theodore H. Jack, president, Randolph-Macon Woman's College, chairman; George A. Works, former dean of students and university examiner, the University of Chicago; Christian Gauss, dean of the college, Princeton University; H. T. Parlin, dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, the University of Texas; and Raymond Walters, president, the University of Cincinnati.

This action reinforces the resolution adopted at the meeting of the Φ B K Senate October 27-28: "The Senate would deplore in colleges holding or applying for charters of Φ B K discriminations affecting the faculties or student bodies in such a way as to limit the spirit of free inquiry and teaching. The Senate relies upon the Committee on Qualifications to interpret in its recommendations the spirit of this expression of the basis of liberal culture."

Investigating Groups

The investigating committee of the Southern Association of Colleges, appointed by the chairman of the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education, consists of H. L. Donovan, president, the University of Kentucky; Rufus C. Harris, president, Tulane University; Theodore H. Jack; M. C. Huntley, dean

(Continued on page 6)



— PM Photo
HOMER P. RAINEY

More than 600 educators are among 1,000 religious, labor, and community leaders protesting the ousting of Homer P. Rainey from the presidency of the University of Texas by the Board of Regents. The statement, signed by residents of 36 states, was sent in January to Governor Coke Stevenson and members of the Texas Senate by

the Academic Council of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties.

The signers, calling for the reorganization of the Board of Regents as well as the restoration of Rainey, state that "the dismissal of Rainey is a serious blow to the University of Texas, to intellectual freedom and academic standards in our country, and to the fundamental democratic concepts for which our country is fighting today," and "a threat to the independence and intellectual honesty of every educator and every educational institution."

Beyond Texas

In presenting the statement to the Texas legislators, the signers emphasize, "We press these views upon you because we sincerely believe that this situation at the University of Texas has implications far beyond the borders of that state. It effects the welfare of the nation. Furthermore, we feel an obligation to America's men and women on every fighting front who are making such sacrifices to guarantee democratic beliefs, to insure that the forces of bigotry and reaction do not make inroads in our American life."

Regents' Charge

Rainey was fired November 1 by the Board of Regents, "charging that he failed and refused to conform to regula-

(Continued on page 7)



Federal Aid to Education

Now before Congress is a bill that would provide \$300,000,000 for the public schools of this country. It is certain that the measure will create sharp issues and bring heated arguments from friends and foe. Shall the Federal government enter the public school field? Will Federal aid mean Federal control? Will the community school be helped by Washington support? These questions will ring not only through Congress; they will be bandied about in the press, in public gatherings, at educational conferences and taxpayers' meetings. Unfortunately, more emotion than reason will be put forth, more heat than light generated.

Although Federal aid bills have been introduced for more than two decades, a year ago, for the first time, the bill reached the Senate for a vote. Friends of the bill were hopeful that it would pass, but at the last moment, through a ruse best described as "tricky," the measure was defeated. However, much ground had been gained, and the new bill, introduced early at the opening of the current Congress, is essentially the same as the one defeated last year.

Briefly, the bill calls for the granting of \$300,000,000 to the public schools of this country, according to a not-too-difficult formula. Two-thirds of the money would go to all states to raise teachers' salaries by \$200 each. The rest would be apportioned to the states on the basis of need, to help equalize existing educational inequalities. Under the proposed bill, each state would get some money, although the poorer states, particularly those in the South, would get substantially higher amounts. Written in the bill, as co-sponsored by Senators Thomas of Utah and Hill of Alabama, is the significant statement that all funds are to be allocated on the basis of an objective formula without any Federal supervision or control.

Opponents of the Federal aid bill insist that its adoption would violate the principle of states' rights. In presenting a minority report to Congress, Senator Taft held that common-school and high-school education is an obligation of the states and not that of the Federal government. It is true that never before in our 150 years of existence has Federal support gone to public schools on a recognized basis of need. Hitherto the aid has been granted on an "emergency" basis.

That education transcends state borders is now recognized in many quarters. Senator Thomas points out that "there is no problem which cuts so deeply into the basic fundamentals which we call Americanization as does the neglect of our public schools and the neglect of educational opportunity for large sections of our population." Thousands of men have been rejected by the Army because they cannot read or write, and do not possess the equivalent of a fourth-grade education. Whether 50 divisions have been rejected, as claimed, no one

BENJAMIN FINE, author and newspaperman, has been education editor for *The New York Times* since 1941.

can be certain, but the figures are staggering.

More direct reasons exist, however, for the support of the Federal aid bill. The United States is a unified nation, something more than 48 individual states. A boy or girl reared in Alabama or Missouri may become a voter in New York or Massachusetts. Our population is extremely mobile. Nearly one-fourth of our native-born inhabitants, in 1930, were living in states other than those in which they had been born. In ten states the number reached 50 per cent.

What does that mean? The educational facilities in one section of the country become the concern of citizens in another. Poor schools can send forth men and women who may become liabilities to their adopted states.

This opens the question, do inequalities of educational opportunity exist? Beyond doubt, here is the crucial issue. Striking inequalities do abound. Some states are too poor to support an adequate educational program even though they spend every dollar collected in taxes on their schools. New York spends \$136 a year per pupil, about five times as much as Mississippi, which spends \$24. Ten states spend less than \$50 while eight spend more than \$100. The ten poorest states are all in the South — Louisiana, Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, North Carolina, Georgia, South Carolina, Alabama, Arkansas, and Mississippi; the "richer" states, industrial for the most part, are New York, California, New Jersey, Nevada, Massachusetts, Illinois, Montana and Connecticut.

In almost every respect, such as salaries paid teachers, per-pupil value of school property, average length of school year, and enrollment in high schools, the Southern states are at the bottom of the scale. But these states cannot be condemned as lacking in responsibility toward their children. Actually, the poorer states, by and large, make a greater effort and spend a proportionately higher amount of their tax money for schools than do the wealthier communities. Taking as a base the total income of the people in each state per child of school age, it is found that the amount ranges from \$698 in Mississippi to \$5,130 in Nevada — giving the richest state seven times as much income for each child as the poorest. The 12 Southern states are found at the bottom of the list.

What does this mean? Simply that many states, now providing the poorest schooling for their children, cannot hope to improve their offerings substantially without Federal support. Even though Mississippi were entirely solvent, it could not hope to bring up its schools to a level equal to that found in New York, California, or Massachusetts. As a matter of fact, it would be fiscally impossible.

Recognizing these wide disparities in educational opportunities, the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, in advocating passage of the Federal aid bill, observed that "these differences have been continuous over a long period of years, and all of the evidence available indicates that equally great differences will continue indefinitely into the future until and unless the Federal government grants a reasonable amount of aid, at least to those states having the least financial ability to support public education and other public services."

Because of the war the question of Federal assistance has become more insistent. One-third of the 900,000 teachers in this country are new to their jobs. The turnover rate is appalling. Tens of thousands of substandard emergency teaching certificates have been issued since Pearl Harbor. Many of the best-trained teachers have left for higher paying war

(Continued on page 7)

THE KEY REPORTER

Published by the United Chapters of Phi Beta Kappa in November, February, May, and September, at the Rumford Press, Concord, N. H. Editorial and executive offices, 12 East 44th Street, New York 17, N. Y. Advertising rates upon application. Subscription, 20 cents a year, \$1.00 for five years. Entered as second-class matter at the post office at Concord, N. H., under act of March 3, 1897.

HAL MARCH	Editor
HIRAM HAYDN	Consulting Editor
BENNETT CERF	
DOROTHY CANFIELD FISHER	}Book Committee
WALDEMAR KAEMPFERT		
KENNETH B. MURDOCK		
IRITA VAN DOREN		

They Say . . .

To the Editor:

I read with considerable interest the discussion of liberal arts in the Autumn issue. As Professor Quinn points out, much is said these days about "the loss of liberal arts subjects with the shift to engineering, science, and mathematics," though actually mathematics and the other sciences are an integral part of a liberal arts program.

Before enlisting in the Navy, I had occasion to teach mathematics to the Army and Navy units. Judging from my experience in these wartime training programs, I would say that the trend toward mathematics and other sciences does not in itself constitute any real threat to the liberal arts. However, I believe that a definite threat to liberal arts does come from *within* the present mathematics curriculum. Mathematics as one of the liberal arts means to me not merely the mechanical solution of practical problems. Real mathematics is also a way of thinking and a frontier of intellectual development. It should not be bound exclusively by the demands of immediate application. Yet, because of the wartime emergency and the resulting lack of time, many college mathematics courses have degenerated into mere problem-solving exercises — quite removed from the "liberal mathematics" of more normal times.

The above observation is certainly not intended as an indictment of the course adopted by the government and by the schools during the emergency. We found ourselves in a super-technical war with a desperate need for more men who knew some mathematics, some physics, some engineering. There was no alternative. Training had to be stripped to the bare essentials useful in certain particular jobs of war. The true liberal mathematics and pure science in general suffered about as much as the other liberal arts, like Latin and Greek.

One question which concerns some of us at this time is the following. Why were many American young people so ill-prepared in the sciences that this stampede toward "practicalized science" was found necessary? I believe the ultimate source of this difficulty lies in a situation which has alarmed many scholars and teachers. The "progressive education movement," with its admirable aim of making schoolwork more vital and liveable for the student, occasionally overstepped its bounds. Sometimes, real subject matter was almost entirely eliminated in favor of all sorts of miscellaneous activities prompted by the whims of the students themselves. The result was a general lowering of academic standards at all the educational levels.

I do not advocate a return all the way to the three R's. But I do believe that in the postwar world we should guard against that neglect of subject matter which left us educationally unprepared on December 7, 1941. Also, when we plan the return to liberal arts, let us not say, "We shall return the emphasis from mathematics to the liberal arts." Let us rather say, "We shall return to the true liberal arts — in mathematics as well as in the other fields of learning."

WILLIAM A. PIERCE, USNR
DAHLGREN, VIRGINIA

To the Editor:

In THE KEY REPORTER, volume X, number 1, I note an item "NAM-NEA Groups Expand." As a news story, it is well for us to take cognizance of this growing "collaboration," but the general tone of the article was one of approbation. Considering the reactionary character of the NAM, its efforts to interfere with academic freedom and the pressure it has exerted to suppress factual text-books, it would seem to me that the REPORTER might see more cause for alarm than for rejoicing!

CONSTANCE L. ROSENTHAL
PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA

To the Editor:

In the last issue (volume X, number 1) of THE KEY REPORTER, I read of a nationwide series of conferences between education and business leaders. The business leaders, according to the article, are represented by the NAM. It seems unfortunate that the NEA has enough "common problems" with the NAM to warrant such collaboration. For a long time now, the National Association of Manufacturers has been recognized to represent a definitely reactionary, and even fascist, trend in American business. It is a force detrimental to the best interests of business as a whole, and labor in general. The National Association of Manufacturers has been exposed as a spreader of anti-democratic propaganda via radio, press, and other channels it controls for reaching the public.

I find it rather deplorable that educational leaders, who should be one of our greatest forces of progress and democracy in our war today against fascism, should choose to ally themselves with self-appointed and self-announced enemies of democracy in America.

SOPHIE POSMENTIER
NEW YORK, NEW YORK

To the Editor:

You pack more worth-while stuff into the small pages of THE KEY REPORTER than any other publication in America.

TIMOTHY G. REMICK
PINE HILL, NEW YORK

To the Editor:

I have just read in the Winter number of THE KEY REPORTER the paragraph entitled "Against Intolerance," and I think it is one of the finest statements I have seen in the magazine.

There is some feeling in Vineland, where I live, against Jews and colored people, and an organization has been formed which is a branch of the State "Good Will Commission." Some good has already been done, I believe.

When I was a boy there was considerable feeling, first against the Irish, then against the Italians. Now we have an Italian mayor, a Jewish Commissioner and an American-born Commissioner.

GEORGE A. MITCHELL
VINELAND, NEW JERSEY

To the Editor:

In the Winter issue of THE KEY REPORTER I notice a news item about the School of Pan-American Agriculture in Zamorano, Honduras. When you were told that the tuition would be free and that the new school would further the study of tropical agriculture, the information naturally seemed worth space in the REPORTER. It is indeed interesting news but not as "evidence of inter-American good will" as you state in your lead. I don't know whether this noble-sounding sentiment was given you by the United Fruit Company along with the facts about the school or whether your staff so interpreted these facts, but I am writing to say that in any case the sentiment is false, that the enterprise is in no sense noble. The "good will" allegation is merely window-dressing for the merciless exploitation of a helpless little nation by a powerful American corporation.

The United Fruit Company since its founding in 1900 has extracted some three billion dollars in fruit and produce from Caribbean countries. It pays its stockholders some 15 million dollars a year dividends. Its original stock has averaged 17 per cent earnings for 44 years. The little countries themselves receive practically nothing, while at the same time they give away their rich lands, under diplomatic pressure, in return for promises to build railways and roads which are mainly useful to the exploiters. They also, our "good neighbors" in the hot lands, furnish laborers who stagger under the most grueling farm work in the world under constant risk of disease and for coolie labor wages.

It is the policy of the United Fruit Company to build hospitals in the teeming jungles they exploit, since they improve the working efficiency of the native peon laborers; but its directors discourage the building and operation of schools for these natives, since education would rouse them to understand what is being done to them, to demand higher wages, and to insist upon a little civilization. The Central American countries have passed laws requiring schools for native workers on plantations producing fruit for the United Fruit Company's ships, but these laws are largely ignored by the company.

Please note that the new school in Honduras is for the study of agriculture and not of history or economics or government and that it is free. This is all part of the company's policy to attract the keenest and best educated of young men coming from our colleges and bribe them to assist in the entrenched, savage exploitations of our helpless good friends to the south of us. These fine boys who enroll for the new school will be groomed as experts, superintendents, bosses of the poor, illiterate mestizos who will do all the dirty work and if the boys show any sympathy for these poor natives, the "wiser" fruit company heads will tell them that the spigoties are born stupid and drunken and are generally hopeless and not to worry about them.

These are facts not included in the publicity of the United Fruit Company but any official of that company knows they are true. Some of these facts were extracted from a reluctant official of the company. Most regrettable of all is the hypocritical attitude of our State Department about our trade imperialism in South and Central America. Exploitation such as I have described is possible only with the connivance of our government. It fully realizes that with democracies to the south of us instead of dictatorships such exploitation would be impossible, wherefore it recognizes the dictatorships. We're now fighting a second world war inspired by a supposed devotion to democratic ideals. This devotion, however, does not extend to our next-door neighbors. To win them, to bring them freedom, we need no war, we need merely to print the truth rather than the publicity releases of multi-million dollar shipping monopolies.

THOMAS H. UZZELL
STILLWATER, OKLAHOMA

Recommended Reading

PURITANISM AND DEMOCRACY. By Ralph Barton Perry. *New York: Vanguard.* \$5.

Analysis of the puritan and the democratic systems of ideas in American life.

ANYTHING CAN HAPPEN. By George and Helen Waite Papashvily. *New York: Harper.* \$2.

Experience of a Russian immigrant on his way to becoming an American.

THE STORY OF A SECRET STATE. By Jan Karski. *Boston: Houghton Mifflin.* \$3.

Full report of the Polish underground.

BOSTON ADVENTURE. By Jean Stafford. *New York: Harcourt, Brace.* \$2.75.

A novel about Bostonians on both sides of the tracks.

TOMORROW'S BUSINESS. By Beardsley Ruml. *New York: Farrar and Rinehart.* \$2.50.

Views of postwar business by the pay-as-you-go author.

MANY A WATCHFUL NIGHT. By John Mason Brown. *New York: Whittlesey House.* \$2.75.

D-Day and the subsequent battles of France described by an eye-witness.

THE AMERICAN CHARACTER. By Denis Brogan. *New York: Alfred A. Knopf.* \$2.50.

Appraisal of the American people today.

MY COUNTRY. By Russell Davenport. *New York: Simon and Schuster.* \$1.50.

A poem of America.

AN INTELLIGENT AMERICAN'S GUIDE TO THE PEACE. Edited by Sumner Welles. *New York: Dryden.* \$3.75.

Essential facts of the geography, ethnography, and economy of over 80 nations.

EARTH AND HIGH HEAVEN. By Gwethalyn Graham. *Philadelphia: J. P. Lippincott.* \$2.50.

The love story of a Jewish and a Protestant Canadian.

THEY CALLED IT "PURPLE HEART VALLEY." By Margaret Bourke-White. *New York: Simon and Schuster.* \$3.

An account, in words and pictures, of the bitterest phases of the Italian campaign.

WHAT THE NEGRO WANTS. Edited by Rayford W. Logan. *Chapel Hill: Uni-*

versity of North Carolina Press. \$3.50.

Fourteen Negro leaders discuss the desires of their people.

CANNERY ROW. By John Steinbeck. *New York: Viking.* \$2.

A miscellaneous set of characters free of the usual social conventions.

PEOPLE ON OUR SIDE. By Edgar Snow. *New York: Random House.* \$3.50.

Analysis of the forces that are shaping the futures of Russia, China, and India.

DEEP RIVER. By Henrietta Buckmaster. *New York: Harcourt, Brace.* \$2.75.

A novel of the pre-Civil War era portraying the role of the poor whites in the Georgia mountains.

THE CROSS AND THE ARROW. By Albert Maltz. *Boston: Little, Brown.* \$2.75.

Justice expresses itself amid the oppressions of the third Reich in the revolt of a "model" Nazi worker.

Krutch's Johnson

SAMUEL JOHNSON. By Joseph Wood Krutch. *New York: Henry Holt.* 1944. \$3.75.

We can now know more, probably, about Samuel Johnson than about any other English writer. If we did not know him so well, we would undoubtedly be repelled by him. For both Johnson and his biographer, James Boswell, have singularly unattractive traits. Johnson, picturesque as he may seem (never contemptible, of course, as Boswell sometimes reveals himself to be in the *Private Papers*), was prejudiced, dogmatic, and personally an unattractive figure. The more we know of Boswell, the less we think of him, certainly as a man. The more we know of Johnson, the more we esteem him for his independence and bravery, for his positive talents and achievements. As a human phenomenon he interests us because he is such an amazing compound of eccentricity, prejudice, good sense, wit and wisdom. With all Johnson's shortcomings, he was a great man who in his various relationships will always be of interest to the humanist.

With Boswell's *Life* and other older source material, and with the new material, associated with the names of Powell, Balderstone, Scott, Pottle, Tinker, and Clifford, before him, the general biographer and critic would appear to be in a favorable position. Indeed it almost seems that Boswell's *Life* and Johnson's works alone offer enough material to

synthesize and interpret. For Boswell's *Life* is only in a very special sense an artistic or interpretive biography. Boswell, as Mr. Krutch reminds us, had "a genuine admiration for intellectual greatness." Yet one may suspect this admiration of being somewhat indiscriminating when it chose for its objects Voltaire, Rousseau, and Johnson. And indiscriminating is a term that may be applied to Boswell's *Life*.

Mr. Krutch calls the *Life* "naturalistic," thus falling into the common error of assuming that naturalism does not have its own special sort of discrimination or selection. Even after examining the pretty full evidence in the *Private Papers*, we can say in Mr. Krutch's words that Boswell is great because he had "an almost unrivaled sense of what words or gestures or actions reveal personality; and a passionately industrious habit of writing down whatever seemed to him memorable." Surely his greatness does not come from selection leading to design.

The problem of the modern biographer is, then, that of selection and organization of material from the really vast amount available. The obvious need, and not only for the general reader, has been for a full length study of Johnson, as critic, writer, philosopher, that would give the reader a sense of orientation, interpretation, and evolution. This Mr. Krutch has achieved.

Johnson was in a sense a static personality. His prejudices, his basic convictions and ideas, his personal habits and tastes (those admirable and those reprehensible or unfortunate) remained essentially constant. He went through no fascinating philosophical revolution or development. Yet to think of him as changeless is a mistake. Mr. Krutch subtly makes the reader feel a definite sense of evolution. To say that Mr. Krutch achieves this is to pay him, I think, the highest compliment, one which cannot be offered to any previous Johnson biographer. The sense of evolution constitutes a large part of the "interpretation." This is achieved by a most careful selection of incidents and opinions, which are significantly grouped without breaking the chronological pattern. Even when, for example, Mr. Krutch is keenly analyzing Johnson's criticism in its various contexts, we do not lose sight of the whole man and of this man's relation to his moral, intellectual, aesthetic, and social milieu.

WINFIELD H. ROGERS, Eighteenth Century scholar and critic, is head of the Department of English at the Woman's College, University of North Carolina.

Pyle the Stylist

BRAVE MEN. By Ernie Pyle. New York: Henry Holt and Company. 1944. \$3.

Some day an ingenious candidate for the Ph.D. degree is going to obtain vast entertainment and perhaps renown from a study of Ernie Pyle as a stylist. As a propagandist he already engages the serious study of the experts, for his ability to move both the minds and

the emotions of his readers is too obvious to be overlooked. No politician in active practice but would give his right hand for Pyle's ability to herd the voters in any direction that he chooses to take. Luckily, Ernie isn't running for anything, for if he were the election would be over before the ballots were cast, much less counted.

As a propagandist, Pyle is relatively easily explained. He is a man who believes with passionate intensity in the cause he advocates, which is the cause of the common soldier. Pyle never has been able to pump up any great interest in generals and admirals and still less in strategy and tactics. But the plain fighting man, including officers from, say, major down, he frankly, honestly and utterly adores. Naturally, they adore him in return, and a man idolized by the Army is inevitably a powerful man in the country. No, it is just as well that he is not a candidate.

The stylist, however, has been pretty generally ignored, probably because he can be by no means so easily explained. Consider, for example, *Brave Men*, which is merely a continuation of *This Is Your War*. It is written in the same deceptively simple, almost naïve, language. It almost arouses pity for a well-meaning man so obviously out of his depth in trying to write of great events — simple to the point where one is tempted to describe it as crude, terse, austere. It is only later — if at all — that one begins to realize how the thing hit with an impact that Flaubert never achieved, unravelled intricate psychological states with a deftness not unworthy of Proust, painted a mental image with an exactness that would have delighted Pater.

How does he do it? If I knew, I might go out for that Ph.D. myself. All I know is that it happens and that it makes *Brave Men* more than a fine piece of war reporting. It is also a work worth the careful consideration of the academicians. I doubt that Ernie Pyle himself has the faintest idea of how he achieves his effects; but I am persuaded that

those effects are not achieved by accident. Long years of patient struggle with the language are behind them; years of reporting and trying to make the reports true in a larger sense than factually accurate. Ernie Pyle — and his readers — are now collecting handsome returns on the evil days when this man was sweating through his apprenticeship as a newspaper reporter.

GERALD W. JOHNSON, historian and formerly an editorial writer for *The Baltimore Sun*, is now a free-lance newspaperman. He has been writing a daily book review column for *The New York Herald-Tribune*.

A Good Story

THE WINDS OF FEAR. By Hodding Carter. New York: Farrar and Rinehart. 1944. \$2.50.

It all started because of a ginger-colored Negro. Half drunk and wholly belligerent after riding forty-eight hours south from Chicago, he resents being cheated out of his bus seat. He gets "up-itly." He says, "I had a seat and I'm gonna get a seat," and this together with the subsequent fight between him and a half-dozen white men sets in motion the train of events that includes four murders, an accidental death, two attempted rapes, and a lynching.

The first man murdered was Carvell City's marshal, a decent man as his type goes, but too worn out and soft to "hold the niggers in line." Now Carvell City could get a man for marshal who would "put the fear of God into the niggers." Over the protest of a handful of humanitarians, Carvell City got such a man, Cancy Dodd.

But Cancy Dodd gets mixed up with women and liquor and notions of grandeur. He is the clear mirror of all that is blind and ignorant and morbid and hateful in the South. Opposed to him are a father and son, Kirk and Alan Mabry, who run the town's weekly. They are the not-so-clear mirror of all that is good and liberal and helpful and hopeful in the South. Dodd goes too far;

the paper exposes him; and, attempting rape on a colored girl, he is killed.

I do not see how Hodding Carter could possibly have written *The Winds of Fear* without writing a prefatory note; it was meant to be that kind of a book. And yet the prefatory note that he did write worries me. As an editorial the note is fine. But beyond this it is both an apology and an explanation. As either it is supererogatory. Those who require an apology for *The Winds of Fear* should not read it. Those who need an explanation cannot. Finally, as an editorial, the prefatory note leads one to expect a depth of treatment and a range of view that the book does not have.

To say this is not to criticize *The Winds of Fear* adversely. The book compels; it takes by force. From the standpoint of technique and writing, it is not a good work. From any standpoint it is a serious and honest work. Given the historical treatment of the elements with which it deals, the book's honesty is important. In *The Winds of Fear* honesty means exactly what it meant in *Strange Fruit* (if I may be forgiven the comparison): that is, that false concepts in regard to the race problem and the people it engulfs are staggering off to limbo.

Now, honesty is not necessarily truth in writing. It is the aim at truth, the will for truth; and when I say that *The Winds of Fear* is not a wholly truthful book, I am saying only that the author's performance does not quite match his intention. I am saying that the implication that the book's events derive from and are due to an atmosphere overcharged with war hysteria is false. And I am saying also that what the author knows about some of his characters — and especially some of his Negro characters — is not enough to make them live, to make them true: is, indeed, just enough to make them false or wooden or both. His white men of good will lack the spark. His characters from middle class Negro life do not come alive. This latter fact is not strange. White writers in the South do not get on knowledgeable terms with the Negro middle class. Some of them wish to, but it is a part of what Carter calls the "pattern" that they do not. They get on such terms with their cooks, their handymen and their yardboys, and these — as Hodding Carter proves — can make a story. *The Winds of Fear* is a good story.



The Saturday Review of Literature

Winner of the 1944 Mayflower Cup, prize of the North Carolina Society of Mayflower Descendants for the best book by a resident of the state, J. SAUNDERS REDDING is professor of English at Hampton Institute.