

UNIVERSITY PRESS ISSUE



REPORTS FROM THE CAMPUSES

- 17 **THE FAR EAST**, by HAROLD H. FISHER
- 18 **ART HISTORY**, by S. LANE FAISON, JR.
- 19 **POLITICAL SCIENCE**, by PETER ODEGARD
- 20 **THE CLASSICS**, by C. A. ROBINSON, JR.
- 22 **SOCIOLOGY**, by C. WRIGHT MILLS
- 23 **THE HISTORY OF IDEAS**, by FRANKLIN L. BAUMER

THE SATURDAY REVIEW publishes this, its Twelfth Annual University Press Issue, on the eve of the annual convention of the Association of American University Presses, meeting at White Plains, New York, May 2 to 4.

In its University Press Issue last year [April 4, 1953], SR advanced the proposition that many of the ideas, much of the information, and a large part of the attitudes of the intelligent man in the street a generation hence are being developed on the campuses of American colleges and universities today. In the dissemination of these ideas and attitudes within the intellectual community and among the lay public, one of the chief roles is being played by the American press.

Last year SR published reports by scholars on the investigations now going on in seven fields (American history, European history, international law and politics, literature and criticism, philosophy, economics, and anthropology) which the university presses are helping to make part of the layman's consciousness.

This year, on this and the following pages, SR publishes reports on half a dozen other fields. Because of considerations of space, the surveys do not attempt to cover their fields exhaustively, but the examples they offer are all representative and significant.



Our Asian Destiny

By HAROLD H. FISHER, *chairman of the Hoover War Library; professor of history, Stanford University.*

ON THE day the Geneva conference on the Far East met to consider, among other things, how to stop or how not to stop the war in Indochina, the Stanford University Press published "The Struggle for Indochina," by Ellen J. Hammer, prepared under the auspices of the Institute of Pacific Relations. University presses are not expected to time their books as perfectly as this. One naturally wonders, in these

murky days, whether this is the result of astute planning, a lucky coincidence, or a sinister plot. Regardless of how this question may be answered by reviewers or by Congressional committees, it is surely significant that today a serious book about Indochina is important and timely for all thoughtful citizens.

In the past ten or twelve years, probably more Americans have been on military or peaceful missions to Asia than in the remainder of our entire national history. They have been serving, in one fashion or another, our "national interest," which becomes increasingly difficult to define.

We Americans have also had to pay taxes because of what has happened in these lands. Years ago, historians used to speak of the age of discovery, the growth of commerce and colonization as the "Expansion of Europe." Not so long ago books were being written on the theme of the "awakening of the ancient East." Now we are experiencing an "Expansion of Asia" and an awakening of the complacent West in the sense that what Asians believe, think, say, and do, greatly concerns us and the rest of the Western world and may, in fact, decide the fate of our institutions.

In the preface to Miss Hammer's

book, Rupert Emerson writes that the United States "has entangled itself in a war in a distant corner of Asia in which it resolutely does not want to participate and from which it equally resolutely cannot abstain." This war, Miss Hammer explains, is one that "springs from the total political and economic experience of the Vietnamese people, going back many centuries. But it has been shaped by the experience of the recent past."

We have become entangled in this war because our policy makers believe that if the Communists win in this corner of Asia, they will win in the other corners, and that it is vital to our national interest to prevent this. There is an unacknowledged recognition that a war that "springs from the total political and economic experience" of a people cannot be won by threats of massive retaliation, with A-bombs or H-bombs. Most of the specialists in these areas and their problems, recognize that while ability to meet military aggression is necessary, it is not enough. They know, as Miss Hammer puts it, that "Indochina is a test of the American ability to offer a positive answer to Communism in something besides military terms." Since 1945 we have been feeling around for some answer to Communism in Asia. We have had some sensational failures; we have also had some successes which may be more significant in the long run than they appear to be at present.

The most significant development of the last decade has been the climax of the Asian revolt against colonialism. This revolt has included not only demands for national independence, but movements for agrarian reform, equality between Asians and non-Asians, and modernization—which means the elimination of "feudalism," the conquest of ignorance, disease, and poverty through the use of science, technology, and administrative skills. In general, Americans favor all the objectives of the Asian revolt. During the occupation of Japan, by one means or another, we prevailed upon the Japanese, the most modernized of Asians, to adopt several of these reforms that they had not already achieved. We gave moral and political support to Indian and Indonesian independence and fulfilled our promise of independence to the Philippines. And yet, in 1954, we seem to have won the unenviable role of chief imperialist menace. As a Japanese friend explained to me, the words "American" and "imperialist" are as inseparable among Japanese intellectuals as "damned" and "Yankee" used to be in the Deep South.

How does it happen that, in the

(Continued on page 48)



Pathmarking Our Artistic Heritage

By S. LANE FAISON, JR., *professor of the history of art, Williams College; author of "Manet."*

MY FRIEND and fellow alumnus of Williams College, James Thrall Soby, once told me that he attributes the beginning of his interest in modern art to the purchase of a color print after Maxfield Parrish from an itinerant salesman in Williamstown, Mass. When it began to bore him he began to wonder why, and that was the end of the beginning.

It is not recorded that Mr. Soby took the courses then being given at Williams by one of America's great teachers of art history, Professor Karl E. Weston. This is unfortunate because I should have liked to make capital of it as an example of the impact of the campus on the mind of a very intelligent layman of the Stutz-Bearcat Age. I shall have to be content to cite three museum directors, Edgar Richardson (Detroit), Gordon Washburn (Pittsburgh), and Gordon Smith (Manchester, N. H.), who enthusiastically acknowledge the influence of Professor Weston's teaching in shaping their careers.

For in the transfer of the fruits of academic teaching and research in art-history from the campus to the mind of the intelligent, curious, and interested man in the street the art museum serves as intermediary. An interesting case in point was the exhibition called "The Dark Ages," which the Worcester Art Museum offered in 1937. The catalogue paid homage to Professor Charles Rufus Morey of Princeton University, whose lifelong study of Mediterranean and Western art from late antiquity to Romanesque times made the very term "Dark Ages" all but obsolete. The Museum was well aware of the irony of its title, and the catalogue emphasized the brilliance of color, design, and workmanship of what was shown. Furthermore, a seminar of scholars, many of them trained by Professor Morey at Princeton or at New York University, accompanied the exhibition itself; and thus the

event as a whole had results which influenced, then and subsequently, the understanding of this phase of cultural history.

These results were put to use, ten years later, when the Walters Art Gallery of Baltimore, organized a still more ambitious exhibition of Early Christian and Byzantine Art. On this new occasion, Princeton University and the Dumbarton Oaks Foundation collaborated with the staff of the Walters Art Gallery. Leading university scholars, like Professors A. M. Friend of Princeton and Wilhelm Koehler of Harvard, were freely consulted. Once again, the visitor could experience at first hand the fruits of the labors of the best minds in the field.

The past decade has witnessed a remarkable growth of interest in Spanish painting before El Greco. It used to be rare to find such art exhibited in American museums, but today many of them show Spanish examples alongside the ubiquitous early Italians. If such a change in taste can be said to have had a single cause, Professor Chandler R. Post of Harvard seems to be primarily responsible for it. Many of our museum directors were students in his pioneering course in Spanish art, and every art library subscribes to his "A History of Spanish Painting," a corpus which has now reached its eleventh volume, not counting volumes-in-parts. As modern taste resurrects ever more variants of "primitive" art, the publications of Professor Walter W. S. Cook of New York University on Spanish Romanesque painting, will undoubtedly stimulate collecting in this field, and the inevitable and happy result will be more examples of good quality in our public museums for the edification of the man off the street. The Cloisters in New York City, with its frescoes, and the Boston Museum of Fine Arts, with an entire twelfth-century apse, have already set a major example. A younger scholar preëminent in Spanish painting of the Golden Age, Professor Martin Soria of Michigan State College

(Continued on page 50)