

ians would rather believe the popular fables of the day than suffer the jolt of learning the real thing.

To a lesser extent radio programs and magazine articles, with the accompanying advertisements, are causing the same type of resentment here. Most of our radio programs are non-commercial rebroadcasts, and many magazines have overseas editions stripped of all advertising, but regular editions also find their way here and are so widely passed around that soldiers become familiar with the general character of their contents. In magazines the G. I. is interested primarily in things which pertain directly to him as a soldier—fiction in which the main characters are soldiers, articles about the army or about the soldier and the war. But he is embittered and frustrated by what he reads. Popular magazine war-fiction, frankly escapist in nature and meant for home consumption, is no longer wanted even in places where reading matter of any kind is at a premium. The physically miserable and spiritually exhausted doughboy cannot stomach the wonderful life of the fiction soldier with his opportunity furloughs to marry the heroine and his experiences that could never happen to a combat infantryman.

Even more antagonizing are the run-of-the-mill war-effort advertisements. The doughboy is proud of his equipment. He recognizes the production miracle which has provided the arms for him and the soldiers of a dozen other nations. But he has little sympathy with companies which feel it necessary to spend thousands of dollars a month to tell the world that their contributions are the backbone of every fight, that they too are making sacrifices, and that they will continue to make sacrifices until the war is over. And when soldiers themselves appear in the advertisement as part of the text or art work, the G. I. looks in vain for a shred of similarity between him and "those guys."

He has read, recently, of American business men who sought transportation to Belgium a few days after Brussels fell, to "look after their business interests." He has read of Paris importers eager to open shop at once. It is hardly necessary to report how this affects the fighting infantryman, who takes out his disgust on the home front in general.

Finally, there are all the miscellaneous bits of information which reach the front-line soldier through his hometown newspapers and service publications. There are the stories of a town in Texas passing the hat so that General Patton may have a thousand-dollar bill to wave in Berlin, of the Sinatra "riots," of dances for prisoners of war. Tales like these come in every week and damage the solidarity between home front and fighting man.

Accounts of the coddling of German prisoners of war have by this time been pretty well discredited. Just how they started and how they reached the men overseas is not quite clear, but they did reach them and were believed, and that drove another wedge into the soldier-civilian gap. The denials, when they were forthcoming, were not nearly so well circulated as the original stories.

And now the doughboy reads of the elaborate preparations being made at home for the celebration of victory in Europe—of barbers planning to leave their lathered customers in their chairs, of storekeepers preparing to board up windows, of arguments over whether liquor stores should or should not stay open. I don't know how the soldiers in the Apennines will react the day Germany capitulates. They will be happy, of course, but I rather imagine there will be a note of dignity in their rejoicing, a quiet thankfulness for themselves and regret for their friends who aren't there. These men aren't sure how people figure it back home, but as far as they are concerned there is always the Pacific.

Racial Dialectic: Missouri Style

BY CAREY McWILLIAMS

IN December, 1938, the United States Supreme Court ruled that Missouri must either admit Lloyd Gaines, a Negro, to the law school of the University of Missouri or provide, within the state, educational facilities equal in every respect to those available at the state university. The state court made a similar ruling in 1940 on the application of Lucille Bluford to attend the school of journalism at the University of Missouri.

The implications of the two decisions not only for the border state of Missouri but for the entire South were immediately recognized. The leading Southern newspapers expressed the view that there was no point in trying to evade them and that "skeleton graduate courses" for Negroes would eventually have to be established in all state universities. "Time," said the Raleigh, Missouri, *News-Observer*, "has moved under our feet."

The smallest law school in the world is now functioning at 4300 Ferdinand Street, in the heart of the Negro district of St. Louis. It is the law school which Lincoln University,

the state-supported Negro university, set up in 1939 in response to the mandate of the Supreme Court in the Gaines case. Seven students are enrolled—four in the first year, three in the senior year. The all-Negro faculty consists of three full-time instructors, one part-time instructor, and a librarian; there is also a clerical and secretarial staff. The school is housed in a building that would accommodate six or seven hundred students. Enrolment cannot be increased by the admission of white students, for this would be contrary to existing constitutional and statutory provisions, and it is doubtful whether even Japanese American evacuees from the West Coast could be admitted if any applied. Four of the present students are from St. Louis, one from the District of Columbia, one from South Carolina, and one from Louisiana.

In part the low attendance is due to the war, for thirty-four students were enrolled in 1939 and thirty in 1940, 1941, and 1942. The school was closed in 1943 for lack of "properly accredited" students—it is rumored that the

failure to approve the credentials of applicants that year was part of a scheme to close the school altogether. There are only two Negro law schools in the country, the other being at Howard University, and Negro students throughout the South have written to Lincoln expressing an interest in attending the law school after the war. A number of Negro soldiers have also indicated their desire to enrol.

It is possible, therefore, that the law school may later become largely self-supporting. To the extent that it does, however, the principle of segregation will become more firmly established. For as the institution and its faculty expand, a new set of vested interests will be created. At present it costs the state more than \$2,500 per year, per pupil, to maintain this Jim Crow institution, while the cost of sending students through the regular law school at the University of Missouri is but a fraction of this amount. Credit must be given the state for its compliance with the letter, if not the spirit, of the decision in the Gaines case. The law school is a first-rate institution. It has been approved by the Missouri Board of Bar Examiners and by the Association of American Law Schools. It boasts a law library of 31,000 volumes, one of the three largest law-school libraries in the South; its instructors are thoroughly competent, and its graduates have been readily admitted to the bar.

On the campus of Lincoln University at Jefferson City may be found the nation's most unique school of journalism, created in response to the decision in the Bluford case. Again the state has technically complied with the law. The school is housed in an attractive building; it has a workable library; it receives a large number of newspapers; it has a good print shop; the faculty is excellent; and the students get practical experience in editing a weekly newspaper. When it was first established, the faculty of the school of journalism of the state university at Columbia motored over to Lincoln three times a week to conduct classes, but the school now has a resident, full-time all-Negro faculty. About twelve students are enrolled. I visited a classroom large enough for forty or fifty students in which an instructor sat behind a desk with one student in front of him. It is possible that Negro students in the law and journalism schools are actually getting better instruction—certainly more individual attention—than they would at Columbia. The loneliness, however, for faculty and students, must be acute at times.

It is interesting to note that this ridiculous situation is not looked on with approval by the students at the University of Missouri. When the Lincoln Law School was opened in 1939, white students from Eden Seminary (Washington University) and from the state university established a picket line around the premises and carried placards with such inscriptions as "Old Jim Crow Is Dead" and "Smoke in St. Louis Is Bad—Prejudice Is Worse." In a poll taken at the University of Missouri last spring 60 per cent of the students favored the admission of Negroes to all divisions of the university and 70 per cent favored their admission to the professional schools. When the University of Missouri and the University of Iowa debated the question "Should Negroes be admitted to the state universities?" Missouri upheld the negative with some reluctance. After the debate a vote was taken among the students present. The result was 216 for the affirmative, 93 opposed.

Recently a delegation of white girls from the University of Missouri appeared on the campus of Lincoln University to interview some of the Negro girls. They asked three questions: (1) Would you be interested in attending the Missouri University School of Journalism if Negroes were admitted? (2) Would you expect to live in the same dormitories and belong to the same sororities? (3) Would you expect to date the white fellows on the campus? To each of these questions they received emphatic affirmative answers. The curious young ladies from Columbia seemed not merely satisfied but actually pleased by the answers. One of the delegates, a Jewish girl, said that the answers to the second and third questions had given her some new ideas.

The Missouri pattern of race relations was further complicated when St. Louis University decided last spring to open all its courses to Negro students. At present seventy-seven Negroes are in attendance. Contrary to the predictions of disaster, the non-Negro enrolment, despite the war, has increased 17 per cent since Negroes were admitted; the enrolment of white women has increased from 2,122 to 2,656. There has been no trouble in classrooms or on the campus, and white parents have withdrawn neither their children nor their financial support.

An interesting story lies behind the opening of St. Louis University to Negroes. Over a year ago, in the face of opposition from the hierarchy, notably from the Archbishop of St. Louis, some of the Jesuit instructors at the university began a campaign to force the admission of Negroes. Their efforts reached a climax in February, 1944, when Father Claude H. Heithaus, assistant professor of classical archaeology, delivered a militant sermon on race prejudice at the students' mass in University Church. "Ignorance," he said, "is the school of race prejudice, and provincialism is its tutor. Its memory is stuffed with lies and its mind is warped by emotionalism. Pride is its book and snobbery is its pen. All the hatreds and fears, all the cruelties and prejudices, of childhood are perpetuated by it. It blinds the intellect and it hardens the heart. Its wisdom is wonderful and fearful; for it never learns what is true, and it never forgets what is false." At the close of this memorable sermon—which should be required reading for all Catholics—Father Heithaus made a dramatic appeal to the students. "For the wrongs that have been done to the Mystical Body of Christ through the wronging of its colored members, we owe the suffering Christ an act of public reparation. Let us make it now. Will you please rise? Now repeat this prayer after me. 'Lord Jesus, we are sorry and ashamed for all the wrongs that white men have done to Your colored children. We are firmly resolved never again to have any part in them, and to do everything in our power to prevent them. Amen.'" The entire congregation rose in response to the appeal and repeated the prayer. Copies of the sermon had been printed in advance of its delivery so that no subsequent pressure, however powerful, could force a retraction. The *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* gave it wide publicity. The profound impression made by Father Heithaus on the Catholic community left the hierarchy no alternative to opening the doors of the university to Negroes.

The action of St. Louis University, with its attendant suc-

cess, has placed both the University of Missouri and Washington University (largely Protestant-supported) in an extremely embarrassing position. The embarrassment is only enhanced by the curious circumstance that both institutions, while denying admission to Negroes, offer no objection to Japanese Americans. A dozen or so Japanese Americans are enrolled in the various professional schools of Washington University. Sooner or later the absurdity of separate professional schools—emphasized by the successful experiment at St. Louis University—is bound to bring about changes in policy at both Washington and Missouri. What is the University of Missouri going to do when a Negro

applies for admission to its school of medicine or its school of mines? In either case, technical compliance, after the current pattern, would involve an expenditure of several million dollars. Fortunately, the people of Missouri will vote on a new constitution this month. Under Article IX of the proposed draft, the legislature could provide, if it wished, for non-segregated schools.

Characterized by one Southern newspaper as "a pebble dropped into a calm pool," the Gaines decision has set in motion a series of events which must ultimately culminate in the abolition of segregation in state-supported professional schools throughout the South.

Under What Banner?

BY JOHN SCHOLTE NOLLEN

IT IS time to bring the discussion of "peace-time military conscription" out of the clouds of rhetoric and generalization and to look at the concrete plans of our military authorities in their factual setting. The army command proposes a standing army of about 300,000 men, an equal number in the National Guard (as an evident concession to state pride), a permanent reserve of 400,000. In addition to this permanent establishment—totaling about one million men, presumably raised by voluntary enlistment—it asks for the compulsory conscription of all boys at age eighteen, amounting annually to about another million, for one year's military training. These young soldiers would then remain in reserve for perhaps six to eight years, receiving refresher training in the summer.*

Thus after eight years had passed, and thereafter in perpetuity, we should have about ten million men actively prepared for military service, and presumably all under training in the summer. This would of course imply an enormous staff of officers, who would need to be professionally trained in order to be kept at the height of ever-developing military science. It would also imply a military equipment somewhat on the scale of our present war equipment.

This grandiose plan for our military preparedness in time of peace can be justified by only one assumption, which is not unnaturally in the minds of our military leaders as an article of professional faith—namely, that there will be another world war within a few years; in which case the military prophets are quite clear that this country would be the first to be attacked. By whom? That question is left hanging in the air.

Meanwhile another presupposition is exercising the minds of the best political and economic authorities in the United Nations—namely, that it is possible to set up an international organization that will bring an assurance of peace, not only by curbing any aggression at the source, but, even more importantly, by removing the common incentives for war. Our

country took the lead in implementing such international cooperation by calling a food conference, which was followed by Bretton Woods and Dumbarton Oaks, and will be followed soon by the San Francisco conference. Out of our experience with national political organization, we know that such a world organization will not meet the demands of perfectionists at the start; it will naturally have faults which the future may correct. Can it be relied upon to keep the peace? Winston Churchill said last September to Lord Cecil: "This war could easily have been prevented if the League of Nations had been used with courage and loyalty by the associated nations." If the enfeebled League, without the cooperation of the United States, could have been so used, then surely the contemplated organization of the United Nations, with the active participation of the United States, offers a guaranty of future peace for which no unilateral military preparation by any one nation, however extensive, can serve as a substitute.

The bills for peace-time conscription laid before Congress allege "security" as the incentive for the proposed legislation. But recent history proves conclusively that in modern war no nation can be secure by its own might. France felt quite secure behind its Maginot Line and boasted of the best army in the world. Germany was assured that its invincible, conquering *Wehrmacht* and preponderant air force placed it beyond any danger of attack. Japan seemed in an impregnable position, shielded by the wide Pacific in its conquest of boundless natural resources. England is an armed camp, powerfully defended by sea and in the air, but millions of men and weapons are no defense against the V-bombs that have devastated London. Uniting against the threat of war is no longer a matter of choice for the nations; it has become a grim and inescapable necessity. There is no longer any such thing as unilateral security. Safety through national defense is a mirage. And the new weapons that are already foreshadowed in this war make the hope of an isolated peace more illusory.

We cannot have it both ways. We must pin our faith either

* This refresher training every summer would be necessary to keep the personnel up to date.

Copyright of Nation is the property of Nation Company, L. P. and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.