

foundly on so many of the problems which preoccupy Koestler, he appears to know virtually nothing. If he did, he might at least have been able to propound a somewhat more sophisticated account of the 'split' which has so strongly emerged in the psyche of Western man since the Renaissance: between the 'masculine', ordering, rational functions which have created modern science, and those 'feminine', intuitive functions which have increasingly dominated art. In the almost total bankruptcy of both science and art, we today see the futility of all attempts to find meaning 'one-sidedly'. The only road back to meaning lies through a reintegration of both 'halves' of the psyche. The poignancy of Koestler is that, for all his awareness of the limitations of reason, he knows nothing else; he is all *yang* and no *yin* – as shows nowhere more painfully than in his pitiful chapters 'analysing' art and humour, full of such sentences as: "matrices" are mental holons...controlled by canonical rules, but guided by feedbacks from the outer and inner environment... ordered into "vertical" abstract hierarchies which interlace in "horizontal" networks and cross-references (cf. "arborescence" and "reticulation"). Here is a poor little fox, baying at the moon, and talking pure gibberish.

End of empire

Henry B. Ryan

Allies of a Kind: The United States, Britain, and the War Against Japan, 1941-1945 Christopher Thorne (Hamish Hamilton £15.00)

Imperialism at Bay: The United States and the Decolonisation of the British Empire, 1941-1945 Wm. Roger Louis (Oxford £12.50)

Christopher Thorne's book casts its net much wider than the title suggests and studies almost the entire range of Anglo-American relations during the second world war. Furthermore, he extends his peripheral investigations back to the nineteenth century and forward to the Vietnamese war. The scholarship this book represents is truly remarkable, for Thorne has combed through an enormous amount of archival material on three continents and provided his book with the basis for excellent new information and insights. And yet he seems so determined to create a portrait of Perfidious Columbia that one tends to be sceptical, not perhaps of his facts, but surely of his emphasis.

Is it really necessary for us to be reminded, for example, that American democratic, egalitarian ideals were compromised in the nineteenth-century period of expansion? Can that horse still be alive?

Angus Wilson THE STRANGE RIDE OF RUDYARD KIPLING

His Life and Works

"Ought to take its place at once amongst the finest of this generation's literary biographies."
C. P. Snow, *Financial Times*
Illustrated £6.90

P. N. Furbank

E. M. FORSTER: A LIFE

Volume 1: The Growth of the Novelist 1879-1914

"Mr Furbank writes uncommonly well, is perceptive and displays the frankness he promised to his subject."

Raymond Mortimer, *Sunday Times*

to be published on March 20

Volume 2: Polycrates' Ring 1914-1970

Milovan Djilas

WARTIME

"Extraordinary and brilliant memoir of those terrible years... Djilas has written not only his best book – which is saying a lot – but also the finest account of the Yugoslav partisan struggle."

Adam Roberts, *New Society*

Photographs

£7.95

Heinrich Böll

MISSING PERSONS

and other Essays

An essential addition to the Böll canon, this collection of writings from 1952 to the present day includes his views on politics, on writing and fellow writers and the arts.

Translated by Leila Vennewitz

£5.00

Dan Jacobson

THE CONFESSIONS OF JOSEF BAI SZ

"A marvellous achievement... there is more to praise than I have space for; read it for yourselves and see."

C. J. Driver, *New Review*

"A first-class book... startlingly original, beautifully written, funny and moving..."

Auberon Waugh, *Evening Standard*

£3.90

Walker Percy

LANCELOT

"Beautifully observed and stimulating."

Anne Redmon, *Sunday Times*

£4.50

David Cook

WALTER

"Readable, funny, unsentimental and well-shaped, this is, in a quiet way, a shattering book."

Janice Elliott, *Sunday Telegraph*

An Alison Press Book

£4.25

Secker & Warburg

Pursuing a theme of American hypocrisy he adds, 'likewise there was to be nothing new about American protestations during the second world war that their determination to acquire new island strongholds in the Pacific was essentially disinterested and unselfish'. If you don't get the point here on p.21, you will by p.730. In his favour, Thorne accurately shows how American self-righteousness rankled with Europeans who were subjected to lectures on colonial reform; obviously it still does.

America's racism, including amongst its troops, is a matter Thorne refers to frequently. The first time he does so is to make the valid point that it helped lead to false American calculations in Asia throughout this century. Yet were American soldiers really such extraordinary racists? More than other soldiers, including their British counterparts, as Thorne suggests? I don't feel it is proven. He says they called Indians 'wogs' (one wonders where they learned a foreign expression like that), and Chinese 'slopeys'. To Americans their Japanese enemies were 'Japs' and 'rats' and no treatment could be too harsh for them. Meanwhile, their President displayed an interest in theories of physiological determinants of national behaviour: skull sizes is the example given. At a later date American soldiers called the Vietnamese 'gooks' and their general, Westmoreland, said the Vietnamese reacted to suffering and death in a 'non-Western manner'. Here Thorne, in what is far from the only example of parenthetical innuendo, says '(he did not actually use the term "sub-human")'. He adds that the conviction expressed by Westmoreland lay behind My Lai and the tactics of US forces in Vietnam and concludes, 'The degree of continuity [with second world war racial attitudes] is evident'.

But it is not evident. All this is in fact extremely questionable social science theorising by a man who is as far out of his field as Roosevelt was with cranial theories and making a very broad assertion backed mainly by insinuation. It is a great shame because the element of racial thinking in the second world war on all sides and especially in regard to the Pacific war is an excellent topic for investigation, and it is to Thorne's credit that he points it out, but unfortunately the study is marred by his inability to approach it objectively.

Thorne is especially determined to cast Roosevelt in the role of a buffoon, unlike Roger Louis, who considers him to have been astute to the last days of his life, however disorganised an administrator, a point upon which both authors agree. It must be admitted, however, when we read at the opening of Thorne's book that Roosevelt 'was burbling away in his hare-brained fashion', that we are served notice of the historical perspective we will encounter.

Comparing Roosevelt to Churchill, he states, 'To Churchill, his friendship with and loyalty to the President were sacred, however much they may have been based upon hard political calculation. For the President,

however, this was certainly not so to the same degree. . . in being less genuine and less loyal to his transatlantic partner, he was the smaller man'. Even if one accepts that a sacred friendship could be based on hard political calculation, this analysis overlooks the fact that Churchill had to have the friendship of the American president, whoever that might have been. Britain's only chance to remain in Great Power society, where Churchill clearly wanted her, was to make a marriage, and the only suitable candidate for a spouse was the United States. Roosevelt, on the other hand, wanted to see created a kind of postwar world organisation which would depend on harmonious relations among the great powers. As a result, American officials worried constantly that the United States and Great Britain might seem to be 'ganging up' on the Soviets which would make them more difficult to deal with than they already were. Consequently, Roosevelt deliberately held Churchill at arm's length from late 1943 on for exactly the same kind of political reasons that made Churchill want to be in close. Comparative personal statures of the two had little to do with it.

I regret to spend so much space criticising a book that has great value. Thorne has, for example, illuminated many issues that vexed the Anglo-American relationship, particularly the colonial question, and has documented the 'confusion and ambiguity' of American policy toward the Far East, and especially China, throughout the war.

Wm. Roger Louis's book could not be a greater contrast; it is a monument of balance. A smaller book, and with a much more limited focus, i.e. the issue of international trusteeship for colonial areas in the postwar period, it nonetheless covers much of the same material as does Thorne's. It is a fascinating study of interaction between two governments, British and American, and between various departments within those governments. The British Colonial Office is shown to have had a genuine, if paternalistic, concern with improving the conditions in the colonies, as in fact did the Foreign Office. Nevertheless, trusteeship was an official American notion, and most members of HMG who were concerned with the problem, especially Churchill, were emphatically opposed to it.

Thought about international trusteeship did not follow national lines. For example, Roosevelt and Attlee as well as the Labour Party and the State Department were in agreement regarding the desirability of international control of colonial areas, anathema to Churchill and many in his party. Similarly, American military chiefs and British Conservative statesmen, often fierce antagonists, agreed that the US should take over unilaterally islands the Japanese had held under League of Nations mandates. They were opposed in this matter by the American President and the State Department, among others.

Louis concludes that Roosevelt and some American officials hoped to liquidate the

British Empire in part via international trusteeship for colonial areas, 'but, in fact, from about 1943 into the period of the cold war the general policy of the American government, in pursuit of security, tended to support rather than break up the British Imperial system. It was an awareness of changing times rather than demands from Washington that led the British progressively to decolonise the Empire'.

Psychoanalytic psychology

Hans Keller

Toys and Reasons Erik H. Erikson (Marion Boyars £5.95)
To Have or to Be? Erich Fromm (Jonathan Cape £4.95)

Considering my attitude to psychology and my preoccupations within that discipline, it was not, *a priori*, likely that I should often agree with Stuart Sutherland, the distinguished Professor of Experimental Psychology at the University of Sussex, and especially with his position *vis-à-vis* psychoanalysis, whose achievements he does not exactly overrate. Add to this that Erik H. Erikson has, as a psychoanalyst, a big name in America, where they like such things as 'ritualisms', not to speak of 'sapientism', and you will expect my disagreement with Professor Sutherland about *Toys and Reasons* to be downright violent.

And, indeed, when he calls the book 'pretentious and unilluminating drivel', and consoles the baffled reader with the reflection that 'nobody can understand nonsense', I must charge him with unscientific over-politeness. It is one thing to be unilluminating; it is another to succeed in consistent obscurantism throughout an entire volume, whose very slimness is obscured by the obesity of the words within. It is one thing to face nonsense with courteous incomprehension; it is another to look behind it all and perceive Erikson's wrong sense: via childhood play, it inspires, for instance, his pseudo-psychoanalytic mystification of art. One would feel tempted to describe his analysis as *obscurum per obscurius*, were it not for the fact that great art isn't obscure in the first place, but only becomes so after Erikson has dealt with it — amongst many other things, such as science, life, politics and, of course, ritualisation, not to speak of de-ritualisation:

But let us not forget that to be magically convincing, the painter must be in technical command of an art providing a living style for the play with forms. Only then will his work appeal to the deepest needs of the viewer and confirm faith with demonstrated truth.

Having got his play into art, and art itself