The Classical Principle: LaRouche Remembers

I haven’t seen it, but a professional actor and friend of ours in California, Robert Beltran, has produced a play from the 1940’s by Clifford Odets. Clifford Odets is a writer of plays, dramas, which are well known to people of my generation, from the 1930’s and 1940’s. He went on to Hollywood, and he had a tragic life, in the sense that he allowed himself—in the play, which is autobiographical—he allowed himself to be corrupted by adapting to Hollywood, and then realized he’d adapted to evil; and then committed suicide as a result of seeing his life as futile, and the outcome hopeless, that he’d gone too far. That was wrong. But nonetheless, it gets the point across.

So therefore, in this case of Odets and his drama, which is produced by professional actors—and is rather moving, as I understand—you have a case of the Classical principle of drama being used in a modern setting. Because the reality was, that from the period from the end of the war, World War II—from the summer of 1944, where a decent Vice President, Henry Wallace, was replaced by the Democratic Party, through the nomination of a bad, very bad, Vice President, Harry Truman—and thus, the sickness and death of Roosevelt led to the evil which took over the United States in the post-war period. Roosevelt was no longer there, and Truman went over to the other, Utopian side.

During this period of evil, I saw a transformation of my fellow soldiers and similar people, who in the main had been fairly good in their attitude about the post-war world, when I knew them during times of military service. But immediately at the end of the war, the United States made a right-wing turn; and what we called “McCarthyism” later on, was actually “Trumanism,” which began in 1945-46. It began essentially with the bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and the Iron Curtain speech by Churchill and Truman’s endorsement of it. We had a right-wing terror, police-state terror, in the United States. This produced a transformation in the U.S. population. It turned people who had been my friends, into pigs, who adapted to the terror, out of what they perceived to be their self-interest. They turned against each other like animals. So, what Odets presents in this drama, as presented by these actors, is that situation.

So here we have a truly Classical tradition in drama, by a person who might be figured a minor dramatist in the Classical tradition, but a skilled one, who presents a very anguished picture of the horror, the corruption which seized so many people in the United States in the immediate post-war period. We look back at early history, and we see that. And that kind of understanding into ourselves, is the understanding of what we need to know to determine how we’re going to respond, in terms of the effect of our decision on not only the society around us now, but on honoring the past who made us possible, and providing a basis for the hope of the future for those who come after us. That is what is essentially necessary. There’s no other drama that’s worth doing, and there’s no other way to perform Shakespeare, or to perform Schiller.

—from a cadre school discussion, Nov. 26, 2003
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his, performed during the 1930’s and later, and because I have relived the times, the experience, and the historically specific relevance of that drama’s subject for today’s living population, and also generations which followed, and will follow yet.

The essence of that drama could not be grasped, or performed, unless the performance transported the audience into the period from the 1932 election of Franklin Roosevelt, through the growing optimism of the late 1930’s and June 1944, and the subsequent moral decline of the U.S. and its people from summer 1944 to the present. There is no audience today, which, wittingly or not, does not have what Odets’ play represents, embedded within them. The moral degeneration of the American people in general, can not be understood without taking into account what the particularity of the drama epitomizes about the American experience of nearly a century, to present date.

We lived through the Depression, the rise to optimism under Franklin Roosevelt, and the great betrayal known variously as the despicable Roy M. Cohn’s “McCarthyism,” and, more accurately, as “Trumanism.” To understand the American today, one must be able to recognize those experiences, and the transmission of the effects of those experiences, across more than three living generations, to the present moment.

Such a case as that of Odets and his relevant tragic play, exemplifies the essential meaning of both history and dramatic Classical artistic composition, both wrapped in one for their functional importance for what people do and feel today.

I have adopted that as an illustration here, because it is a bridging of the principal events of world history during my actual lifetime to date. People who do not know that set of connections, that process of unfolding development over this period as I do, really know almost nothing about themselves today. For that reason, any Classical drama whose chosen subject is specific to the period of Odets’ play, must not attempt to move the significance of the events portrayed from the immediate time-frame in which the drama is situated. To move it to the 1960’s, or the 1970’s, or today, would be a damnable lie.

—from a campaign pamphlet prologue, Nov. 30, 2003

producing great works of art that could improve the world. Instead, he finds himself the captive of the studio system, which asserts total control over what he can and cannot do in films. The story is autobiographical, as Odets came to Hollywood after establishing himself as a dramatist in New York City, where he had begun his career as a member of the experimental, leftist Group Theatre. He had hoped that, given the positive changes which had occurred during the FDR Presidency, he could use his writing skills to produce films that would inspire audiences to pursue the ideals of social and economic justice which he believed to be the basis of American greatness.

We see these idealistic beliefs in Charlie Castle at the beginning of the play. Charlie, who we later learn is a World War II veteran, is being interrogated by an influential gossip columnist, who is probing for salacious material to feed to her millions of hungry readers (some things never change!). While poking around to find out if he and his wife have separated, or if she is contributing funds to questionable causes, she says, “The first time we met, all you’d talk about was FDR.” And Charlie replies, “I believed in FDR.”

Thus, from the outset, Odets conveys to the audience that an actual historical event—the death of FDR—is a matter of central concern in the drama. For Charlie, as for much of the nation, FDR’s death became a metaphor for the death of idealism, of hope for a better future. Charlie returns to this theme often, as he is sinking ever deeper into a seemingly inescapable trap—one set largely by his own embrace of the corrupting influence of Hollywood.

We see this, for example, in an intense argument with the one character who seems to stand up to the corruption, Hank Teagle, who serves as an explicit Horatio (Charlie’s nickname for him) to Charlie’s Hamlet. When Teagle challenges him to fight to return to his ideals, Charlie says that is no longer possible: “When I came home from Germany, I saw most of the war dead were here, not in Africa and Italy. And Roosevelt was dead, and the war was only last week’s snowball fight; and we plunged ourselves, all of us, into the noble work of making the buck reproduce itself.”

The drama is full of this kind of dialogue, as Odets uses these characters to demonstrate the depth of corruption in the whole society—his society. This is difficult for a dramatist, as it is much easier to make such truthful comments about times past. Yet Odets faced his society with courageous truthfulness, and pungent observations.

Thus, Odets takes on the post-war American obsession with being “popular”—what Lyndon LaRouche often refers to as “wishing to be overheard as having the right opinion.” When one character states that the eagle