

Isolationism, Old and New

By LEONARD P. LIGGIO

PART 1

The Old Isolationism

During the 1964 Democratic National Convention, the American people waited while Lyndon Johnson met with the two senators, Thomas Dodd and Hubert Humphrey, between whom he would choose his vice-president. For those who were not confused by the superficial differences between them, the meeting of the three symbolized one of the major traditions in American politics. Johnson, Dodd, and Humphrey had one major common denominator: their consistent and unswerving support of American imperialism. Johnson was a member of the Southern congressional bloc that was a major force for American intervention in World War II; he supported the Truman Administration's launching of the Cold War and maintained it during the succeeding years; and he was a major proponent of the heavy defense budgets for both strategic missiles and the smaller armaments for conventional limited wars whereby US imperialism is maintained around the globe. Senator Dodd's career as a government bureaucrat and a congressional advocate of the Cold War was interrupted by service as the chief trial prosecutor against German political officials at the Nuremberg trials. Senator Humphrey had risen to mayor of Minneapolis from the havoc wreaked on Minnesota liberalism by advocacy of intervention in World War II. The defectors from Norman Thomas'

isolationist socialism had formed the Union for Democratic Action, which had become the pre-Cold War ADA with Humphrey firmly in the leadership; the Minneapolis Trotskyist teamster leaders were tried for sedition for their anti-imperialism, and the Farmer-Labor party ultimately collapsed from the loss of its isolationist base. Johnson, Dodd, and Humphrey were strong supporters of World War II and the Korean and Vietnam interventions, as well as the imperialist policies which formed and surrounded them.

The tradition of American imperialism is a long one as its proponents keenly emphasize, and this is indicative of the kind of system that has successfully maintained itself in this country, despite occasional major threats, until this very moment. The major threats have been occasional because, unlike the system evidenced by American imperialism, there has not been the organization, continuity and understanding by those whom the system exploits comparable to that displayed by the beneficiaries from the exploitation. The opposition to the tradition of American imperialism has been characterized as the tradition of "isolationism". The statesmen of the American Revolution were the founders of the American isolationist tradition, which combines cosmopolitanism and citizenship of the world with rejection of international political alliances. The concept of cosmopolitan neutrality and non-intervention, established in Washington's Farewell Address, was firmly rooted in American ideals by Thomas Jefferson, who in his First Inaugural Address announced the principle: "Honest friendship with all nations, entangling alliances with none."¹ The isolationist creed was maintained by the Jeffersonians and Jacksonians in their opposition to international status quo exploitation.

Significantly, it was also John Quincy Adams who first rebuffed a European suggestion that

1. See Selig Adler, The Isolationist Impulse: Its Twentieth-Century Reaction (New York: Abelard-Schuman, 1957), pp. 10-11.

the United States assume a share of responsibility for world order. . . Ultimately, John Quincy Adams' precepts were incorporated into isolationist creed; the United States would lend only moral support to the worthy cause of universal freedom, and would not deviate from non-entanglement even for the purpose of preserving world peace.²

During the period of American imperialism against Mexico, the aggressive expansionists labelled their opponents as "isolationists".³ The American South has always been the major center of American overseas expansion and foreign intervention. The South desired to use federal troops to gain additional territory just as it had used them to maintain slavery and then serfdom among the Negroes. Spearheaded by the Texans, the South took the lead in the Mexican aggression, and then pushed for the conquest of Cuba and control of Central America, especially the Isthmus. The Civil War crisis developed through the South's loss of control of the federal troops to a party which preferred continental expansion within the national boundaries to either the conquest of Cuba or the extension of slavery across the continent. The centers of opposition to expansionism and American imperialism during the Mexican and Civil Wars were the Middle West and areas in the East, which were centers of anti-war activities, including non-payment of taxes and draft-riots.

The origins of modern twentieth century isolationism are related to the development of the New Imperialism from the 1880's on, and in which the United States was a major participant. The seizure by the US of the Spanish colonial empire at the turn of the century was a major cause in the development of isolationism. The Anti-Imperialist League under the leadership of the Liberal Republicans (Mugwumps) established the basic traditions of American isolationism, with which the populism of Bryan and the socialism of Debs were

2. Ibid., p. 14.

3. Ibid., pp. 14, 27.

associated. The Mugwumps were paralyzed by their upper social position from bringing forward and educating those who sympathized with their views; Bryan compromised the Populist commitment which itself was lacking in clarity. It was the incipient Socialist movement in America which, as heir to classical liberalism, possessed in this period the ability to bring together and educate those opposed to American imperialism. The strongest early twentieth century isolationists in America were those most influenced by socialism, whether directly like Debs or indirectly like LaFollette; similarly, in Europe, isolationism was led by Socialists like Jaures and Lenin. Thus, in America as in Europe, it was the Socialists who led the struggle against US Imperialism's intervention in World War I and bore the brunt of the resulting persecutions.

The liberals whose courage had failed with US intervention in World War I rejoined LaFollette, Debs et al. in the two-fronted battle for isolationism and for civil liberties against the Wilson Administration. The government's campaign for the League of Nations coincided with its persecution of progressives in the Red Scare of 1919-20. The League of Nations was recognized as the imperialist instrument of the exploiters that would lead to war by maintaining the status quo imposed by them at Versailles. Oswald Garrison Villard, Walter Lippmann, Albert Jay Nock and Scott Nearing provided the intellectual and polemical ammunition for the anti-League senators of the Battalion of Death led by Robert LaFollette, Hiram Johnson and William Borah. The campaign for isolationism and civil liberties continued during the 1920's as US imperialism continued its course in the Caribbean and in the Far East. But it was the depression of the 1930's which eventually led to a strong popular isolationist movement. Rooted in the close financial collaboration with Britain in the 1920's, the depression forced the "have not" nations into desperate measures against the system of Western imperialism which exploited them, and these desperate measures in turn provided the excuse for

the rearmament by which the US government finally was able to end the depression.⁵

The development of opposition to American intervention in World War II was crucial for the succeeding quarter century of American history. It was the US intervention into World War II that disrupted the isolationist factor in American politics and led to confusion of its basic principles.

During the course of the protracted twentieth-century debate over foreign policy, the word "isolationist" became a cliché. Through reckless use it acquired, like "appeaser" or even "liberal", a somewhat sinister meaning. . . . It was a handy designation for our twin policies of neutrality and non-intervention. . . . We can begin by saying that American isolationism has never meant total social, cultural, and economic self-sufficiency. . . . Ardent isolationists have frequently advocated American leadership in the promotion of peace, provided always that we limit our efforts to moral suasion and scrupulously avoid commitments for coercive action to allay or punish aggression.⁶

The death in January, 1940 of Senator William Borah was a significant blow to American isolationism. Borah had a complete grasp of world problems and understood the nature of imperialism, and especially of American Imperialism. He recognized that it was Asia and not Europe that formed the crisis center of the world because it was there that nations suffered from imperialism and would struggle mightily to free themselves. Furthermore, Asia was the area of the greatest US financial and strategic involvement and expectation. Borah died as the earliest US measures leading to war against Japan were initiated, and no one remained

5. Cf. Murray N. Rothbard, America's Great Depression (Princeton, N.J.: D. Van Nostrand Co., 1963), and William Appleman Williams, The Tragedy of American Diplomacy (N.Y.: Dell Pub. Co., 1962.)

6. Adler, op. cit., pp. 26-29.

with the preception to center the attention of American isolationism on the crisis in Asia.

It was the threat of American intervention in the European war that led to the formation of the America First Committee and it was the European situation on which the America First Committee concentrated during the near year-and-a-half of its existence. Founded by R. Douglas Stuart, Jr., Kingman Brewster, Jr., and other Yale students under the influence of the eminent international lawyer, Professor Edwin Borchard, the organization came to include many of the traditional isolationists, like John T. Flynn, Norman Thomas and Harry Elmer Barnes, but was dominated by businessmen with short-run viewpoints. Many of these businessmen were former generals who not only completely lacked understanding of the basic isolationist opposition to militarism and conscription, but even proposed a wide program of militarization for America. Thus, the failure of America First to put itself in complete opposition to the draft permitted the extension of conscription in September, 1941 by but a single vote. Without the extension of conscription the administration would never have pursued the aggressive policy against Japan which led to war in December, 1941. Thus, the insistence upon compromise, moderation and non-principled stands by the businessmen-generals who assumed the leadership of the isolationist movement undercut and ultimately defeated the traditional isolationism of the membership and the intellectuals in America First, as well as of the other isolationist groups. It was the compromises and failures of that very leadership that provided the opportunity for successful US involvement in World War II.

The noninterventionist strength, which the Committee and other groups represented, definitely affected the strategy of President Franklin D. Roosevelt. More than that, persons close to Roosevelt felt that the noninterventionists had fought the president very nearly to a standstill near the end of 1941. . . .⁷

7. Wayne S. Cole, America First, the battle against intervention, 1940-1941 (Madison, Wisc.; University of Wisconsin Press, 1953), pp. viii, 199.

With their decision in favor of compromise, moderation, and manipulation, the leadership of America First attempted to play a game that was lost from the beginning. The "instrumentalists" of the pro-war New Republic recognized that their only effective opposition came from the principled and absolutist isolationists, men who had emerged from the original main center of American isolationism, the American Left.⁸ In its editorial "Hutchins and the Absolute", the New Republic (February 3, 1941) declared:

It is worth noting that, whatever their other differences, it is the absolutist philosophies of our time that are united for isolation and appeasement. The Communists and the dogmatic socialists of the Norman Thomas stripe; the pacifists; the Nazis; the liberal absolutists of the Flynn type; and now the Hutchins brand of neo-Thomas (sic) absolutism that speaks and thinks in terms of frozen moral categories.⁹

The "instrumentalist" approach is essentially a conservative one, dedicated as it is to the substantial maintenance of the status quo. Walter Lippmann, who was developing a conservative philosophy, and Herbert Agar, a leader of southern conservative thought, became interventionists, as did conservative critics of the revolutionary aspects of National Socialism, such as Peter Viereck (Metapolitics: From Wagner to Hitler) and William M. McGovern (From Luther to Hitler). American nationalists like Joseph Alsop and William Kintner (American White Paper) were joined by European-born nationalists like Robert Strausz-Hupe (Axis America: Hitler Plans our Future) and Stefan T. Possony.¹⁰

Stefan T. Possony is an interesting example of the role of nationalist influences - the antithesis of American cosmopolitan isolationism. Until 1939 Possony had lived in Vienna where he published

8. "America First and the Left," New Republic, June 2, 1941.

9. See James J. Martin, American Liberalism and World Politics, 1931-1941 (New York: Devin-Adair, 1964), II, 1272.

10. Ibid., pp. 1167-68, 1180, 1265, 1274.

a work on economic controls during wartime (English translation, Tomorrow's War, London, 1938). Based on the German experience during and since the First World War, Possony emphasized the development of capital accumulation by the State during wartime in case the European conflict should be resumed. Possony soon fled to France where he became an adviser to the French government, 1939-40, and came to the US after the defeat of France. When it was proposed in the Nation, "Shall we feed Hitler's Victims" as suggested by the work of the Quakers, the Red Cross and Herbert Hoover, Possony effectively answered, no, in "Relief, Limited" (Nation, December 14, 1940). Possony contributed to the hysteria engendered by Hearst's geopolitical theories, under which the US would be invaded by Germany by way of Africa, South and Central America. When John T. Flynn rationally disposed of these ravings, Possony rushed into print in the New Republic (May 12, 1941) making fantastic military predictions, but also significantly appealing to the all-too-real fears that American business in South America could not bear German economic competition.¹¹

By early 1941, however, the Nation and New Republic had fallen behind in the intensity of advocacy of belligerency as compared to the Hearst newspapers and the Luce publications, Time and Life. Tex McCrary, Hearst editorialist, declared: "When we have won the war I will become a rampant imperialist - in that I would want to see America enforce the peace. . . It would be a "Roman peace", and we would be the Romans. . ." ¹² Clare Boothe Luce's campaign for war won her a nomination in Common Sense (January, 1941) as the American woman who when war came could claim "sole responsibility for the event". Asia, and especially, China, was central to the American dreamers of empire, as William L. Neumann has noted:

Financial aid to Chiang Kai-shek, another writer promised, would be the "first step toward the

11. Ibid., p. 1258.

12. Ibid., p. 1174.

practical realization of the long-awaited El Dorado of the Chinese market". Henry Luce, perhaps the most influential disseminator of the conventional image of China, warned that failure to assume the responsibilities of the "American Century" would mean a dissolution of the Asian dream, whereas a positive program would mean that Asia "will be worth to us four, five, ten billions of dollars a year."¹³

Henry Luce's "American Century" would establish the US as the dominant world power in alliance with England. Max Lerner (New Republic, April 7, 1941) criticized liberal lack of enthusiasm for Luce's program, and approved of much of the program, especially in contrast to the position of the isolationist liberals like Senator Wheeler and John T. Flynn. Luce represented for Lerner "a new capitalist-conscious group, most of them younger men, who do not fear the war but regard it as an opportunity". Lerner noted that Luce's views were preceded by a New Republic editorial (December 23, 1940) on the necessity of an American-led Anglo-American hegemony. America in cooperation with England should "establish its hegemony in the world, control the world sea lanes and world trade, send out technicians to develop the world and education to teach it and food cargoes to feed it and ideals to inspire it".¹⁴

The role of American financial and business leaders and their major press organs, such as the Luce publications, was clear to the leading isolationists. They realized, too late, where the real source of American imperialism was seated. Senator Robert Taft's rebuttal (Nation, December 13, 1941) to an article by Arthur Schlesinger Jr. (Nation, December 6, 1941) summed up the major forces supporting American intervention in World War II:

Nor is Mr. Schlesinger correct in attributing

13. William L. Neumann, "Determinism, Destiny and Myth in the American Image of China," in George L. Anderson, Issues and Conflicts, (Lawrence, Kan.: University of Kansas Press, 1959), p. 13.
14. See Martin, op. cit., pp. 1171-72.

the position of the majority of Republicans to their conservatism. The most conservative members of the party - the Wall Street bankers, the society group, nine-tenths of the plutocratic newspapers, and most of the party's financial contributors - are the ones who favor intervention in Europe. . . The war party is made up of the business community of the cities, the newspaper and magazine writers, the radio and movie commentators, the Communists, and the university intelligentsia.¹⁵

In the period preceding American entrance into World War II there had been a number of persons who sought direct US support for the Chiang Kai-shek regime, among them such individuals as Henry and Clare Boothe Luce, Walter Judd, Alfred Kohlberg, and Joseph Alsop who worked through a number of established groups and specially-formed committees. As part of the limited opposition permitted by themselves during the war, Republicans agreed to limit their attacks to the waste and methods of conduct of the war effort. One of the gravest examples of graft and corruption was the use of American money by the Chiang regime. The exposure of this waste in 1943 caused a split between the businessmen and journalists who continued to support Chiang, and the East Asian scholars who denounced this injury to the war effort; indeed, it has been said that Chiang stopped active fighting when the US came into the war. Alfred Kohlberg then leaped to the charge that anti-Chiang and "therefore" pro-Communist influence had caused these scholars to criticize Chiang Kai-shek. The basis for this wild accusation was the charge that the scholarly journals Pacific Affairs and Far Eastern Survey had contained in the preceding seven years no criticism of Japanese policies except for

15. Ibid., pp. 1277-78. The Communists' role had of course changed drastically with Germany's invasion of Russia on June 22, 1941. For the Communists though not for the Trotskyists the new turn of events had so changed the nature of the war to justify advocacy of American intervention.

its feudal land system, no major criticism of the Soviet Union, and mixed criticism and praise of Chiang.

Despite the veteran opposition to Chiang by American isolationists, the burgeoning China Lobby in the U. S. was able to execute a cunning maneuver to curry the temporary favor of the isolationists. During the Congressional Pearl Harbor inquiry in 1945, it was revealed that a crucial American proposal for a Japanese modus vivendi in November 1941 had been scuttled by a negative cable from Chiang Kai-shek. Chiang had demanded that the US cancel its proposal, which would have forced him to enter into a coalition with Chiang's former prime minister who now headed a pro-Japanese government in northern China. Whereas Chiang was clearly the person responsible for the note and hence the collapse of the last hope for peace in the Pacific, both the isolationists and the China Lobby, for entirely different reasons, agreed to center their retrospective fire upon Owen Lattimore, who had been sent out by the US some months before as special adviser to Chiang Kai-shek. As a result of this maneuver, the isolationists were effectively disarmed from combatting the China Lobby's smear campaign against the formerly pro-Chiang interventionist Lattimore, a campaign launched by Kohlberg in the pro-Chiang American organ, China Monthly, in October, 1945.

The China Lobby's concentration upon Alger Hiss also served to neutralize any isolationist opposition, for Hiss, as a pro-Chiang and pro-interventionist assistant to Stanley K. Hornbeck at the Far Eastern desk of the State Department, had earned the hatred of the isolationist forces. Thus, despite the fact that the purpose of the China Lobby's campaign was stepped-up US intervention on Chiang's behalf, its early concentration on such formerly pro-war US advisers as Hiss and Lattimore served to stifle any developing isolationist opposition to this early--and crucial--emergence of the Cold War in Asia.

The China Lobby, early in its Cold War campaign, established the American China Policy Association, with Clare Boothe Luce as president and Alfred

Kohlberg as vice-president. In preparation for the 1948 elections, Richard Nixon and the House Un-American Activities Committee began, in the summer of 1948, its parade of ex-Communist witnesses--the Bentleys, the Budenzes, the Chamberses--all distinguished for their often failing memories and their bitterness toward their former comrades. The China Monthly soon claimed (in its September, 1948 issue) the honor of being "the first to distinguish between a loyal and disloyal citizen." It is also perhaps not too far-fetched to collate the pro-Chiang enthusiasm of Senators Knowland and Nixon with the fact that the Bank of America, California's immensely powerful bank, has been the major depository for Chiang's enormous American cash holdings.

The total defeat of Chiang and the establishment of his government on Formosa led to an all-out effort by the China Lobby to preserve that island as the center for future US domination of China. In January, 1950, the Truman Administration indicated its willingness to allow Peking to gain possession of Formosa during the summer of that year. Senator Knowland, with the cooperation of General MacArthur's staff in Tokyo, immediately leaked this information to the public and attacked the idea. Early in February of 1950, Senator McCarthy began his famous attacks on the State Department, concentrating his smear charges especially on Philip Jessup, who had prepared the State Department book demonstrating that the Chiang regime had fallen from its own failings. Jessup was, characteristically, accused of being a Communist. The charge against Jessup revealed that the China Lobby now felt itself strong enough (and the isolationists weak enough) to break with the isolationists in the course of drumming up its multi-sided propaganda for a new American war. For Philip Jessup had been a distinguished leader of American isolationism (after as well as before June 22, 1941). Jessup had been chairman of the Board of Trustees of the American Council of the Institute of Pacific Relations before the War, and editor of the Far Eastern Survey. However, he had been forced out of his posts by the Luce-Kohlberg-China Lobbyists because of his isolationism. He had been a key adviser to the America First Committee and had sponsored its local chapters in Nor-

folk, Conn. and New York City. Philip C. Jessup was as isolationist in 1950 as he had been in 1940 and suffered for this equally; he had opposed US imperialism against Japan just as much as he now opposed it against the New China.¹⁶

For Philip Jessup to be accused of Communism by the agents of the China Lobby was not a special case. Most isolationists have been so accused for so many years that the charges have lost all meaning. Senator Taft, within a matter of weeks of the Jessup slur, was himself subjected to the same charges by another influential member of the China Lobby, Joseph Alsop. Taft and all other isolationists were characterized as tools of Communism because isolationism basically denies the aggressiveness of any major power other than the US government, the only government that Americans can do anything about.

But it was not only the burgeoning China Lobby wing of the American Right that heartily smeared isolationists as tools of Communism. The charges were enthusiastically joined by the nation's liberals--the Nation, the New Republic, Americans for Democratic Action--who still fixed upon the dwindling ranks of American isolationism as the major enemy. And in a profound sense they were right; for these battered isolationists were the last carriers of a great American tradition, and constituted the last centers of total opposition to expanding and swelling American global imperialism. It was precisely these liberals, moreover, whom the historian William Appleman Williams has brilliantly termed "the corporate liberals", who have provided the major ideological and demagogic rationale for World War II and post-war American imperialism. And so these liberals recognized their main enemy, and were not above the very tactics of "McCarthyism" from which they were later to recoil when McCarthy himself humorlessly began to employ them against the Establishment itself!

16. Cole, op. cit., pp. 76, 161, 188. On Jessup, see also McGeorge Bundy, The Pattern of Responsibility (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1952), p. 218; and Congressional Record, Vol. 87, Pt. 8 (October, 1941), p. 8321.

As for the Communists themselves, they were not about to favor any kind of political alliance with the isolationists. For one thing, the Communists still suffered from the cultural lag of the World War II thesis that smeared the isolationists as "parroters of the Goebbels line"; for another, the Communist policy was to seek passive adaptation and coalition on virtually any terms with reformist liberals--indeed the very liberals who were cementing the new American imperialism upon the American public. In short, whereas the liberals were astute in recognizing their main enemy, the Communists never succeeded in identifying theirs.

The Geography of Isolationism

The isolationist tradition in the United States is often associated with geographical regions. Of course, geographical regions are short-hand methods for describing cultural areas, so that a geographical description summarizes a complex of ideological, economic, and ethnic bases of cultural units. Briefly, the region best known in America for isolationism is that embracing the Old and New Northwest, from the Ohio River westward. This region, as the frontier that was settled last, has had the least influence in the decision-making of the federal government, a situation aggravated by the limited economic and intellectual influences of the region. The settlement of this region occurred primarily in the nineteenth century, and its viewpoint reflected the people who migrated there from Europe or the East. The economic reasons for their migration were based on their desire for independent economic development, free from the feudal systems of Europe and even in the American East. Similarly, the European migration from northern Europe and from the American East hoped to avoid the caste and class domination of politics that characterized the established political regimes. The leading migration to this area was German: whether as descendants of the German pacifist sects that had settled at first in Pennsylvania, or as refugees from the militarism and authoritarianism of anti-democratic German governments in the nineteenth century, there was a common

cultural viewpoint shared by the Scandinavians as well as by the migrants from the East and the British Isles.

Samuel Lubell has emphasized the importance of the generally neglected German element in American politics.¹⁷ As the second major ethnic group in the US it could not help but have a strong influence. Yet Lubell limits his analysis to the purely ethnic aspects without fully recognizing their far more significant cultural dimensions. Particularly significant were the democratic and anti-militarist traditions of the German immigrants and their descendants. These groups would not have favored the US entering a war on the side of Germany any more than they favored a war opposed to Germany. Their profound anti-militarism was the significant factor during both of the wars which Lubell perceptively feels could well be described as the first and second German wars. What Lubell fails to notice is that the accusations of pro-Germanism levelled against all opponents of US war were particularly directed against Americans of German descent, since their way of life emphasized their Germanic heritage for religious and cultural reasons. Their use of the German language made them especially suspect, for during the wars all things German were proscribed. The severe persecutions induced in German-Americans an identification with the government of Germany from which they had previously been free. At the same time, the pressures of mass culture have homogenized German-American and other ethnic groups, and have thus helped to undermine the specifically anti-militarist traditions of German America.

Pro-British, pro-League sentiment was always strongest in the Eastern and Southern areas. The Germanic elements were joined in opposition by other western European groups such as the Irish and Italians. While for special reasons Slavic groups led by the Poles supported the League, Southern

17. Samuel Lubell, The Future of American Politics (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1952), and Lubell, Revolt of the Moderates (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1956).

sentiment for the League was aroused by the reminder that the anti-English Irish and Germans had provided the margin of victory for the North in the Civil War. The Ku Klux Klan, it must be remembered, was solidly based in the old Anglo-American groupings. Along with the racist Southern groups, the American Legion's Anglophile outlook was in reaction against the revisionism that had exposed the unheroic nature of the war and of deaths in which the Legion gloried.¹⁸

Internal migrations in the US have altered the sectional divisions based on cultural diversities. The heaviest migrations in the last quarter-century have been out of the South. It has been noted by sociologists that the less progressive attitudes on political, economic, social and especially civil libertarian questions exhibited by blue-collar workers reflects not only their educational level and the effects of mass media but the fact of accelerated Southern origins of America's industrial working class. Not only has there been a vast increase in industrialization in the South but Southerners in huge numbers have migrated to the cities of the Middle West and to southern California. The situation in California is especially instructive. Before World War II, California was a major center for progressivism in America, in liberal and socialist aspects of which were reflected in attitudes toward foreign policy. California's powerful Hiram Johnson was one of the leading opponents of American entrance into World War I, the League of Nations, and World War II, and was a center of isolationism in the Senate until his death in 1945. The Second World War greatly changed the political demography of California, southern California and Los Angeles in particular. For a quarter-century a massive government defense industry has developed there, fed by the labor of largely Southern migrants. The post-war emergence of William F. Knowland and Richard M. Nixon as California's Senators and major centers of Republican power, contrasts strikingly to such pre-World War II Republican leaders as Hiram Johnson and Earl Warren. All this is reflective of the changes

18. Adler, *op. cit.*, pp. 75-92.

in California brought about by the heavy World War II migrations. The migration from the South, however, has also been double-edged, involving as it has large numbers of Southern Negroes seeking the constitutional rights and civil liberties denied them in the South. Their anti-militarist religious traditions and their continued deprivation of civil liberties in the cities of the East, Middle West and southern California, combine with their recent admission to voting in the South to make the Negroes a potentially important anti-imperialist force in both electoral and direct action.

In the meanwhile, the older center of isolationism--the Old and New Northwest--was reduced as such by the swelling of Southern migration to the cities north of the Ohio River. The remaining strongholds of isolationism are the states of the Northwest from Lake Michigan to the Pacific. Surely it is no accident that states like Wisconsin which produced the two Bob LaFollettes are now represented by Senators with strong doubts about America's aggression in Vietnam; or that Montana, which used to be represented by Burton K. Wheeler is now represented by Mike Mansfield; or that Idaho which sent William Borah and Glen Taylor to the Senate now sends Frank Church, or that Oregon's Charles McNary has been succeeded by Wayne Morse.