

VOLUME XXIV

JANUARY & JULY 1989

NUMBER 1-2

**JOURNAL
OF
RESEARCH**
[HUMANITIES]



UNIVERSITY OF THE PUNJAB
LAHORE

EDITORIAL BOARD

Chief Editor :

Secretary, Editorial Board

Muhammad Ismail Bhatti, Professor and Chairman, Department of English Language and Literature, University of the Punjab.

Members, Editorial Board

Dr. Munir-ud-Din Chughtai, Professor and Chairman, Department of Political Science and Pro-Vice-Chancellor, University of the Punjab.

Dr. Yar Muhammad Khan, Professor and Chairman, Department of History, and Dean, Faculty of Arts, University of the Punjab.

Kh. Amjad Saeed, Professor and Chairman, Department of Business Administration, University of the Punjab.

Dr. A. R. Jaffary, Professor and Chairman, Department of Administrative Science, University of the Punjab.

Dr. Muhammad Anwar, Professor and Chairman, Department of Sociology, University of the Punjab.

Dr. Maskeen Ali Hijazi, Professor and Chairman, Department of Mass Communication, University of the Punjab.

VOLUME XXIV

JANUARY & JULY 1989

NUMBER 1-2

JOURNAL OF RESEARCH [HUMANITIES]



UNIVERSITY OF THE PUNJAB
LAHORE

CONTENTS

	Page
I. ABDIEL'S CAREER AND THE ARGUMENT OF <i>PARADISE LOST</i>	<i>Dr. Zahir J. Khattak</i> .. 1
II. NAPOLEON III : A CASE STUDY	<i>Dr. Sadiq A. Gill</i> .. 9
III. DEMAND FOR EXPATRIATE PAKISTANI WORKERS IN IRAQ AFTER CEASE-FIRE	<i>Fareed A. Fareedy</i> .. 39
IV. DEMAND FOR CHILDREN : A MICRO-ECONOMIC APPROACH	<i>Dr. A. Rauf Butt</i> .. 51
V. MILLER'S EXPRESSIONISM IN <i>DEATH OF A SALESMAN</i>	<i>Nasim Riaz Butt</i> .. 63



Printed by Javed Iqbal Bhatti at the Punjab University Press,
Lahore, and published by Prof. Muhammad Ismail Bhatti
for the University of the Punjab, Lahore - Pakistan

E-212—Punjab University Press—500+30—21-8-90

CONTRIBUTORS

1. Dr. Zahir J. Khattak, Department of English, Islamia University, Bahawalpur.
2. Dr. Sadiq A. Gill, Department of History, University of the Punjab, New Campus, Lahore.
3. Fareed A. Fareedy, Assistant Professor, Department of Economics, University of the Punjab, Lahore.
4. Dr. A. Rauf Butt, Associate Professor, Department of Economics, University of the Punjab, Lahore.
5. Nasim Riaz Butt, Assistant Professor, Department of English Language and Literature, University of the Punjab, Lahore.

ABDIEL'S CAREER AND THE ARGUMENT OF *PARADISE LOST*

DR. ZAHIR J. KHATTAK

The industry that has grown around Milton's writing has been largely engaged in the polemics of the interpretation of *Paradise Lost*. Whether Milton is of God's party or the Devil's advocate continues to be the main grounds on which critics expend their ingenuity.¹ This article attempts to suggest that the controversy will lose its edge if the career of Abdiel (an angel in the poem) is related to Milton's purpose in *Paradise Lost*.

The Abdiel episode structurally located at the centre of *Paradise Lost*, bridging Book V and VI, has an interpretative function in the thematic development of the poem. Abdiel's fiery zeal serves as a gloss to Adam and Eve—and of course, to Satan as well whom he directly confronts at the beginning of war in heaven. The avowed purpose of *Paradise Lost* is to justify the ways of God to man, and Abdiel's character is an object lesson for all around in the poem.

How significant to Milton Abdiel's character is can be realized from the fact that he is invented solely by Milton: he does not appear as an angel in the Biblical stories; his name "meaning, servant of God,"² occurs only as a human name in the Bible (1 Chron V. 15). Not only that, but also Milton himself had not included him in the first draft of his poem;³ it was on second thought that he was introduced. It is, therefore, obvious that Milton must have felt a definite need for him.

Abdiel's resemblance to Milton's own character and conduct—specially the Milton of the Restoration looking back on his past heroism—will be readily allowed. Like Abdiel Milton too would always stick to the side of truth and would never budge from his position even in the face of overwhelming odds. Micheal Lieb says that "Abdiel's reference to himself as a, 'dissenter' and to the host of God as 'sectarians' . . . would not have been lost on Milton's contemporaries,"⁴

Of particular interest, however, and more pertinent here, is Abdiel's functional relevance in the development of the central theme of *Paradise Lost*. In fact, he provides a perspective on the poem which would have been otherwise impossible for Milton to achieve; he shows how to use free will and avoid the fall. His story is so carefully structured that it leaves no doubts as to the responsibility of Adam and Eve for their fall. He faces practically the same sudden temptation as that to which Eve is exposed; yet he chooses the right course and continues to retain his blissful seat in heaven.

Raphael, whom God has sent in pity to enlighten Adam of his situation and to warn him of the danger that has recently beset him, relates to him the rebellion of Satan against God. It is in this context that Abdiel is introduced. Raphael tells him how Satan one night out of 'deep malice' against the son of God "resolv'd/With all his Legions to dislodge, and leave / Unworshipet, unbey'd the Throne supreme." (V.668-70).

In order to carry out his project—Raphael continues his narrative to Adam—Satan with 'ambiguous words' drew after him a third part of heaven's host, Abdiel included. There Satan with 'counterfeited truth', addressed the angels:

Thrones, Dominations, Princedoms, Virtues, Powers,
If these magnific Titles yet remain
Not merely titular, since by Decree
Another now hath to himself ingross't
All Power, and us eclips'd under the name
Of king anointed. (V.772-77)

In his speech Satan goes on with his rhetoric skilfully manipulating the concepts of 'reason' and 'right':

Who can in reason then or right assume
Monarchy over such as live by right
His equals, if in power and splendor less,
In freedom equal? (V.794-97)

And more importantly he asks who "can introduce/Law and Edict on us, who without Law/Err not?" (V. 797-99)

In fact, Satan here and a few lines further on (V. 800-03) raises all the important questions regarding 'destiny', 'free will', 'obedience', and 'equality' that are all so vital to the understanding of God's ways to man. It is, therefore, necessary that someone should be there on the spot to answer all these questions and put these fundamental concepts in their proper context.

Abdiel, as Milton's surrogate, stands up and with "The current of his fury" answers all of Satan's "Proud arguments". He points out that Satan's objection to the son's elevation ill—becomes him and tells him that it is not "Expected, least of all from thee, ingrate,/In place thyself so high above thy peers" (V. 811-12). After castigating Satan for his anarchic tendency (V. 815-20) he argues that Satan cannot be:

Equal to him begotten Son, by whom
As by his Word the mighty Father made
All things, ev'n thee, and all the Spirit of Heav'n. (V. 835-37)

Abdiel successfully clinches the argument by observing that obedience to the Son by no means vitiates the angel's liberty—rather it enhances it: since he the Head:

One of our number thus reduc't becomes,
His Laws our Laws, all honor to him done
Returns our own. (V. 842-45)

Abdiel is thus a necessary foil to the devilish logic of the Arch-fiend; he is there with his arguments based on the scriptures⁵ to give a lie to Satan's accusations.

In addition to that, his action and 'unshak's, uneduc'd, unterrifi'd' loyalty, 'his love' and his 'zeal' serve as examples in the drama of the poem. In terms of the dramatic context he demonstrates how one can remain 'faithful' and 'unmov'd', 'Among the innumerable false'. He

sustains the truth, as Allan H. Gilbert says, "without fear of their (the devils) numbers."⁶ That is why he earns the memorable Commendation of God who welcomes him as :

Servant of God, well done, well hast thou fought
The better fight, who single hast maintain'd
Against revolted multitudes the Cause
Of Truth, in word mightier than they in Arms ;
And for the testimony of Truth hast borne
Universal reproach, far worse to hear
Than violence : for this was all thy care
To stand approv'd in sight of God, though Worlds
Judg'd thee perverse :
(VI.29-37)

No doubt this was the type of character Milton himself possessed and which he cherished all his life—Abdiel's solitary heroism is Milton's ideal. Milton as a poet has, however, put him to specific uses in the poem and his character is so well integrated into the poem that much would have been lost had he not been included. Abdiel's story is parallel to that of Adam and Eve but from within that parallelism offers an instructive contrast.

Both of our grand parents are subjected to the same kind of temptation: Eve directly by Satan and Adam by the Satan in Eve (Having yielded to Satan Eve's will has become corrupted ; and will only be restored by the Grace of God). Raphael expressly points out to Adam that he has narrated the war in heaven to him so that he could learn from it and be on the look out :

Thus measuring things in Heav'n by things on Earth
...that thou mayst beware

By what is past....

(V. 893-95)

In fact, Raphael is carrying out God's command to inform Adam and Eve how Satan "designs/In them at once to ruin all mankind" (V. 227-28) and to bring it home to them that their happiness is now entirely in their

own hands : "lest wilfully transgressing" they pretend "Surprisal, unadmonished, unforewarned." (V. 244-45). In such a context the Abdiel episode is evidently a concrete manifestation of how one can stand of his own free will. It emphasises the "nonfall of one such free spirit in a way that reinforces the claim, made both to prelapsarian Adam and postlapsarian reader, that giving in to Satan's temptation is not necessary."⁷ Adam himself understands perfectly what is involved in Raphael's visit and thanks him for it :

Divine Interpreter, by favor sent
Down from the Empyrean to forewarn
Us timely of what might else have been our loss. (VIII. 72-75)

Unfortunately for mankind, however, when the time comes Eve will transgress and so will Adam, too. It is worth remarking that Satan in persuading Eve—to whom he has come in the guise of a serpent—to eat of the forbidden fruit employs more or less the same arguments he had used with his crew and Abdiel. But Eve who had heard Raphael relate the laudable conduct of Abdiel and how he overcame the temptation does not realize that she is in Abdiel's position and should, therefore, display his kind of zeal and love to God.

In order to give a fair chance to the mother of mankind, God had arranged a dream trial in her sleep (V. 28-94). Satan's words in the actual temptation scene are distinctly reminiscent of that dream as well as his speech in the 'north quarter of Heaven' yet Eve fails the test. She is too Narcissistic and when Satan lies to her that by eating the forbidden fruit 'ye shall be as Gods' she succumbs to the temptation.

The pattern of Satan's logic is generally the same: he plays upon the notions of justice, freedom and equality. For instance, he initially asks Eve :

...hath God then said of the Fruit
Of all these Garden trees ye shall not eat,
Yet Lords declar'd of all in Earth or Air ? (IX. 656-59)

Then he gradually waxes more bold and openly critical of God and advises her to eat of the tree of knowledge. He assures her that God cannot be angry "For such a paltry trespass," and if He is He cannot be 'just', and comes up with the brazen declaration that if "Not just, not God; not feared then, not obeyed" (IX. 693-701). Eve is easily taken in and she falls.

Adam's confrontation with the fallen Eve again brings in the Abdiel and Satan situation. This is a second chance for Adam too, to collect himself. He had missed his first opportunity to strongly forbid the going away of Eve alone in the morning. A strong dissuasion was required of him. A man of Abdiel's conviction would not have dilly-dallied with her demand of trust. But Adam, as he is presented in *Paradise Lost*, wilfully chooses to fall though he is perfectly free like Abdiel to stand. Instead of opposing her proposal very strongly he weakly submits to her request and allows her to go alone. He ignores the fact that he as the image of God for her, has to strongly command her to stay. He deceives himself into thinking that if he orders her to stay it will limit her free will. He tells Eve: "Go; for thy stay, not free, absents thee more" (IX. 373) little realizing that his forbidding will still leave Eve free to obey or disobey his command and will in no way impinge on her freedom.

When Eve, on her return, informs him that she has eaten the forbidden fruit, he instantly knows that "some cursed fraud/Of Enemy hath beguiled thee Eve" and declares that "With thee/Certain my resolution is to Die" (IX. 901-07). So it is in vain that he later expostulates with God "that from her hand I could suspect no ill." God aptly reminds him of his wilful disobedience and tells him that he has not been man enough, so to speak. God's words are:

Was shee thy God, that her thou didst obey
Before his voice, or was she made thy guide,
Superior, or but equal, that to her
Thou didst resign thy Manhood, and the Place
Wherein God set thee above her made of thee.

(X. 145-49)

By this time Eve has fully understood her folly and when God asks her she accepts the responsibility for her action and replies: "The serpent me beguiled and I did eat." Eve knows that this cannot be accepted. Abdiel's conduct in the similar situation, says Dennis Richard Danielson, has amply demonstrated "that the temptation by the devil does not necessitate a free creature's falling."⁸

It is to mankind's that its grand parents did not learn from Abdiel. Their fall which was avoidable has been brought upon them by themselves. At the close of *Paradise Lost*, after Michael has shown to Adam the vision of the future and how his progeny would be redeemed by Christ, he makes the following declaration which re-echoes Abdiel's indignant rejection of the invitation to ally himself with Satan's rebellious forces:

Henceforth I learn, that to obey is best
And love with fear the only God, to walk
As in his presence, ever observe
His providence, and on him sole depend, (XII. 561-65)

In the first edition this speech was at the end of Book X and thus there was its even mathematically neat parallelism with Abdiel's speech at the end of Book V.⁹

In any event, the point is that hearing Adam speak these lines it feels that in a sense he is choosing Abdiel's role for himself in the future; and that Milton has deliberately linked Adam's final resolution with the Abdiel episode. By placing Abdiel—a positive norm of conduct and a model of faith—in the centre of *Paradise Lost* Milton has justified the ways of God to man.

REFERENCES

1. For instance A.L. Rowse's argument in *Milton the Puritan* (London : Macmillan, 1977) represent those who believe that Milton has glorified Satan at the expense of his justification of the ways of God to man. Stanley E. Fisher's interpretation in *Surprised by Sin* (London : Macmillan, 1967) upholds the views of those who believe that Milton has been successful in his declared purpose.
2. Merrit Y. Hughes, (ed.) *John Milton : Complete Poems and Major Prose*. (1957 ; rpt. Indianapolis : The Odyssey Press, 1981), footnote to p. 321.
3. Allan H. Gilbert, *On the Composition of Paradise Lost*, (Chapel Hill : University of North Carolina Press, 1974), p. 86.
4. Michael Lieb, *Poetics of the Holy : A Reading of Paradise Lost*. (Chapel Hill : University of North Carolina Press, 1940), p. 290.
5. John Milton : *Complete Poems and Major Prose*, (ed.) Merrit Y. Hughes, (1957 ; rpt. Indianapolis : The Odyssey Press, 1981). All subsequent references to *Paradise Lost* are from this edition and appear in parentheses inside the paper.
6. Allen H. Gilbert, "The Theological Basis of Satan's Rebellion and the Function of Abdiel in *Paradise Lost*", *Modern Philology*, Vol. XL. (1943), p. 35.
7. Allan H. Gilbert, *On the Composition of Paradise Lost*, p. 124.
8. Dennis Richard Danielson, *Milton's Good God*, (New York : University of Ottawa, 1982), p. iii.
9. John Reesing, *Milton's Poetic Art*, (Cambridge : Harvard University Press, 1968), p. 6.

NAPOLEON III : A CASE STUDY

DR. SADIQ A. GILL

Department of History

University of the Punjab, New Campus, Lahore

The problems involved in arriving at an understanding of Napoleon III are legion. The first difficulty one encounters is the absence of any significant amount of personal primary source materials—letters, memories, diaries. That is only the beginning. In the secondary literature there is little unanimous agreement on Louis Napoleon's character, the nature of his regime, his intentions, or his policies. Some writers, Louis Namier for instance,¹ condemn him for almost everything; others, like Albert Guérard,² tend to do the reverse. Of these two extremes, I frankly intend to place myself even beyond Guérard, if that is possible. I will take his position for a number of reasons. First, I believe that too many accounts of Louis Napoleon's reign have been written by men with blatant republican, socialist, or Catholic biases. Secondly, there has been too much of a tendency to see all of Napoleon's actions and decisions in foreign and domestic policy as leading inevitably up to the final débacle of Sedan. This defeat has obscured the solid accomplishments of his regime. Moreover, I will maintain that he was not directly responsible either for the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian War or for the unprepared condition of the French army. Therefore, in general, I intend to present the case for Napoleon III.

The man who was later to take the title Napoleon III was born in Paris on the 20th of April, in the year 1808. His father was Louis, then King of Holland; his mother, Hortense, daughter of Josephine, Napoleon's Empress. His early life need little detain us. Because Hortense was suspected of playing a role in the Hundred Days she was exiled after 1815 from France, and Louis Napoleon was thus raised near the German-

Swiss border. It was undoubtedly from his mother that he first imbibed the Napoleonic tradition and the legend of Napoleon the democrat. Quite early, at least by the age of twelve, he had developed a belief in his destiny as successor to his idealized uncle. In 1831, with his older brother, he participated in a rising against the Papacy in Romagna. After its failure and the death of his brother he was ready to go east and join the Polish insurrection, but Warsaw fell to the Russian armies before he could set out. The following year the first Napoleon's son, the Duke of Reichstadt, died. Louis Napoleon could now more realistically make plans to insure for himself the Napoleonic succession.

One of his first steps in this direction was the publication of an artillery manual for the Swiss army in which he was now an officer (1836). The work itself, while not astoundingly brilliant, was competent and solid.³ But the book was not written for its own sake. It was distributed to a number of French military men and allowed Louis to establish both professional and friendly, though non-committal, relations with them. It also served as a reminder that another young artiller officer by the name of Bonaparte was around.

In the same year that Louis Napoleon published his artillery manual (1836), he made his first attempt to actually take power in France. But before we enter this juncture in his career, it would perhaps be wise to come to an understanding of just what kind of a man he was. Victor Hugo, from his refuge in Belgium during the 1850's and 1860's, contemptuously, and unfairly, labeled him Napoleon the Little (*Napoléon le Petit*). But France to the first Napoleon had been only instrument to be used for his purposes. He had a heart of iron and had not hesitated to ask: "What does a man like me care about a hundred thousand lives?" They were nothing to him. Louis Napoleon was made of different stuff. His heart never turned to stone. From his mother he had inherited the one trait that stood out above all others in his personality—gentleness, the absence of severity. "He loved the people," La Gorce, probably the fairest of his enemies among historians, declared, "not particularly his

own, but all peoples, that is to say the poor, the weak, the disinherited."⁴ And at Solferano and Magenta in 1859 he was repulsed by the butchery and suffering that his uncle had been able to look on impassively. It was not mere squeamishness; it was humanity. Most revolutionaries, most plotters, most dictators have a core of steel. Louis Napoleon did not. This flaw, if it be deemed one, was partially to account for the later failures of Strassburg and Boulogne and was one of the major reasons for the decline of his Empire. He lacked toughness. He was tender and humane, deficient in exactly those qualities usually found in revolutionaries and authoritarian regimes. Persigny, the Emperor's closest associate in the later years of the Empire, noted this and criticized Napoleon for it. In analysing the Empire's decline he argued:

So it all comes back to his character. It is impossible not to love and respect him, but he lacks a quality essential to great princes—severity, the faculty to punish as well as to reward.... If one looks deeper into his nature and witnesses the strife between his reason and his kindly heart, one pities this prince, so generous, so indulgent, for being unable to punish those who deserve punishment. How easily can this noble spirit be the victim of intrigue! Hence his errors, weakness and frustrations at home and abroad.... He once said to me: Ah! Persigny, what a pity you are so angry! What a pity you are not! I replied. If you, like me, could not suppress your indignation against evil, injustice and intrigue, everyone would do his duty, which no one does now.⁵

Persigny was all too right. Too often there was a conflict between Louis Napoleon's heart and his reason. The one urged him to toleration, the other to push through what was necessary regardless of feelings and costs, to strike quickly and harshly. Too often the former won out. Napoleon III was thus a rather kindly ruler. He was never known, or so some say, to have lost his temper or have raised his voice. But it was just this humanity and gentleness, the absence of severity, the absence of a heart

of stone, that was to cause, ultimately, the downfall of the Second Empire. The opposition he refused to crush led the nation into war in 1870.

Bismarck once commented that he thought Louis Napoleon's heart underrated; his intellect overrated. On the first count he was right; the second only shows Bismarck's notorious egotism. There was plenty of intellect in Napoleon III. It is true that he was unable to improvise suddenly, but this did not mean that he was mediocre or incompetent. His thought processes were quiet, calculating, and deliberate. He had an imaginative temperament and was able to sense many of trends of the times. He tried to adapt to and flow with these trends, while at the same time adapting France to those same trends. He was also a gambler and a dreamer. He could be patient, he knew how to wait, and he had, almost always, a belief in his mission. In addition to these traits the Emperor also had personal courage. He could face enemy fire without fear and humiliation without complaint. He was a gambler, an idealist, a schemer all mixed together. But most of all he was a man who sincerely desired the welfare of his country and a fairer lot for the masses. He desired this not only before he achieved power, but afterwards. As Emperor he did not seek to hold power for its own sake, something which, to many historians with a less noble character, seems incomprehensible.⁶

At Strassburg in 1836 Louis Napoleon made his first bid for power. The whole affair has been described by his enemies as a farce. This epithet is, to say the least, questionable. Strassburg, his target, was discontented, and he had the cooperation of the commander of one of the regiments stationed there, the old 4th Artillery of the first Napoleon. On his entrance into the city that regiment was quickly and totally won over to his cause. The other formations might have followed but for the quick response of several minor officers. The rising was crushed in the bud. That it was regarded by responsible contemporaries as a serious threat rather than a farce is abundantly shown by the response of Louis Philippe's government to the first rumors of the attempted coup. A cabinet meeting was called, instantly, at the Tuileries. Almost the whole night the

ministers stayed there waiting for farther news, talking, conjecturing, discussing measures which might be taken in various eventualities. Only the next morning did the news finally arrive. A group of relieved officials learned that the attempt had been a failure. Rather than make a martyr or rather publicize what was felt to be a dangerous threat to the regime, the government elected to deport Louis. He was quickly loaded on board a ship bound for the United States.

His mother's death brought Louis Napoleon back to Europe in 1837, and he once again took up residence in Switzerland. The French government, still remembering the so-called farce at Strassburg, demanded his expulsion and massed troops on the frontiers to back up the threats. One does not threaten war unless a farce is taken seriously. The Swiss were prepared to resist the demand, but Louis wisely chose to leave without a fight. He did so in a flourish of publicity, in order, as he said, to save Switzerland from 'great affliction.' England, that perennial home for political refugees, was his residence for the next few years.

Louis Napoleon continued to believe in his star, and in 1839 he published his most substantial monograph, *Idées Napoléoniennes*, a defense of what he considered to be his uncle's principles and a revelation of his own beliefs on government. In it he espoused the cause of a transitory autocratic state, governing for the good of the people in the 'national will.' It was his most popular work, selling half a million copies before 1848.⁷

In 1840 Louis Napoleon attempted a second coup. Again the move was well planned. It was not comic opera material. He had, this time a half-promise of support from the commander of the northern military district at Lille and a known Bonapartist as second-in-command at the proposed landing place, Boulogne. He also had a register of all the regiments and officers that would be encountered on the march to Paris. Many of these, like the general at Lille, awaited only an initial Bonapartist success before deserting Louis Philippe. The date chosen for the landing was one on which it was known that the hostile commander in Boulogne

would be absent. But unavoidable delays caused a twenty-four hour postponement. When the landing did occur, the hostile commander was back in the city. His presence alone was responsible for crushing the coup. Had he been absent that day or had he been forcibly prevented from rallying his troops at the critical moment, the initial success might have conceivably brought about a chain reaction throughout northern France. Here, as at Strassburg, a less humane revolutionary might have succeeded. The quick execution of opposing officers in both cases might have turned the tide, but Louis was not one to shed blood where he thought or hoped it could be avoided.⁸

This time Louis Philippe's government elected not to be lenient. Napoleon was impeached before the Chamber of Peers. The trial, right from the start, did not go off as planned. Although the usurper was condemned to perpetual imprisonment in the fortress of Ham in Picardy, the trial enabled him to gain publicity and to demonstrate that he was something besides the obstinate fool that his opponents had made him out to be.

Long imprisonment has broken the spirits of many men, but Louis Napoleon had an inner strength—his faith in his star. That could not be broken. He turned the years of imprisonment to advantage, and the prison of Ham became, in his eyes, the university of Ham. He studied, thought, conversed, and wrote for six long years. Lord Malmesbury, visiting Ham, left visibly impressed: "Very few in a miserable prison like this," he said, "isolated and quasi-forgotten, would have kept their intellect braced by constant studies and original compositions."⁹ His works on the extinction of poverty, the Nicaraguan canal, and the sugar beet industry, while not totally original, were competent, well written, and helped create a favorable image for Lewis in the public mind. Napoleon III was, indeed, no orator, but he could handle the pen and handle it well. Jules Simon and others have passed these works off as 'worthless' and unoriginal. Simon revealed his true bias when he added, pridefully, that they were so worthless that he had never bothered to look at them.¹⁰

Others have not been so honest. Often those who did read them were impressed. Beranger called Louis Napoleon "the first writer of the age,"¹¹ and Tocqueville called him "the only man living who could write *monumental French*"¹² (italics are Tocqueville's). And even Victor Hugo, arch-enemy of Napoleon, reluctantly admitted: "He is quite a good writer."¹³

In 1846 Louis Napoleon decided that his education at Ham was sufficient. A well-planned escape succeeded,¹⁴ and he returned, once again, to England and waited patiently for events to turn his way. He did not have long to wait.

In 1848 revolutions broke out all over Europe. In Paris, Louis Philippe, now old and weak, meekly surrendered to the demands of the Parisian mob rather than shed French blood to preserve his dynasty. The republican government which replaced him vacillated between the demands of the bourgeoisie and those of the Parisian workers, while the countryside, often resentful, followed the capital's lead. The crisis steadily worsened. Then in the supplementary elections of the 4th of June, 1848, for the National Assembly four constituencies unexpectedly elected Louis Napoleon. His hour had finally come. But the government of the Second Republic, fearing his presence, was reluctant to allow him to take his seat. He withdrew, opportunely, without a fight, in order, as he expressed it, to avoid increasing the political confusion of the country. It was a shrewd move making him appear dignified and statesmanlike in comparison with the Assembly. It was also a lucky move. He was absent from Paris during the June days. In the supplementary elections of the 17th of September, 1848, Louis Napoleon was again returned to Parliament, this time by five departments. The government felt that it could deny him no longer. But his showing in the Assembly was not a success. Neither an orator nor an improviser, his first appearance was a total failure, but this only led his enemies to underestimate both his abilities and his appeal.

The constitution of the Second Republic called for a president, elected by popular vote, to serve as the country's executive. In the fall of 1848

Louis Napoleon declared his candidacy for the post. And in the election of 10th December 1848 he drew some 5.4 million votes to approximately 1.8 million for the combined opposition. Some historians have asserted that it was his name alone that won the election.¹⁵ This only obscures the issue. The name 'Napoleon' was a necessary, but not a sufficient factor. There were others with the same name in 1848, but Louis Napoleon was the only one able to make full use of the undoubted advantages it offered. He was the only member of the Bonaparte family who had attempted to revive its fortunes; the only one who had not sold out for thirty pieces of silver. All of his relatives were living in placid and contented retirement. He alone had risked his fortune; he alone had braved ridicule; he alone had suffered willing exile; all because he had faith in his destiny. Thus, when the path did open, he and he alone was able to take it. The other members of the family had sold their birthright for the bowl of porrage. There are other factors which must also be taken into consideration. The French people were, as a whole, anti-republican in 1848. They detested the Republic and its Assembly, and they turned to the only man in the running who appeared to oppose both.¹⁶

As President of the Second Republic a deadlock almost immediately ensued with the Assembly, and the two forces soon became irreconcilable. Napoleon honestly attempted to work within the framework of the constitution for some months, but he could get nowhere. He tried to amend the constitution so as to eliminate its one term presidential limitation, but again he was blocked. All but six of the departments supported the move, and he secured a 446 to 278 votes in his favour in the Assembly, but the constitution required a 3/4ths majority for amendment. It was only after his appeal to democratic processes had failed that Napoleon took recourse to arms. In the closing months of 1851 he insured the loyalty of army units around the capital, and on December 2, 1851, he dissolved the Assembly and arrested a number of the potential opposition. There was little resistance, even in Paris. On the 4th of December, he began to pull troops out of the heart of the city, but his opponents, interpreting

this as a sign of weakness, threw up barricades. There was little enthusiasm; resistance was slight and easily crushed. On the afternoon of the 4th, however, nervous troops panicked when a stray shot wounded one of their number and fired on a crowd of middle-class onlookers. There were less than two hundred casualties, but this accident brought republican criticism down on Louis Napoleon's head as the death of five times as many workers on the barricades never would have. For killing workers they could forgive him—they had done it themselves in June of '48—but for killing bourgeoisie, never. The fact that the major governmental turnover of December 1852 had cost relatively little bloodshed did nothing to allay republican condemnation of Louis Napoleon as a bloodthirsty tyrant. To them a revolution against any monarch was virtuous; but a revolution against a republic, no matter how unpopular or bad it was, was an unforgivable sacrilege. The French republicans blatantly assumed that republics always had a special degree of popular approval. They chose to forget that their precious little government had not been the product of a popular or national movement, but of street fighting in the capital, while Louis Napoleon's coup had the overwhelming support of the masses of the nation. And, in any case, the alternative to his coup would probably have been a royalist restoration of some sort.¹⁷

A number of repressive measures were, of course, carried out in the days immediately following the 2nd of December in order to prevent a counter-coup. Over-zealous prefects showed their support of the new regime by arresting 26,000. But Louis had many of these released. There was no reign of terror, no executions, no pseudo-legal massacres as the republicans had carried out in 1792, 1793, 1794, and during the June days of 1848, and were to carry out again after the suppression of the Commune in 1871. There were deportations to Algeria and banishments, but within a few years many of these sentences were terminated and full amnesty granted. A man with a harder heart would have executed the most dangerous of his opponents, not deported them and later left the door open for their return to prominence. But Louis Napoleon was not that

kind of man. For the future of the Empire it was unfortunate that he wasn't. His humanity gained him no gratitude from his opponents and singularly failed to convert them to his cause. Execution would have eliminated both an active and a potential threat to the regime.

In the closing days of 1851 Louis Napoleon order a plebiscite, asking the French nation for their approval of his action. The voting was made as fair as possible: ballot papers stating 'no' were distributed as well as affirmative ones. There was no terror or fraud involved. The results: 7.4 million for; 600 thousand against. Less than a year later the nation was asked to vote on the restoration of the Empire. The results were overwhelming: 7.8 million yes; 250 thousand no.

It must be admitted that the coup of 1851 and the beginnings of the Second Empire created a certain amount of suffering and unpleasantness. But the Empire also provided the political stability necessary for the great economic and social advances of the next twenty years. France say, largely as a result of Louis Napoleon's restoration of order and his positive conception of government, the most sustained economic boom of her entire history. Between 1850 and 1870 railway mileage increased seven times, new roads and a telegraph system were extended to all of France, and drainage and flood control projects were undertaken successfully on a large scale. During the first ten years of Napoleonic rule alone the consumption of coal jumped three times, foreign commerce tripled, and the amount of horsepower used in French industries increased five times. The scope of his public works projects was astounding. In Paris alone 20,000 housing units were demolished and replaced by 40,000 new ones. The capital was, through his efforts, transformed from a dying medieval city to a modern metropolis with a core of lasting beauty. For the workers he did more than any government or sovereign before his time. He sponsored old age pensions and health insurance, he contributed heavily to the establishment of co-operatives, and used governmental powers to begin the regulation of factory conditions. He built parks and general hospitals for the lower classes and expanded public education. He played

a major role in the unprecedented stimulus given to capital formation, credit expansion, and the spirit of foreign enterprise.¹⁸ In the earlier years of his reign, in particular the French economy as a whole expanded faster than that of any other country in Europe. And this progress was often made in the face of tremendous difficulties. Much of it could scarcely have been accomplished without at least some measure of autocratic government.¹⁹

While in Bordeaux in 1852 Napoleon had declared that the Empire meant not war, but peace. At the time he meant what he said. But within two years of his accession to the throne as Emperor, France was involved in the Crimean War. It was not something the Emperor had wanted to happen, and it was certainly not, as certain jingoist British historians have suggested, plotted by him in order to secure prestige for the dynasty. Like the other combatants he drifted into the conflict. Napoleon, it is true, pressed the Russians and the Ottomans for all he could get in 1852 and 1853 in order to strengthen France's position in the Levant. But when war with Russia threatened he was anxious to compromise. He took no steps to increase the French army until late in 1853. It was the British Ambassador in Constantinople, Canning, who encouraged the Porte to refuse all concessions to the Russians, and it was Canning who put enough guts into the Ottomans so that they were brave enough to declare war on the Tzar after the Russian occupation of the Principalities. Napoleon joined England against Russia in order to cement his entente with the English, to destroy the Treaty of Vienna, and to end Russian hegemony in Europe.

The whole of the Crimean War was badly conducted. It was to be expected. The European armies had not seen a major war since 1815. The only man in high position on the Allied side during the war who really had clear ideas on how to fight the war was Louis Napoleon. In the opening days of the conflict he proposed a unified command to the British—they were to have supreme command on the sea, the French on land. It was refused. Napoleon's plans for a Baltic campaign were

quite realistic and had good chances for success, but quarrels between the Allied commanders in the region led to their demise. His plan for the investment and capture of Sébastopol was "more original and thoughtful than any proposed by any French or English general," and in the end the fortress fell after a sequence of events that amounted to a change of positions according to his plan.²⁰ No man during the course of the war did more to support its vigorous and successful prosecution, and, anticipating French public opinion, no man was more ready to bring the war to a speedy and honorable conclusion. The British, however, muddled along. Perhaps symbolic of their attitude towards the whole affair, including their alliance with the French was Lord Raglan, the British commander-in-chief. He was sixty-five and had not seen active service since 1815. Totally out of touch with conditions and campaigns in the field, he never could quite break the habit, even in front of the French staff officers in the Crimea, of referring to the enemy as 'the French.'²¹ Peace, when it finally did come, was due not only to Russian collapse behind the lines and the fall of Sébastopol, but also to Napoleon's diplomacy. He negotiated a Swedish alliance, threatened to raise Poland against the Tzar, and arranged for the Austrians to threaten intervention. These moves had their calculated affect.

The successful conclusion of the Crimean War and the Peace of Paris in 1856 represented a peak in Napoleon's reign. France had thrown off the treaties of 1815; Russian hegemony in Europe had been destroyed; France had resumed her place as the first power on the continent. At home, Lewis Napoleon was popular as never before.

But the course of the war had strained Napoleon's entente with England. Despite the fact that the French had twice as many men in the Crimea and had carried the brunt of the fighting, English public opinion persisted in believing that the English were doing it all and the French trying to take the credit. They resented the fact that their armies had not looked good and they resented French prominence in the diplomacy leading up to the Congress. After 1856 the English expected French foreign

policy to meekly follow their lead and give way in every conflict of interest. Napoleon farther prejudiced the alliance for the sake of an independent Roumania, a policy comprehensible only if it is remembered that he did indeed believe in the principle of nationalities. The English, especially after 1856, irrationally opposed everything Louis Napoleon did. They were pro-Roumanian until Napoleon sought to unite the Principalities; they were pro-Italian until Napoleon intervened to help Italy; they wanted to help the Christians in the Levant until Napoleon stopped the Lebanese massacres. They suspected Napoleon of aiding the Indian mutineers, and even his offer to allow the British to transport their troops across France did nothing to allay this suspicion. Throughout the reign of Napoleon III British public opinion was so anti-French, so anti-Napoleon, and, I might also add, so assinine that it was blind to all other dangers to British supremacy and the balance of power in Europe.

After the Crimean War, Louis Napoleon turned his attention to Italy. In 1849, as President of the Second Republic, he had ordered French troops into Rome. He was accused of doing it in order to gain the support of French Catholic opinion, but this was probably of only minor importance. French policy since the days of Habsburg encirclement had been to prevent Austrian domination of the Italian peninsula. And in 1849 the question was not whether the Roman Republic would be crushed or not, but only who would crush it, the Austrians or the Neopolitans or the French. Napoleon moved first, not only to thwart Austrian dominance in Italy, but also because he hoped to be able to pressure Pius IX into granting liberal concessions to the populace. Austrian or Neopolitan occupation, he realized, would mean only brutal suppression and total reaction. His intentions were well-meaning, but they did not succeed. Pius IX on his return to Rome refused all thought of compromise, and French Catholic opinion blindly and unhesitatingly backed his position. Napoleon was left in a bind. To pull out would mean Austrian control over central Italy and a Catholic reaction against him in France; to remain alienated Italian and republican sentiment. Later Napoleon was to admit

that the Roman intervention was his one regret.

But despite the Roman quandry, Napoleon was determined "to do something for Italy." After the Crimean War he turned his full attention to the problem, asking Cavour, the Sardinian Prime Minister, to visit him in Paris. Subsequent negotiations between Paris and Turin resulted, ultimately, in the famous meeting at Plombières. The decision to intervene in Italy was not decided on here, nor the terms under which it was to be accomplished. The main points had already been agreed upon—a confederated Italy, an enlarged Piedmont, the cession of Savoy and Nice to France, the marriage of Prince Napoleon to Victor Emmanuel's daughter, with Sardinia to take responsibility for luring Austria into declaring war first. The last was the biggest problem and the main topic of discussion with the Emperor's plan finally being adopted. Austrian bumbling of the affair, her demand for unilateral disarmament by Piedmont, and, then, her declaration of war allowed the French to intervene on the pretext of aiding an invaded country.

The war went successfully enough. At Solferano and Magenta the Allies won victories. Then, after Magenta, the Emperor unexpectedly arranged a meeting with Francis Joseph. An armistice resulted. Under its terms Austria ceded Lombardy to Piedmont, but retained Venetia. Napoleon gave up, in return, his claims on Nice and Savoy. Cavour was infuriated at Napoleon's withdrawal from the alliance and temporarily resigned, but Napoleon had little choice and every justification for the withdrawal. Of primary importance was Prussian mobilization on the unprotected Rhine frontier. France was not prepared to fight a two-front war. Moreover, the Sardinians had not lived up to their side of the agreement. They had undertaken to provide supplies for the campaign, but the supplies were grossly inadequate. And, even worse, the Sardinians had begun the machinations which were to ultimately lead to their absorption of the central Italian states, something not provided for in the Plombières agreement. Finally, the bulk of Austrian troops were still

in fighting condition and protected by the Quadrilateral fortifications. Reluctantly Victor Emmanuel realized that the French had given their best and consented to the peace and French withdrawal. When the Sardinians proceeded to annex the central Italian states in 1859 and 1860, Napoleon was able to raise his claim for the Savoy and Nice regions once again. To this Victor Emmanuel and Cavour conceded. A plebiscite approved their incorporation into France. This step could be justified by the principle of nationalities, and until Mussolini, Italy never protested the cession. Thus by 1860 Napoleon had extricated himself from a very dangerous position and had done so with considerable skill. He had achieved, as far as the circumstances allowed, one of the major aims of his life. France had gained not only three departments, but increased military power and national prestige. And Napoleon, amazingly enough, was still rather well-liked by both the Austrians and the Italians.

The period following the Italian War is usually considered a turning point in the reign of Napoleon III. The Empire had reached its apogee. Both at home and abroad the Emperor's power and reputation were at their highest points. It is therefore somewhat surprising that the domestic history of the Empire swerved at this point onto a new path. The 1860's were to see the rise of the Liberal Empire.

Napoleon III's government between 1851 and 1860 had been autocratic but not despotic or totalitarian. The Second Empire was not a police state. Opposition was possible, though sharply restricted by limitations on press freedom and public political gatherings. There were no concentration camps. The freedoms that the Empire offered were those that most Frenchmen wanted: freedom from foreign dictation, from endemic disorder, from economic distress, from the vacillations of a despised parliamentary body. There were sharp and severe repressive measures for only two brief periods—after the coup and after the Italian nationalist Orsini's attempt on the Emperor's life in 1858. The subjects of the Second Empire were probably freer than those of any other country save possibly England. The parliaments, though heavily pro-government,

were not packed with mediocre government officials and were not expected to meekly support everything the government introduced. In the late 1850's, in fact, the Assembly violently opposed the free trade treaty with England. It is true that there were official candidates, and for the most part they usually won, but these were not always Bonapartists. Neither were they puppets. They were men of standing in their own right and with often divergent ambitions. They were not hand-picked in Paris and forced on the provinces; they were usually chosen in the departments by the prefects and often forced on Paris because no other candidate could win. The official candidates were favoured by government pressure in the elections, but the pressure was subtle; there was never open bribery or violent coercion. The Second Empire was thus a curious alliance of old and new forces, representing neither a total break with the past nor a continuance of the old order. To call the regime an anticipation of modern facism, as some historians have done, is both unjust and incorrect.²² There were more differences than similarities, many more.

France under the authoritarian Empire was satisfied with conditions at home and with the Emperor's foreign policy. But in 1860 Napoleon III began the course of action that makes his regime almost unique among dictatorships—deliberate liberalization directed and initiated from above, not forced from below. This evolution from the authoritarian to the parliamentary empire was planned, desired, and promised from the very outset of the Empire. It was a conscious intention made, as Napoleon believed, in accordance with the trends of the century. For once a party platform was honored, and honored over the opposition of many of the regime's supporters. In his pre-Imperial writings Louis Napoleon had dreamed, as many have dreamed, of a transient dictatorship which would not only restore order out of chaos, but would be in the 'national will' and would provide a political education for the nation. The implementation of this political program was, as L.C.B. Seaman says, "much more a sign of his doctrinaire over-confidence than... a sign of weakness."²³ He had promised on assuming power that he would one day crown the

imperial edifice with liberty "and the spectacle of a political figure actually carrying out one of his promises has appeared so incredible that historians have been at infinite pains to explain the phenomenon out of existence."²⁴ But those who have intimately studied political conditions in France in 1860²⁵ and the shrewdest of contemporaries, like Cavour and Bismarck, agree that it was not done as the result of outside pressures. The tale that the concessions were made from weakness is an invention of the opposition made to flatter their own importance. Napoleon, of course, hoped that by making liberal concessions he could win the republicans to the support of the regime, and somewhat lessen his dependence on the conservatives. That it did not work was not his fault, but the republicans. They refused to support the regime, not because it was not moving in the direction of their goals and principles, but because they wanted power, not the fulfilment of their doctrines. Rather than applaud the concessions as they came, they resented Napoleon for stealing their thunder. That Napoleon did not stop the transition from an autocratic to a parliamentary empire at the first sign of liberal recalcitrance is a reflexion not on the power of the opposition, but on the absence of severity in his character and on the principles he firmly believed in. It was the major mistake of his lifetime. The Liberal Empire released French public opinion, and it was to be French public opinion, manipulated by a free republican opposition, not Napoleon, which led the country to disaster in 1870.

The first concession from the throne came in 1859—general amnesty to all political exiles. Then in late 1860 Napoleon gave the Assembly the power to vote an address to the throne, in effect, to propose legislation. He also promised the Assembly all the information it required on national policies and agreed to open its meetings to the public and to publish its proceedings. More concessions were to follow. But each concession, instead of gaining the gratitude or the support of the republicans, was used by them against the Empire. The press was liberalized in the spring of 1861, and then in 1867 it was given complete freedom of action. In the departments the electoral machinery of the Empire, which had returned

the heavily pro-Napoleonic majorities of the autocratic period, was disassembled. This was another mistake. Every government in France, both before and since, has used the departmental officials to influence the outcome of elections. Napoleon had just used them more effectively, and their elimination led, too often, to a confusion of local interests with national ones. In 1867 Parliament was given the power to question ministers and freedom of political assembly was restored. The workers, meanwhile, were granted the right to strike and to organize trade unions. Then, on the 1st day of January, 1870, Louis Napoleon agreed to the creation of a homogenous cabinet responsible to the Assembly and subject to overthrow. Furthermore, he appointed a long-time opponent of his regime, Emile Olliver, to head it.²⁶

Just as public opinion played an increasingly larger role in domestic politics during the 1860's, thanks to the transition to the Liberal Empire, it also played a greater and greater role in foreign policy decisions.

In the early 1860's before liberalization had gone too far and while he still had considerable control over France's destinies, Napoleon involved her in Mexico. His motives here were varied. He had dreams of creating a progressive state, able to resist the encroachments of the neighbor to the north which had dispoiled her less than twenty years earlier. He believed that a stable, progressive government in Mexico would not only benefit its own people, but provide a new outlet for European capital and a new source of raw materials. His candidate for the throne, Maximilian of Austria, was similar to Napoleon in outlook, a progressive aristocrat. The project was not, as Seamen and others have said,²⁷ "foolish" and did not show "a grotesque disregard for practical realities." It was not at all ridiculous, and it almost succeeded. By the end of 1864 Bazaine and the French army with their Mexican monarchist allies had pacified most of the country. The failure of the expedition was determined not in Mexico, but to the north. Appomattox and the end of the War for Southern Independence in 1865 turned the tide. Juarez received arms and sanctuary across the border, and American troops massed on the Rio Grande. From

mid-1865 on, and only from that time, did the project really become impossible and withdrawal imperative.

Meanwhile, back in Europe, Austro-Prussian relations were becoming increasingly strained. By the beginning of 1866 it had become obvious to most observers that a war over supremacy in Germany was eminent. Napoleon's over-riding aim in the diplomatic manoeuvres preceding that conflict was to insure the cession of Venetia to Italy and to prevent the total absorption of all of Germany by either of the competitors. He played his hand both skilfully and wisely. Before the war's outbreak he had been assured by both contending parties that Venetia would pass to Italy no matter what its outcome. In return he had promised nothing to either side save his neutrality, which, in any case, the pressure of public opinion and the unprepared state of the French army would probably have forced him to keep. Napoleon stood to lose no territory in the conflict and the chance of securing compensation on the Rhine, especially if Austria won. At worst he risked a moral defeat with serious but by no means disastrous consequences. It was Bismarck who was playing the dangerous game in 1866. He went to war with both his parliament and his people protesting the burden the Prussian army forced on them and in serious doubt of just what the French might do. He staked everything on quick victory. He was lucky. He got his swift victory. After Sadowa there was some pressure placed on Napoleon by public opinion to mass troops on the Rhine, to threaten war as Prussia had done in 1859. But neither Napoleon nor the French masses really wanted war in 1866. Relying solely on bluff and diplomacy Napoleon attempted to make it clear to Prussia that France could not permit the annexation of the south German states and that all territorial clauses in an Austro-Prussian settlement would have to be approved by France. The Prussians, still fearing the possibility of French intervention, agreed both to these demands and to French mediation with Austria. In 1866 it was still Napoleon and not Bismarck who was calling the plays. His policy of diplomatic firmness and keeping the powers in suspense over French intentions resulted in

his retrieving from the Austro-Prussian War much more than might have been expected otherwise. The belligerents had been forced to accept his mediation, the Prussians, partly in order to avoid the effects of this mediation, had granted Austria a milder peace than had originally been planned, and no transfers of territory had taken place without Napoleon's consent. Moreover, the war had seen the completion of important parts of his own basic program—the unification of Italy through the cession of Venetia and the unification of Germany along more national lines. True, it had created a powerful state on France's weakest frontier, the north-east, and a potential threat to the Empire. But by liberating the south German states from Austrian influence, a path seemed to be open for the extension of French influence into Germany. To see Sadowa, therefore, as a French defeat as well as an Austrian one is to see retrospectively; to look at history through the tinted glasses of 1870.

Napoleon III's friends as well as his critics have in general agreed that he was sincere in his nationalities program and that many of the policies followed by the French government after 1866 were in opposition to his desires and at least partially due to domestic pressures. In the springtime of the Empire, especially in the fifties, Napoleon had been able to carry out his policies and programs in spite of public opposition. The war in the Crimea was both entered into and carried on in spite of the almost totally negative attitude of the French people. The intervention in Italy was also undertaken against public opinion, as Napoleon knew from the periodic reports he required from his prefects. At critical moments in foreign affairs in the fifties and early sixties Napoleon had been able to resist public opinion in order to press diplomatic advantages. But the liberal reforms of the sixties and Napoleon's voluntary surrender of large blocks of the imperial power altered this situation. In the last phases of the Empire, French policy was increasingly shaped by the popular pressures that had been resisted during the earlier phases. The government was now often forced to take up disastrous policies by a public opinion corrupted by an irrational and free opposition. The surrender of imperial

power unleashed at a critical point in the history of Europe and France (1867—1870) all that was irresponsible. The opponents of the regime, seizing on any weapon which might enable them to take power, made the most outrageous promises, promises impossible of implementation—higher wages and lower prices, more public works and economy in government, lower taxes and more subsidies, martial glory and peace. Using the so-called shame of Sadowa as a weapon the republicans demanded that Napoleon seek compensations. His attempts to satisfy this demand were not undertaken because of a personal belief that France needed compensations, but in order to placate the French public.

Napoleon seized on Luxemburg as both a peaceful to an easy way to satisfy France's demand for compensation. The terms for the sale of the region by the King of the Netherlands to France involved a French guarantee to Holland against Prussian aggression and the agreement of the population to the transfer. Bismarck had to be brought into the negotiations since a Prussian garrison was stationed there. His leak to the German nationalists made the sale impossible, but the victory was not all Bismarck's, as he had expected. He too had to compromise. Napoleon was forced to abandon his claim to the province, but the Prussians were compelled to withdraw their garrison from Luxemburg, guarantee the country's neutrality, and dismantle the fortress there, called the Gibraltar of the north. Thus the final result was neither a victory for Bismarck nor a defeat for Napoleon. It was a draw.

Much has also been made of the draft treaty which Bismarck had the French Ambassador Benedetti draw up in 1866 and which allegedly revealed French designs on Belgium. It is sometimes asserted that its publication on the outbreak of war in 1870 lost the French whatever sympathy they may have had in many European court circles. In the first place, sympathies are not armies, and sympathy would have done the French little good in 1870. It is very unlikely that the publication of the draft treaty made any difference in the foreign policies of any of the European powers. Moreover, in the words of one historian, the publication of the draft

"proved to be a damp squib: the neutral powers regarded it as either a forgery or a piece of diplomatic jobbery equally discreditable to Prussia and to France."²⁸

Nowhere, not even in Napoleon's search for compensations, was the detrimental effect of public opinion on the conduct of policy more clear than in the case of the Emperor's program of army reform. Napoleon knew, definitely, both from the performance of the Prussian army in 1866 and from his military attachés in Berlin, that the French army desperately needed revamping if it was to continue to play a decisive role in European politics in the future. In late 1867 and in 1868 he tried, vainly, to push a military reform bill through the legislature. But it aroused tremendous opposition from every class of society. The middle classes demanded the continuance of their right to buy exemptions, the lower classes opposed universal conscription since it would eliminate the chance they had of not being called up at all. All opposed any lengthening of the term of service. The republicans used the unpopular measure as a stick to beat the Emperor's government with. But this same public which blocked the Emperor's program of army reform and forced Napoleon to finance experiments on the chesspot rifle, on the breech-loading cannon, and on an improved version of the Gatling gun out of his own pocket also demanded a bellicose foreign policy. This was the price of the Liberal Empire. Where the guilt lies for the failure of French foreign policy after 1866 and for the débacle of 1870 is clear. Lynn Case admirably summed the case up as follows :

Thus the responsibility for the dilution of the army bill...falls directly upon French public opinion and its legislative representatives. This responsibility is all the heavier because at the same time that opinion was opposing the bill, it showed evidence of a universal belief in the inevitability of war with Prussia.... The road to Sedan, unlike the road to Hell, was not even paved with good intentions. And when the tragedy of defeat finally broke upon the land, the unrepentant people loaded all the blame upon the one man who, accepting captivity to

save the lives of his handicapped soldiers, had long before exerted himself more than all the others to spare them that evil day.²⁹

The indictment must not fall upon the mass of the French people alone. It must be, in great measure, placed directly on Napoleon's political opposition, especially the republicans. No one was more pacific when it came to army reform or more bellicose when it came to foreign policy than they were. They called for a revolutionary war to liberate Poland, for intervention after Sadowa, for compensations after 1866, for the natural frontiers, for the defense of national honor and the humiliation of Prussia. But, simultaneously, they advocated arms reductions, the abolition of standing armies, and the defeat of the army reform bill of 1868. The republicans, not Napoleon, were willing to seek factional advantage and political power at the expense of national security. Napoleon sought to pursue a rational policy, accepting German aspirations while following a prudent policy of rearmament in the face of a real Prussian threat. It is France's tragedy that there were few who would support this policy.

The events which led up to the war in 1870 are rather well known and need not be gone into in detail. Whether Bismarck wanted war or not is questionable. That the French public wanted war and that Napoleon did not are certain.³⁰ In any case French opinion forced French diplomacy to take too firm a stand on the Hohenzollern candidacy for the Spanish throne, and it was French opinion which forced the declaration of war after Bismarck's Ems dispatch. Napoleon was by now no longer the effective ruler of France. Fulfilling a promise made twenty years earlier and in accordance with the principles he had held all of his life, Napoleon had voluntarily ceased to be the arbiter of France's destinies. Gordon Wright has asserted that "what doomed the empire was not its internal evolution but rather the cumulative results of a series of errors in foreign policy."³¹ He was only partially right. What doomed the Empire was the cumulative results of a series of errors in foreign policy which were a result of the internal liberal evolution of the Empire. The republicans and liberals, allowed through this internal evolution to freely spread their

propaganda, to destroy the facts, were, together with the French public at large, responsible for the military unpreparedness in 1870 and for the disastrous foreign policy of the late 1860's. The declaration of war itself was not the whim of an arbitrary autocrat, but came, instead, from the powers which represented French public opinion—the mobs in the streets of Paris, the cabinet, the Chamber, the press. France had her liberal constitution in 1870, and the Emperor could do little to stave off the demands of the majority. "He was hurled, paralyzed and open-eyed, into the abyss."³²

Once the war got under way things went wrong right from the beginning. The army's mobilization was grossly inefficient, and in place of the expected 300,000 men, only 220,000 were ready when the Prussians struck. Nonetheless, in spite of logistic difficulties and obsolescence, the French armies fought well. The Second Empire can not be blamed for not having a Moltke; men like that are rare. The Empire can also not be blamed for its choice of commanders. MacMahon had a long and distinguished record; Bazaine had been efficient in Mexico; Trochu had a reputation as a strategist. None were court generals; all had experience. But, outnumbered and outgunned, the defeats came quickly. Bazaine was surrounded at Metz. Then MacMahon with the Emperor, attempting to relieve Bazaine, was lured into a trap at Sedan. Lewis Napoleon could have elected to go down in a blaze of glory here had he wished, and indeed, while the issue was still somewhat undecided, he sought death on the firing lines. It did not come. By ordering resistance to the last man he could have retained some prestige, but he was not that kind of man. He saw the suffering of his soldiers and was genuinely affected by it. For him the choice was not hard. To prevent the needless shedding of blood he surrendered. When the news was received in Paris, the Parisian mob overthrew yet another French government. In 1848 it had been the July Monarchy, now it was the Second Empire.

Bismarck seriously considered restoring Napoleon to his throne in 1870-71, but Napoleon refused unless the Prussians gave milder terms to

France. At the end of the war Napoleon once more settled in England. During the last ten years of his reign he had been constantly ill and often in intense pain. By 1870 he was dying. In December of 1872 and January of 1873 British surgeons operated. A third operation was planned for the morning of January 9, 1873. It was never performed. The Emperor's last coherent words were spoken to his ever-faithful physician, Conneau, that morning: "Were you at Sedan?" He sank rapidly and within a few hours he died.

France did not moan. By this time the Empire was already becoming an unpleasant memory, totally blamed for the débacle of 1870. That this was not true mattered little. But there were still some who were not so blind. In the midst of the déluge Maxime Du Camp had written to Flaubert:

The nation weeps and laments, is in despair, proclaims its innocence, and casts the blame upon the Empire. The nation is in the wrong; she had her fate in her own hands, and this is what she has made of it.³³

REFERENCES

1. Namier, Sir Lewis "The First Mountebank Dictator," *Vanished Superemacies*, London, Hamish Hamilton, 1958, pp. 54-64.
2. Albert Guerard, *Napoleon III*, Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1943.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 39.
4. G. P. Gooch, *The Second Empire*, London, Longmans, 1960, p. 2.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 28.
6. For Napoleon III's personality and character I have relied largely on G. P. Gooch's masterly *The Second Empire*, London, 1960, especially the first thirty or so pages; also Roger L. Williams, "A Tragedy of Good Intention," *History Today*, Vol. V, 1954, pp. 219-226, and L. C. B. Seaman, "Lewis Napoleon, Second Republic and Second Empire," pp. 55-68 in his *From Vienna to Versailles*, New York, Harper and Row, 1963; finally, Samuel M. Osgood (ed.), *Napoleon III: Buffon, Modern Dictator, or Sphinx?*, Boston, D. C. Heath, 1963, pp. 1-13.
7. T. A. B. Corley, *Democratic Despot: A Life of Napoleon III*, London, Barrie and Rockliff, 1961, p. 38.
8. For Napoleon's attempted coups at Strassburg and Bologne I have largely relied on T. A. B. Corley's *Democratic Despot*, pp. 26-50, Albert Guerard's *Napoleon III*, pp. 25-47, and F. A. Simpson's *The Rise of Louis Napoleon*, London, Longmans, Green & Co., 1909.
9. G. P. Gooch, *The Second Empire*, p. 55.
10. Guerard, *Napoleon III*, p. 55.
11. *Ibid.*, pp. 55-56.
12. F. A. Simpson, *Louis Napoleon and the Recovery of France, 1848-1856*, London, Longmans, Green, 1923, p. 195.
13. Guerard, *Napoleon III*, p. 56.
14. *Ibid.*, pp. 69-72.
15. Charles Seignobos, "The Magic of a Name," Samuel M. Osgood (ed.) *Napoleon III*, pp. 14-16.
16. F. A. Simpson, *The Rise of Louis Napoleon*, pp. 305-20; Guerard, *Napoleon III*, pp. 93-98.

17. F. A. Simpson, *The Rise of Louis Napoleon*, pp. 312-14; Guerard, *Napoleon III*, pp. 117-18.
18. Alan B. Spitzer, "The Good Napoleon III," *French Historical Studies*, Vol. II, 1962, p. 308 ff, reprinted in Shepard B. Clough, Peter Gay, and C. K. Warner, *The European Past*, New York, Macmillan, 1964, Vol. II, pp. 182-83.
19. For French economic history during the Second Empire I have largely relied on Shepard Bancroft Clough, *France: A History of National Economics, 1789-1939*, New York, Scribner's 1939, pp. 163-199, and Rondo E. Cameron, *France and the Economic Development of Europe, 1800-1914*, Princeton, New Jersey, Princeton University Press, 1961. Spitzer, *op. cit.*, pp. 181-186.
20. Brison D. Gooch, *The Reign of Napoleon III*, Chicago, Rand McNally, 1969, p. 17.
21. Corley, *Democratic Despot*, p. 158.
22. Namier, Sir Lewis *op. cit.*, and J. Salwyn Schapiro, *Liberalism and the Challenge of Fascism*, New York, Mc Graw-Hill, 1949, pp. 320-331.
23. Seaman, *From Vienna to Versailles*, p. 67.
24. *Ibid.*
25. Theodore Zeldin, *The Political System of Napoleon III*, London, Macmillan, 1958.
26. For the internal political development of the Empire, I have relied on Zeldin, *The Political System of Napoleon III*; Guerard, *Napoleon III*; Corley, *Democratic Despot*; Seaman, *Vienna to Versailles*; and J. M. Thompson, *Louis Napoleon and the Second Empire*, Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1954.
27. Seaman, *op. cit.*
28. Corley, *op. cit.* p. 335. For the diplomatic events of the 1860's I have relied on the following works in reaching my conclusions: L. C. B. Seaman, *op. cit.* A. J. P. Taylor, "Bismarck and Europe," *From Napoleon to Lenin*, New York, Harper & Row, pp. 87-102; Corley, *Democratic Despot*, pp. 184ff; Guerard, *Napoleon III*, pp. 219 ff; J. M. Thompson, *Louis Napoleon and the Second Empire*, pp. 196 ff. On the role of public opinion in the determination of foreign policy the standard work is by Lynn M. Case, *French Opinion on War and Diplomacy during the Second Empire*, Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1954. I did not have his work

available and was thus forced to rely on the sections reproduced from this work which are found in Osgood's *Napoleon III*, pp. 65-70, and in Spitzer's bibliographical article as reprinted in Clough, Gay, and Warner's *The European Past*, Vol. II, pp. 190 - 192.

29. Lynn M. Case, op. cit. pp. 239-40, from Spitzer in Clough, Gay, and Warner, op. cit. p. 191. Farther information on the army reform bill of 1868 and the reaction of French public opinion to it may be found in Gordon Wright, "Public Opinion and Conscription in France, 1867-1870," *Journal of Modern History*, Vol. XIV, 1942, pp. 26-45.
30. Case, op. cit. pp. 275-277, Spitzer, Clough, Gay, and Warner, op. cit., p. 192.
31. Gordon Wright, *France in Modern Times*, Chicago, Rand McNally, 1960 p. 193.
32. Guerard, *Napoleon III*, p. 279.
33. Roger L. Williams, *The World of Napoleon III, 1851-1870*, New York, The Free Press, 1957, p. 268.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Cameron, Rondo, *France and the Economic Development of Europe, 1800 - 1914*, Princeton, New Jersey : Princeton University Press, 1961.
- Clough, Shepard B., *France : A History of National Economics, 1789-1939*. New York : Scribner's 1939.
- Corley, T. A. B., *Democratic Despot : A Life of Napoleon III*, London Barrie and Rockliff, 1961.
- Gooch, Brison D., *The Reign of Napoleon III*, Chicago : Rand McNally, 1969.
- Gooch, G. P., *The Second Empire*, London : Longmans, 1960.
- Guérard, Albert, *Napoleon III*, Cambridge, Mass. : Harvard University Press, 1943.
- Hauterive, Ernest d', *The Second Empire and Its Downfall : The Correspondence of the Emperor Napoleon III and his Cousin Prince Napoleon*, (Translated by Herbert Wilson,) New York : George H. Doran, n.d.

Namier, Sir Louis, "The First Mountebank Dictator," *Vanished Supremacies*, London : Hamish Hamilton, 1958.

Osgood, Samuel M. (ed.), *Napoleon III : Buffon, Modern Dictator, or Sphinx?* Boston : D. C. Heath, 1963.

Pickney, David H., *Napoleon III and the Rebuilding of Paris*, Princeton, New Jersey : Princeton University Press, 1958.

Seaman, L. C. B. "Louis Napoleon, Second Republic and Second Empire," and "Bismarck and Germany 1862 - 1871," *From Vienna to Versailles*, New York : Harper Row, 1963.

Simpson, F. A., *Louis Napoleon and the Recovery of France, 1848 - 1856*. London : Longmans, Green, 1923.

Ibid., *The Rise of Louis Napoleon*, London : Longmans, Green, 1909.

Spitzer, Alan B., "The Good Napoleon III," *French Historical Studies*, Vol. II, 1962, pp. 308 - 329 ; reprinted in Shepard B. Clough, Peter Gay, and C. K. Warner, *The European Past*, New York : Macmillan, 1964, Vol. II, pp. 177 - 193.

Taylor, A. J. P. "Bismarck and Europe," *From Napoleon to Lenin*, New York : Harper Row, 1952.

Thompson, J. M., *Louis Napoleon and the Second Empire*, Oxford : Basil Blackwell, 1954.

Williams, Roger L., "A Tragedy of Good Intentions," *History Today*, Vol. IV, 1954, pp. 219 - 226.

Ibid., *The World of Napoleon III, 1851 - 1870*, New York : The Free Press, 1957.

Wright, Gordon. *France in Modern Times*, Chicago : Rand McNally, 1960.

Ibid., "Public Opinion and Conscription in France, 1897 - 1870," *Journal of Modern History*, Vol. XIV, 1942, pp. 26 - 45.

Zeldin, Theodore, "The Myth of Napoleon III," *History Today*, Vol. VIII, 1958, pp. 103 - 109.

Ibid., *The Political System of Napoleon III*, London : Macmillan, 1958.

DEMAND FOR EXPATRIATE PAKISTANI WORKERS IN IRAQ AFTER CEASE-FIRE

FAREED A. FAREEDY

Assistant Professor

Department of Economics, University of the Punjab, Lahore

The Iranian acceptance of the UN General Assembly Resolution 598 calling for immediate cessation of wartime hostilities, gave a sigh of relief especially in the neighbouring Muslim countries including Pakistan. This eight years of senseless barbarism that cost a hundreds of thousands of lives are now being said to be the result of an exaggerated sense of national self esteem and a tentative devotion to martyrism that had kept both the nations at each other's throat for longer than anticipated period since the outset of hostilities in September, 1980. Apart from inflicting considerable physical, infrastructure and human damage to Iraq, the 8 years of war have seriously disrupted and distorted Iraq's economic development process which was moving ahead with a considerable pace. The war has placed an overwhelming emphasis on the petroleum sector both to generate current income and to assure future economic growth. In the short term, Iraq has but little choice than to pump more oil to generate revenues which are absolutely necessary to restore war damages which in turn are necessary for the survival of Saddam's regime. However, Iraq enjoys a broader resource base than other Arab oil-exporters, but pre-war plans for diversification have been undermined by the diversion of finance and of trained manpower to the war effort. By the end of 1985, the cost of war was more than \$ US 176 billion.¹

Before the war Iraq's people lived under a fairly efficient state socialism, with a heavy military flavour. Its rulers including president Saddam Hussain himself, are largely of the minority, i.e., about 40 per cent Sunni faith of the total population. The Iraqi majority, despite past persecution and pre-war expulsions, is still of the Shite Muslim faith, Iraq's Shites have

remained loyal to the state despite the efforts of Iran's revolutionaries to take advantage of the commonality of religious faith. The Iraqi Shias are proud Arabs as proved during the war with Iran. It seems that President Saddam Hussain has worked hard to receive their loyalties by giving them a fairer deal in the states affairs.

The Iran-Iraq war is called as a personal one because it is the result of Saddam Hussain's ambitions as he began to eliminate all opponents to his sole authority as soon as he became President in 1979. The war has served the purpose of enhancing his own authority against that of potential rivals and generating mass enthusiasm for his leadership. Hence, among those trends that have been accelerated by war are; the concentration of political power in the hands of Saddam Hussain, the pragmatic alteration of long-standing Baath Party principles, the structural dependence of the economy on the oil sector.²

In view of the conflicting version as to who was responsible for the war, Iraqis had fought this war as a defensive one because ever since September, 1980 the Iraq's government had called for a cease-fire. Since June, 1982, it had asked for no more than a return to the *status quo*, but war did continue for eight years. Now the war has ended, yet there is still no squeak of a challenge to Saddam's regime. Some relatives of the 300,000 or so Iraqis killed at the front will question an eight-year war that changed no borders was worth fighting. In return of war, hundreds of their villages have been razed and as many as half a million of them have become refugees.

Oil, War and the Economy

By definition, the national income of Iraq depends on oil sales and an immediate consequence of the fighting was the reduction of exports as a result of damaged wells and the closure of the Gulf route. The final straw came in 1982 when Syria decided to close the Iraqi pipeline to its port Baniyas, thereby depriving Iraq to some 5 billion dollars in revenues annually thereby leaving Iraq with only 0.65 mbd export capacity via the pipeline

to Dortyal in Turkey. This was supplemented by road exports of refined products through Jordan and Turkey, and the joint Saudi-Kuwaiti agreement in 1983 to transport some 0.3 mbd from the Neutral Zone on Iraq's behalf. By 1985, the original Turkish pipeline was pumping 1 mbd and Saudi petroline to the Red Sea began pumping at a level of 0.3 mbd which significantly helped the Iraqis. The following table shows the comparative statistics of Iran and Iraq regarding the impact of war :

TABLE 1
Comparative Losses due to War

	(US \$ Billion)	
	Iran	Iraq
<i>Revenue / Expenditure Losses</i>		
Less of oil revenues	.. 23.4*	65.5*
Extra military expenditure	.. 24.3	33.0
<i>GDP Losses</i>		
GDP less (oil sector)	.. 108.2	120.8
GDP less (non-oil sector)	.. 30.3	64.0
<i>Fixed Capital Losses</i>		
Unrealised fixed capital formation	.. 76.5*	43.4*
Loss from destruction (oil sector)	.. n.a.	n.a.
Loss from destruction (non-oil sector)	.. 25.9	8.2
Total	.. 188.7	226.0

*Included in GDP losses

Sources : *The Middle East Journal*, Vol. XL, No. 1, Winter 1986 and Vol. XLII No. 3, Summer 1988.

It has been estimated in April, 1988, that the financial losses to Iraq was greater compared to Iran. These were \$226 billion and \$188.7 billion

respectively for Iraq and Iran.³ The reason lies behind this is that Iraq was financially supported by other Muslim and non-Muslim countries and had enough sources to meet the expenditure of war but this was not true for Iran.

The impact of war has been magnified upon economy by combination of many factors. Development spending rose sharply in 1979, based on optimistic assessments of a continued income growth. At the sametime (ignoring the cost of war), Iraq decided not to curtail spending, in order to maintain public morale to complete the infrastructure for the 1982 Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) summit which was to be hosted by Iraq. Expenditures rose by 29 per cent in 1981 and then again by a further 12 per cent in 1982.⁴ Spending continued to rise, despite the drastic reduction in Iraq's oil-exporting capacity. Consequently Iraq's financial reserves were rapidly depleted and it was forced to borrow from Arab and international sources. The government component exceeded \$50 billion since the Gulf states alone might have lent that sum till 1986. This debt burden increased to \$60 billion by the end of the war. By 1986, commercial debts covered by government export agencies amounted to some \$9.3 billion and another \$6 billion owed to Western companies was not covered. Iraq has sought to defer the problem by asking its creditors to extend the repayment period.

The cost of war was estimated ranging from \$500 million to \$1 billion per month and this had forced the Iraqi government to make economies where ever possible. Consumer imports were slashed and restrictions imposed on the proportion of wages remittable by foreign workers. The Remittances to Egypt were cut in 1982 and again in 1986.⁵ Thus many priorities were redefined and spendings were curtailed in all sectors except towards the war effort.

Privatization of Economy

Saddam's government had imposed a heavy socialist hand on the economy. Shortly, after assuming the presidency, he launched several

initiatives intended to enhance his popularity, including revolutionary reforms concerning land ownership and agricultural policies. The war imposed harsh realities on the socialist elements of the government, which slowly started to realize the importance of the private sector in feeding Iraqi population and thus shouldering burden of the war. Coupled with tenure policies that since 1979-80 favoured private landownership were a series of steps designed further to stimulate the private sector. The allocation of loans by Agricultural co-operative banks had declined from over 2/3 to less than 1/4 of the total from 1979 to 1980.⁶ It dropped to 15.1 per cent in 1981. This share reversed between 1981 and 1983 to about 1/3.

In addition to government subsidies, a further hidden subsidy was provided through the setting of currency exchange rates. This had been of advantage to the private sector, for it had imported well over half of all equipment since the onset of the war.

In short, crop and livestock production had been significantly effected by the changing policy of 1979. The total production of vegetable and fruit had increased due to the privatisation of the agriculture sector. In 1986, private sector held 70 per cent share in agriculture.⁷ This was a significant policy change as 30 per cent of Iraqi population is occupied in the agriculture sector.

Apart from this, the figures on public and private sector shares of GDP, exclusive of the oil industry revealed that private sector contributed 50 per cent of GDP in 1982 and private sector's share of manufacturing rose to 40 per cent in 1982. However, the impact of the war on the wage structure had distorted the private sector's share of GDP arising in agriculture. Since 1986, the government had sold off dozens of fairly small state enterprises in the agricultural and services sectors. These included poultry farms, dairies, super markets, gasoline stations, repair shops and some bus companies. The government hoped the shift would boost farm output, reducing the need for imported food.

Demand for Pakistani Workers

Iraq has enormous oil reserves. It has been estimated that Iraq was exporting 2.2 mbd in 1987. This huge increase came from 750,000 mbd in 1982 after Iran first destroyed and later occupied Iraq's Gulf port of Faw.

Iraq, according to Middle East Economic Survey was actually pumping 2.7 mbd, more than twice the quota of 1.54 mbd set for it by the OPEC. Iraq had insisted since the beginning of the war that its quota must be equal to that of Iran's OPEC quota.

It is anticipated, that the pipeline through Saudi Arabia to the Red Sea, which is expected to be completed by 1989, costing about 1 million U.S. dollars per kilometer, will pay for itself in a few months of its operation.⁸ When this pipeline is completed, Iraq would have an export capacity of 3.5 mbd, which is approximately the same amount before the war broke out eight years ago. Thus financial analysts are predicting a fast recovery of Iraq's oil revenues immediately after the cease-fire, and it is hoped that many development projects that have been stopped by the war could be resumed. Iraqis are anticipated to look towards Western Europe and America for financial assistance in reward of its contribution in putting a halt on the Iranian revolutionary process which may have extended to the Arabian countries. Further, it will seek financial help from its rich oil exporting neighbours and Manpower assistance from traditional Arab labour exporters.

The US, France and other European countries are potential contractors in almost every field in development projects. These industrial countries are hoping to join in Iraq's post-war reconstruction programme. Credits have been sanctioned in the amount of \$1.9 billion from the U.S., \$2.4 billion from Turkey and much larger sums from France.⁹ Thus it is anticipated that these donor countries are likely to get most of the industrial contracts.

At this stage, Iraq appears to hold the edge in its ability to rebuild.

It has a smaller population, has sustained less damage and at least for the moment has a more stable government—although it is \$60 billion in debt. The important point for now, however, is that the peace process appears to have begun in earnest.

The following data provides comparative statistic of Iraq and Pakistan, highlighting the size of population differences between the two countries:

TABLE 2
Population and Demography of Pakistan and Iraq

	Pakistan		Iraq	
	1979	1984	1979	1984
<i>Population Growth and Projection :</i>				
Average annual growth of				
Population (percentage)	3.1	2.9	3.3	3.6
Population (millions)	80.0	92.0	n.a.	15
Hypothetical size of Stationary				
Population (millions)	340	353	52	71
Assumed year of reaching net				
production rate of 1	2035	2035	2030	2025
<i>Demography and Fertility:</i>				
Crude birth rate per thousand				
population	44	42	45	45
Crude death rate per thousand				
population	14	15	12	10
Total Fertility rate (percentage)	6.5	6.0	6.7	6.7
Life expectancy	—	52	—	58
Infant mortality rate (aged under 1)	n.a.	116	n.a.	74
Children death rate (aged 1—4)	15	16	16	7

Source: "World Tables (1980-85)," *World Development Reports* (1980-86), World Bank, Washington, D.C.

The current period after the cease-fire is also very crucial. Iraq is facing the problems of reconstruction and rehabilitation with depleted manpower and collapsed economy. Real peace and political stability in Iraq will require the following steps :

1. Physical damage needs to be repaired and towns and cities and the people who live in them are in need of urgent medical care and attention after the damage caused by bombing, etc.
2. Hundreds of thousands people in the vicinity of town of Basra and Northern Iraq are refugees, they need new homes, schools, hospitals, shops and farms.
3. Armies have bulldozed their ways across million of acres of land which was used to grow food. This has hurt Iraq capacity to be self-sufficient in Agriculture production, where a major portion of the population is involved in this activity.
4. Roads and bridges have been shelled out of existence, requiring great reconstruction and restoration efforts.
5. The damage to oil installations and export facilities produced oil revenue losses of \$65.5 billion in Iraq during 1981-85. Crucial industries of Iraq especially of oil and natural gas are largely in ruins and require immediate attention.
6. Iraq had launched a major development effort just before the war. The rising expectations of the Iraqi people will necessitate that those development plans to be recontinued and resumed.

Manpower shortages are obvious in most of the development projects which were underway before the war, therefore, Iraq may import workers in bigger numbers but it will not be able to pay them high wages. However, the labour force from Sri-Lanka, India, Bangladesh and South East Asia would be prepared to do work on minimal wages in the manner they have swarmed Arab countries by under cutting higher paid Pakistanis. Iraq can also take help from the rest of the Arab World on the basis of its

strong relationships with them. The labour force from Jordan, Syria and Egypt will be competing Pakistanis in labour market of Iraq. The decline in the value of Iraqi Dinar may make the Iraqi labour market as an unattractive option for the neighbouring Arab countries and should open the way for migrant workers from South and South East Asia. Thus the real competitors for Pakistanis, in the unskilled labour market will be from Sri-Lanka, India and Bangladesh. However, for the skilled labour market, Pakistanis may have additional competitors from Korea, Philippines and Thailand.

CONCLUSION

In the light of above analysis and the future requirements of human capital, it is concluded that Iraq will be in great need of manpower supplies of both skilled and unskilled type. Pakistan can help by exporting its labour force on the basis of its brotherly relationships with the Arab countries. From our previous experience of migration process from Pakistan to Middle East, which has now ended in negative net migration, it can be said that Pakistani workers will have to compete the labour force coming from the countries of South Asia. Further they will be offered to do work on meagre wages. Therefore, the previous method of licencing the private agencies to export Pakistani manpower to Middle East and leaving the whole process to private sector is less likely to succeed in the present circumstances. Therefore, Pakistan will have to use different policies and tactics to export its labour to Iraq's labour markets than the policies adopted during the 70's. Although, there is no doubt that the Iraq labour market demands skilled persons who can support their industries as well as unskilled labour for construction sector, there are serious considerations regarding its ability to pay attractive wages and transfer payment to migrants home country. Thus the following policies are specifically recommended.

Pakistan should take benefit from migration process mainly on the basis of bilateral agreement on labour exchange. In this case, pays are

fixed of different types of labour force. This labour force will live within the enclave on work camps, but more permanently. The government of Iraq should bear all the expenses of travelling as well as of the cost of living of the worker. The government of Iraq should remit payment to the government of Pakistan, who in turn will pay a fixed income in domestic currency, to the migrant's family. This policy can be argued because the previous studies on international migration had shown that the absolute poverty groups of our economy did not benefit from the migration process. As the empirical research has indicated that almost all of the migrant workers during the 70's were employed or involved in some income generating activity before they left Pakistan. Further the research showed that people from the absolute poverty group could not meet the rising cost of agency fees and the travelling expenses for going to Middle East. Now the government of Pakistan should selectively pick unemployed labour from this group to meet the shortage of unskilled manpower for Iraq.

As the analysis has indicated that wages are very low in Iraq, there is little attraction now, compared to the labour response to job opportunities during the 70's. Nevertheless, the private sector, and the labour exporting agencies should continue to play their usual role. Therefore, private sector, that is private corporations should be encouraged to bid for various project contract, that are now being promoted in Iraq's development plans. It has also been noted that one of the main purpose of the government of Pakistan to earn foreign exchange was not fulfilled in the past. Most of the foreign exchange was remitted by 'Hundi System.' Moreover, the Iraqi government had imposed certain restriction on transfers. Therefore, to avoid this situation, government can receive foreign exchange directly from the government of Iraq by receiving direct labour contracts. The government of Pakistan should take steps through its state owned enterprises as well as private corporations to acquire direct labour contracts from the Iraqi government.

REFERENCES

1. King, R., "The Impact of War on Iraq and Iran", *A Delphi Papers*—219 Spring, 1987, p. 26.
2. Ibid, p. 19.
3. Gowers, A., "The Balance Tilts Against Iran", *Financial Times*, April 27, 1988.
4. King, R., op. cit.
5. Ibid, p. 19.
6. Springborg, R., "Iraqi Infitah: Agrarian Transformation and Growth of the Private Sector", *The Middle East Journal*, Vol. XL, No. 1, 1986.
7. Ibid p. 42.
8. Francis, David F., "Despite War Burden, Iraq...", *The Christian Science Monitor*, October 29, 1987.
9. "Iraq Defies The World", *Financial Times*, September 19, 1988.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Chubin, Shahram and Tripp, Charles, "Iran: the War and the Economy", *Iran - Iraq at War*, 1980-87.
2. Clawson, Patrick, "Islamic Iran's Economic Politics and Prospects", *The Middle East Journal*, Vol. XLII No. 3, 1988.
3. Cooley, John K., "Repairing the Damage in Iran and Iraq", *The Christian Science Monitor*, August 1, 1988.
4. Francis, David F., "Despite War Burden, Iraq ...", *The Christian Science Monitor*, October 29, 1987.
5. Gowers, A., "The Balance Tilts Against Iran," *Financial Times*, April 27, 1988.
6. Haq, Zahurul, "Fall—Out of Iran—Iraq Ceasefire" *The Pakistan Times*, September 1, 1988.
7. King, R., "The Impact of War on Iraq and Iran", *A Delphi Papers*—219, Spring 1987.

8. Momayezi, N., "Economic Correlates of Political Violence : The Case of Iran", *The Middle East Journal*, Vol. XL, No. 1, 1988.
9. Naqvi, E., "Gulf War Ceasefire—What Next ?" *The Pakistan Times*, August, 22, 1988.
10. "Post-War Economic Rehabilitation (PAGE Report)." *Pakistan Statistical Year Book*, 1988.
11. *Pakistan and Gulf Economist*, September. 3 - 9, 1988.
12. Springborg, R., "Iraqi Infitah : Agrarian Transformation and Growth of the Private Sector", *The Middle East Journal*, Vol. XL, No. 1, 1986.
13. *World Development Reoprt*, 1982 - 1986, World Bank, Washington, D.C.

DEMAND FOR CHILDREN: A MICRO-ECONOMIC APPROACH

DR. A. RAUF BUTT

*Associate Professor, Department of Economics,
University of the Punjab, Lahore*

This paper attempts to identify the factors which influence the demand for children by a couple. In other words, this paper aims to estimate a model of demand for children. To this end, this paper is organized in the following fashion. Section I introduces the theme of the paper. Theoretical and methodological frameworks are presented in Sections II and III, respectively. Whereas, Section IV presents the empirical results of regression analysis. Finally, conclusions and suggestions are presented in Section V.

I. INTRODUCTION

The Less Developed Countries (LDCs) are making strong efforts to raise the standard of living of their people. Their governments are endeavouring to improve the quality of living of their citizens through various long-term development plans and short-term policies.

Let us take the case of Pakistan as one of the LDCs. Pakistan has launched development plans for the last thirty-five years. In spite of achieving reasonable rates of economic growth, per capita income and living standard of the population could not be raised to a reasonable level. One enquires surprisingly what is the underlying problem? If economic history of Pakistan is traced it will be found that economic growth rates and population growth rates are going side by side. The impact of development plans on economic growth is nullified by high population growth rates.¹ Therefore, it is concluded that population growth is the

major obstacle in raising the standard of living of Pakistani population. This phenomenon calls for a systematic and thorough research on population growth in Pakistan.

Population growth of a country depends on three factors : fertility (birth rates), mortality (death rates), and migration.

In the present attempt, migration effect on population growth is not subject of interest. Therefore, assuming a constant migration, population growth rate is simply the difference between fertility and mortality rates. During the last two decades, mortality rate has declined considerably in Pakistan because of improved health care technology and medicines. On the other hand, fertility rates remained unchanged. Keeping in view the declined mortality rate and stable fertility rate, one can explain the trend of population growth in Pakistan. This indicates that fertility has contributed the most in population growth in Pakistan. Government of Pakistan launched various fertility control programmes, but none could achieve the desired objectives.² Fertility depends on socio-economic and biological factors which must be examined properly. One of the objectives of this paper is to identify these factors quantitatively. This is done by estimating a micro-economic-based regression model of demand for children.

II. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Demand for children is studied in the context of traditional demand theory of Economics.³ The demand theory is based on the theory of consumer behaviour. As demand for *i*th commodity by *j*th individual (Q_{ij}) depends on: 1. its own (P_i), 2. purchasing power (or income of the consuming unit, Y_j , 3. prices of related goods, P_r , and 4. tastes of the consuming unit, T_j , etc., the demand function can be specified as : $Q_{ij} = f(P_i, Y_j, P_r, T_j)$. A demand for children function can be specified on the same lines.

It seems appropriate here to list the possible factors which affect the demand for children. These factors are : 1. Level of income of the

household. 2. Education of wife. 3. Child bearing age after marriage. 4. Major source of income of the household. 5. Education of husband.

A rationale for using the above variables in the regression model is presented below.

As income of individual (or household) increases he/she can afford more children. But the evidence seems to show that parents with higher income tend to substitute child quality for quantity. They invest in fewer and more educated children. The earning capacity of these children is expected to be quite high. Hence, it can be argued that high income parents tend to demand fewer children than low income parents. This could be because status effect of increased income raises the relative desire for material goods, especially for medium income families whose budget constraints previously precluded the purchase of these goods. In other words, additional children beyond a socially accepted or minimum desired number may be inferior goods.⁴ Shultz (1974) has found empirically an inverse relationship between the demand for children and the level of income.

A basis for using education of wife, as a proxy variable for opportunity cost of raising children is given below. More educated females have better opportunities for employment and other activities outside their homes. As there is a positive correlation between level of education and income, the earnings foregone of these educated mothers to bring up children are substantial. Therefore, for highly educated mothers, the opportunity cost of raising a child is relatively very high. This opportunity cost can be used as a proxy for price for having a child. It has also been found that better employment opportunities for females outside their homes and greater female school attendance, especially at the primary and early years of secondary schooling, are associated with lower level of fertility.⁵ Hence, female education is expected to affect the demand for children inversely.

Child bearing age after marriage, being a biological factor is related with the number of children born. A rationale for this is very

straightforward. As the child bearing age after marriage is relatively long, there are chances for having more children.

Need for children depends also on the major source of income of the head of the household. If the head of the household is self-employed rather than a wage earner, more children will be helpful in income earning activities. Therefore, self-employed persons are expected to demand for more children.

Education of husband reflects taste factors in the demand for children model. The educated persons appreciate the utility of education more than their uneducated counterparts. More educated fathers wish to see their children highly educated and are expected to substitute child quality for quantity. A famous study by Simon (1974) has recognized that more educated people like to have fewer children than their less educated counterparts of the same economic conditions. Hence, the demand for children is expected to be inversely related with the level of husband's education.

There can be certain other factors which might affect the demand for children, but they are omitted because they are either difficult to quantify or the information about them is not available.⁶ This means the model used here will not provide R^2 as big as it could be if all the explanatory variables are included.

III. METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Traditional methods of multiple linear regression have been used to identify the factors which can serve as determinants of demand for children. To compare the relative importance of various determinants, use of standardized regression coefficient is made. The cross-section data on all variables for the year 1978 were taken from a survey conducted by the Social Sciences Research Centre, University of the Punjab, Lahore under the title of 'Lahore Fertility Survey.'

The Statistical Model : Equation (1) forms a basic part of the model for the present study.

$$Y = f(X_2, X_3, X_4, X_5, X_6) \dots (1)$$

where Y denotes demand for children (number of live children born to a couple since their first marriage), X_2 denotes level of income (monthly income of the households from all sources), X_3 denotes education of wife (education level of respondent's (wife), measured in terms of years of schooling), X_4 denotes child bearing age after marriage, X_5 denotes the major source of income. (The whole sample was classified in terms of profession as (a) wage earners and (b) self-employed and dummy variable is used as:

$$X_5 = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{If the source of income is self-employment} \\ 0 & \text{Otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and X_6 denotes education of husband (educational level of husband measured in terms of years of schooling).

For the purpose of estimation and verification, the following functional form of (1) is assumed :

$$Y = b_1 + \sum_{i=2}^6 b_i X_i + U \dots (2)$$

In Equation (2) 'U' denotes the error or disturbance term and it indicates the effect of omitted variables. It is also assumed that Equation (2) satisfies all the assumptions of a Classical or Ordinary Least Squares (OLS). Therefore, Equation (2) is estimated by OLS and its empirical results are presented below.

IV. EMPIRICAL RESULTS AND THEIR ANALYSIS

Empirical results of the paper have been presented in the following table, hereafter referred to as the Regression Table.

REGRESSION TABLE

Regression Coefficients, Standard Errors, *t* - Ratios and other
Empirical Results of the Demand for Children

	Level of Income	Education of Wife	Child Bearing Age after Marriage	Major Source of Income	Education of Husband
Regression Coefficient	.0074	-.0525	.1509	.0800	-.0022
Standard Error	.0049	.0245	.7504	.7515	.0848
<i>t</i> -Ratio	1.5192	-2.141	2.011	.1064	-.0260
Standardized Regression Coefficient	0.2315	-0.0045	0.0162	.1875	.0894

Intercept = 0.0380, $R^2 = 0.84286$ and $F = 47.21028$

The Regression Table indicates that the value of R^2 is 0.84 which is statistically significant at 5 per cent level of significance as *F*-statistic is 41.21. This means 84 per cent of the variation in the dependent variable (demand for children) is explained by the explanatory variables used in the model. This indicates the present model has an excellent explanatory power. Nevertheless, the variability which remained unexplained by the present model can be minimized by incorporating other important variables and/or by experimenting with other functional forms of the model.

Now empirical results presented in the Regression Table are analyzed taking each of the independent variables in turn.

Level of Income: The value of regression coefficient associated with the level of income is 0.007 as indicated in the Regression Table. This regression coefficient is statistically significant at 10 per cent level of significance; but being positive, is contrary to *a priori* expectations. Possible reasons for having a positive coefficient of income variable are that our sample

contains low income households and level of income may not be an important variable in this study, or there may be little variation in the levels of income among households included in the sample, or at low income levels a positive relationship between income and the demand for children is more appropriate.

Education of Wife: The regression coefficient associated with education of wife is -0.052 with a *t*-statistic of 2.141 as indicated in the Regression Table. This coefficient is statistically significant at 5 per cent level of significance and is also consistent with *a priori* expectations. Hence education of wife is inversely associated with the demand for children.

Child Bearing Age after Marriage: The regression coefficient associated with variable, child bearing age after marriage, is 0.151 with a *t*-statistic of 2.011 as indicated in the Regression Table. This coefficient is consistent with *a priori* expectation as the coefficient is positive and is statistically significant at 5 per cent level of significance. Hence, child bearing age after marriage and demand for children are directly related.

Major Source of Income: It is expected that self-employment, a major source of income, is directly related with the demand for children. As the coefficient associated with the major source of income is 0.080 as indicated in the Regression Table, it is consistent with *a priori* expectations. However, the coefficient is statistically insignificant. This may be one of the consequences of suspected multicollinearity (R^2 is very high, whereas, *t*-ratios are very low).

Education of Husband: The sign of the coefficient is consistent with *a priori* expectations, but its value is statistically insignificant, which again could be due to collinearity between major source of income and education of husband. To conform this simple correlation between major source of income and education of husband was computed and found out to be statistically highly significant. This means the values of *t*-statistics of the regression coefficients associated with major source of income and

education of husband are superficially reduced to the extent there is multicollinearity problem.

Relative Importance of Explanatory Variables : The relative importance of explanatory variables is determined by computing the Standardized Regression Coefficients and comparing their absolute magnitudes.⁷

As indicated in the Regression Table, the standardized regression coefficient associated with the level of income has the highest value (0.2315). This means, level of income is the most important determinant of demand for children.

The variable, child bearing age after marriage of female, ranks second in importance as is evident from the Regression Table. (The standardized regression coefficient of this variable is 0.1875). The variable, education of wife, used as a proxy for opportunity cost of raising a child, stands third in relative importance in the model, as its standardized regression coefficient is 0.0894. Major source of income which reflects the need factors for demand for children stands fourth in relative importance in the demand for children model. Its standardized regression coefficient has a value of 0.0162. The least importance variable included in the present model of demand for children is education of husband. This variable reflects the taste factors for demand for children. The standardized regression coefficient of this variable, being 0.0045, is of the lowest value.

V. CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

Conclusions : The following conclusions emerge from the empirical results of this study.

The determinants of fertility can be identified by estimating a demand model for children based on micro-economic approach, as used above. An exercise done in this study to estimate and verify the demand for children like the demand for other goods and services has proved to be useful.

The factors which have proved to be important determinants of the demand for children are listed below in order of their relative importance;

1. Level of household income.
2. Child bearing age after marriage.
3. Education of wife.
4. Major source of income.
5. Education of husband.

Suggestions : The present study can be improved upon by working in the following directions.

1. Only the linear functional form of the model was tested in the present study. Experiments with non-linear functional forms of the model may provide more interesting results.
2. Multicollinearity is suspected because of small size of the sample. Therefore, multicollinearity problem can be avoided by using a sufficiently large sample.
3. It has been indicated above that the present model explained 84 per cent of the variation. The remaining unexplained variation of 16 per cent is due to omitted variables. Efforts can be made to include omitted variables to enhance the amount of explained variation.

In addition, the following policy oriented suggestions are also in order :

1. One of the findings of this study reveals that the child bearing age after marriage is an important determinant of demand for children and this variable affects the demand for children directly. Hence fertility can be controlled by affecting the child bearing age after marriage. Governments of all levels—Federal, Provincial and Local—must affect the child bearing age after marriage by providing monetary incentives for late marriages, by persuasion and/or otherwise.
2. The educational status of females has been found to be another

important determinant of demand for children and affects fertility inversely. Hence, fertility can also partly be controlled by improving the educational status of women. Governments of all levels must adopt certain policies to realize this goal.

REFERENCES

1. Since, GNP per capita rate of growth is equal to GNP growth rate minus population growth rate, then given the GNP growth rate a positive population growth rate implies a lower GNP per capita growth rate. And lower GNP per capita growth rate means lower rate of improvement of the standard of living.
2. For evaluation of Family Planning in Pakistan, Robinson 1978, pp. 233-247.
3. Gould and Ferguson, 1980, pp. 56-88.
4. These arguments have been given by Ogawa, 1978, pp. 431-450.
5. Todaro, 1985, has mentioned this result without any reference. Todaro, 1981, p. 192.
6. To examine the consequences of omitted variables, Pindyck and Rubinfeld, 1985, pp. 128-131.
7. There are two approaches of computing standardized regression coefficients. First, if b_j is an ordinary regression coefficient associated with j th explanatory variable, then the standardized regression coefficient associated with this variable is defined as the product of b_j and S_xj/S_y , where S_xj and S_y denote the standard deviation of j th explanatory variable and the dependent variable, respectively. Second, the original variable is standardized first as following : $X_j - \bar{X}_j / S_{xj}$ where X_j denotes the j th explanatory variable \bar{X}_j and S_{xj} denote the mean and standard deviation respectively, of the j th explanatory variable. Then the regression equation is estimated using the standardized variables and the estimated coefficients obtained from this equation and called as the standardized regression coefficients. Since the statistical significance of the standardized regression coefficient is the same as that of the ordinary regression coefficient and R^2 is also unaffected.

To avoid running additional regression using standardized data, the first method of computing the standardized regression coefficients has been adopted in this study. For more on standardized regression coefficient (Beta coefficients), Pindyck and Rubinfeld, 1985, pp. 90-91.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Gould, J.P. and Ferguson, C.E., *Micro Economic Theory*, Richard, D. Irwin, Inc., 1980, pp. 56-88.
- Ogawa, Naohiro, "Fertility Control and Income Distribution in Developing Countries with National Family Planning Programme," *The Pakistan Development Review*, Vol. XVII, Winter, 1978, pp. 431-450.
- Pindyck, R., and Rubinfeld, D., *Econometric Models and Economic Forecasts*, McGraw-Hill, 1985, pp. 90-91, 125-131.
- Robinson, W.O., "Family Planning in Pakistan, 1955-77 : A Review", *The Pakistan Development Review*, 1978, Vol. VI, No. 3, pp. 233-247.
- Schultz, T. Paul, *Fertility Determinants : A Theory Evidence, and Application to Policy Evaluation*, Santa Monica, Calif : Rand Corporation, January, 1974.
- Simon, J., *The Effects of Income on Fertility*, Chapel Hill : North Carolina, Population Centre, 1974 (Mimeographed).
- Todaro, Michael P., *Economic Development in the Third World*, Longman Press, 1985, pp. 187-198.

MILLER'S EXPRESSIONISM IN *DEATH OF A SALESMAN*

NASIM RIAZ BUTT

Assistant Professor, Department of English Language and Literature,
University of the Punjab, Lahore

Arthur Miller's plays are usually discussed as social criticism or as domestic tragedies involving guilt, corruption, conflict and betrayal within a family. This essay, however, examines Miller's quest for a workable dramatic form, especially in *Death of a Salesman* (1949), where he utilizes basic Expressionistic settings and techniques as well as the dilemma of man under the very existing socio-economic and political conditions to express the basic conflicts of twentieth-century American life.

"Nowhere in the world where industrialized economy rules." Miller writes in his introduction to *A View from the Bridge* (1955) "where specialization in work, politics, and social life is the norm—nowhere has man discovered a means of connecting himself to society except in the form of a truce with it." Any sense of leading a full, non-fragmented, and satisfying life, Miller acknowledges, is almost unknown in our world, yet the desire for fulfilment remains. And in writing *Death of a Salesman*, Miller's response was not simply to plot the tragedy of a man cruelly abused by his world, a victim of society, he was working within the larger vision of Aeschylus, Ibsen, and the Expressionists of the early twentieth century who saw such a man mistreated as much by himself as by his own society. For Willy Loman, finally, is a victim of his own imagination—and his sacrifice and deception do not end with him; they are endemic in his family—and the tragic irony is explicit in the final speech of the play: "Forgive me, dear. I can't cry. I don't know what it is, but I can't cry. I don't understand it. Why did you ever do that? Help me, Willy, I can't cry.... I search and search and I search, and I can't understand it, Willy. I made the last payment on the house today. Today, dear. And there'll be nobody home.... We're free and clear." (p. 139) At this point, it makes no difference whether Willy is alive or dead. Linda sobs

that the home is clear and free, may be from Willy's kind of self-deception and illusion. The scene leaves behind a note of unreality.

Arthur Miller himself took great pride in developing "a very open form"¹ in *Death of a Salesman* through which he attempted to provide "plenty of space"² for his characters to move unrestrictively and to act out the dramatic situations, emotional tensions, and confrontations of the action. By "open form", Miller acknowledged, he would not adhere to any particular artistic form quite faithfully, but rather see whether a certain principle of art would help establish the truth better and more appropriately than another one. The subject matter before an artist must have in itself the urgency and vitality to claim a right form for itself because any work of art that sustains the test of time can possibly be created only in its right form which, as he says, is "literally the body which holds the soul of the play."³ Expressionism was only one mode of expressions for Miller which he intended to use in *Death of a Salesman* because the subject-matter was of its mould and kind, and the social, economic and political conditions were compatible to the early part of the twentieth century, otherwise he felt quite free to use any artistic mode of expression, or part of it, which suited most his purpose.

The purpose of art, Miller observes, is "how may man make for himself a home in what vastness of strangers and how may be transfer that vastness into a home."⁴ This means establishing a harmonious, purposeful, and comfortably sharing relationships with the people living in a socio-political context, and with the people of the rest of the world. The formulation of the moral laws to govern these relationships in the wake of the cultural realities confronting the "need of our souls for freedom"⁵ is always open to challenges. The ultimate human dilemma stems from emotions and not from intellect. The cultural realities give birth to certain problems which are beyond the control of man. In fact, they put such a powerful effect upon his total being that his perception, at all levels is changed, in many cases, perverted or distorted and his whole personality warped. Such a situation needs a special artistic treatment. The strains

and stresses, confrontations, crises, spiritual anguish, psychological torments, and other such effects of an age upon man spur the imagination of an artist to create his won world of art which must sustain in itself the 'idea' of existence enforced by the realistic surroundings. What we get is not a psychological analysis or realistic continuity of a story but a character in mask, with a distorted visage, invaded by the onrushing memories, and a story of tension and spiritual anguish with no resolution in sight.

Arthur Miller's *Death of a Salesman* is a play depicting the depression years of American society of the nineteen thirties when the relationship of an individual American was not quite harmonious with the total social set-up. Willy Loman, the protagonist of the play, represents the sensibility of those years. His mind disintegrates under the heavy weight of socio-political and economic realities of an industrialized society to which the moral dimensions of his personality can no longer compromise. The stringent compulsions of a competitive industrial society demand of him to be reft of his naturalness, that is to give up a moral system in favour of another one in which he comes out as a robot. This disparages his human status in his own eyes, and distorts his visage; he cannot confidently look into mirror. This grotesque presentation of man demands that "attention must be paid."⁶ (p. 56). This is depression sensibility in a society which demands hard work and affords less wages with no benefits and heart-rending exploitation. This brings forth a picture of incongruous cultural realities. How do we appreciate a situation in which the dominant cultural realities are juxtaposed with human failure, especially when those realities are created and developed by the people living in the same society! Such a situation is characteristic of paradox, distortion, and absurdity, hence calls for a special treatment for aesthetic evocation and better understanding.

Miller thinks that the idiosyncracies, accentricities, incongruities, anguish, psychic abnormalities, distortions, grotesqueness, hallucinations, and other resultant effects of the depression period can be better portrayed by using the Expressionistic artistic techniques which, in his opinion, go

back to Aeschylus.⁷ Miller presents Willy Loman as a man in an ultimate dilemma; the depression period stands only as a reference to the ultimate psychic environment in which a man is confused enough to lose his identity. Miller's fascination with the Greeks shows his intention of using the depression sensibility as a means to present the metaphysical heights of human situation. *Death of a Salesman* is only in particular concerned with the American society, and Willy Loman only in particular represents an American man; otherwise, generally speaking the play and its protagonist occupy a place in the history of humanity. For Miller creates not only a "language of the private life, the kind of private life men retreat to when they are at odds with the world they have made or been heirs to",⁸ he also creates "a drama of the whole man. It seeks to deal with his differences from others not *per se*, but toward the end that, if only through drama we may know how much the same we are, for if we lose that knowledge we shall have nothing left at all."⁹ Furthermore the depression years brought forth those problems which the Expressionists and their precursor symbolists faced in their times; in spite of a very strong wave of reformation throughout Europe, the socio-economic and political conditions were not conducive, for a citizen, to live with acceptable values. This is, in fact, an ultimate dilemma from which a man suffers in all repressive social conditions.

Greek dramatists, such as Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides, do not portray the world in which they lived, neither its values, nor its realities, nor its social psychology. They created an artistic world which claims its separate entity, legitimacy, and validity on its own terms. The purpose is to reveal a certain truth for total understandings. Realizing that human problem is so gigantic, man's nature so complex, and his relationship with other forces so profound, they concluded that the day-to-day realities would not suffice to their purpose. Rather they created symbolic designs, special personage, and irrational forces to widen the scope of their dramatic art. "There is for instance" Miller observes, "no attempts by Aeschylus to create the psychology of a 'violent' character in *Prometheus Bound*, or of a 'powerful' one; rather he brings on two figures whose names are Power and

Violence, and they behave as the idea of Power and the idea of Violence ought to behave according to the laws of Power and Violence."¹⁰ They wrote to probe metaphysical and psychological forces, thereby confirming a statute by which human beings could live their lives, and establish their relationships amongst themselves and God.

Greek dramatists also wrote their plays as art form, purely for presenting them on stage for their audience. The conflict they presented in their plays was of appearance and reality; the tension they portrayed came out of a protagonist's responses to the social, religious and moral forces of life. They did not present life in a realistic framework, but rather as they themselves envisaged it. It was fiction, it was played in masks. The playwright was interested only in portraying an essentiality of a tension or a conflict as in *Antigone* or *Prometheus Bound*, or he might choose to show the deeper and darker recesses of the human mind in the forms of Oedipus and Orestes complexes. He did not bother with the social situation out there. This form of art provides a tremendously vast scope for Miller to write about the story of *Death of a Salesman*.

Miller sees similarity in Greek dramatists and the Expressionist painters of the early twentieth century. "I was struck by the similarity of their dramatic means in one respect—They are designed to present the hidden forces, not the characteristics of the human beings playing out those forces on the stage."¹¹ Both wanted to communicate their emotional and visionary experiences; both gave utmost importance to their private obsessions, emotional and psychological pressures, and spiritual ecstasy, both used symbolic patterns; and both condensed the time and space for artistic reasons. However, it should not be assumed that the Expressionists were not different from the Greeks; in fact they had a strong bias against classicism and they rejected all mimetic art, may it be in the forms of Realism, Naturalism, or Impressionism. The Expressionists did not limit themselves to a particular subject-matter or to a particular mode of art. Style ranged from instructive and representational to revelatory and

non-objective, and the subjects ranged from neurotic anguish to ecstatic spirituality.

Expressionism, philosophically, was a passionate answer to the confusion, insecurity, uncertainty caused by the socio-political and economic atmosphere of the war days of Europe. And Miller noticed the compatibility of this kind of existence with the American society of the depression period. Being overly a war phenomenon, Expressionism brought a growing concern with the plight of man, sanctity of human life, and the revival of spiritual values, clung with which was a disgust of the victory of war technology, and a resolution of aggressive pacifism. Wassily Kandinsky, Oskar Kokoschka, Pechstein, Marc, Mülleur, and other Expressionists were not nationalists or patriots in the strict sense of these phrases, but rather humanitarians with wider and better sense of the social and spiritual values. In spite of their yearnings for the cosmic and metaphysical spheres, they could not dissociate themselves from the phenomenal world; and in spite of being against presenting the psychological realism, they felt quite comfortable with Jung's 'collective unconsciousness' because of its universalization and primitive consciousness. Some Expressionists—Nolde, Kokoschka, Marc—reacted negatively to the surrounding tortured situation because of the mounting distress on their souls. They projected their own anguish and terror into a perception of a man as an animal or foliage. Others—Modersohn-Becker, Barlach—reconciled themselves with the external realities and sang a song of pain or joy with utmost intensity and concern. The element of intense passion in both kinds of art works was, however, extremely felt. It displayed vision, passion, aesthetics as well as a tendency to monumentalization and distortion. The external appearance of an object, an action, or an emotion was consciously distorted to create another kind of image which, hopefully could reveal truth better.

The most prominent characteristic of the Expressionists is their adverse attitude towards Realism. Realist art and literature were critical

of society on account of the urgency and immediacy of the socio-economic problems of the nineteenth century. They portrayed a truthful picture of contemporary life and manners. The Expressionists thought that such an observational and objective treatment of the surrounding realities negated the personality of the artist. They did not either favour the deterministic implications of Naturalists which ultimately led to epicurianism and other escapist tendencies. Furthermore, Impressionism, in fact an extension of Realism, was considered much too limited because of its concern with perception and interpretation of nature and its commitment to rendering a faithful visual impression. The visual, the actual was too limited a scope for an artist. The new world beyond the actual must be explored. Emphasis shifted to the symbolic and emotive character of things.¹²

Miller shows both his attraction and repulsion toward the "brilliance of Expressionism":¹³ attraction, because of the unlimited freedom it provides to an artist for revealing the indepth truth and for presenting the "humane 'felt' characterization;"¹⁴ and repulsion, because the Germans used it for 'demonstration'¹⁵ and because it discarded psychological realism altogether, and thus could not maintain a happy balance amongst the different forces of life.¹⁶ Miller's main concern, the determining of the state of man in the face of 'familial' and 'social' compulsions, cannot be fully realized unless both spheres of life are fully presented and bridged together.¹⁷ It is because of the inability, or may be insensitivity, of an artist to actualize the existence of "man as a whole"¹⁸ that a certain decay in art, especially in the drama, has occurred. So, it becomes very important for an artist to portray the harmony as well as the dichotomy of the social and moral laws of a society and the individual living therein; and how those laws work to promote his freedom and dignity or else they are repressive. The relationship of the individual with society must be harmonized because "the fate of mankind is social."¹⁹ Besides, an individual has his own psychological, biological, and spiritual problems which demand a thorough investigation for their better understanding. These

situations, individual and social, are intimately interrelated, and the one cannot be fully understood unless it is put in the perspective of the other. Hence, an artist, in order to create a genuine art, must envisage 'man as a whole' in all possible situations and in all true perspectives.

Distortion and condensation are central to the dramatic form of *Death of a Salesman*. There is Miller's consciously distorting of the external appearances and condensing of the time and space. Willy in order to maintain a spiritual balance divulges anything that disturbs his mind. He is shown on "his last day on the earth"²⁰ and so much has happened to him in his over sixty years of unsuccessful living. His past dominates his present, which, dramaturgically, makes the time reference very important. Miller has to deal with the "material that goes back probably twenty-five years. And it almost goes forward, through Ben, who is dead."²¹ And he has to project it in a way that it becomes "the fiber of the play, rather than being something that somebody comments on."²² While directing the play for the first time in China, he came to know that the play was taking place in the Greek unity of one circle of the sun,²³ which required a violent condensation of the time. The 'unique power' of the play is in the "melting together of the social time, personal time, and psychic time,"²⁴ the psychic time being "the way we remember things,"²⁵ and the personal time "as the sense of time created by the play and shared by the audience."²⁶

The importance of time references in the play is essentially because of the vital role the memory scenes play in its action. *Inside of his Head*, the first title of the play indicates that the memory would not be a transitory moment of remembrance, having a very minor or virtually no effect on the action of the play, but rather it would illumine those moments of Willy's life which have stuck to his mind, and have a very powerful effect on him. The essentiality of the total action of the play, by and large, is determined by the memory scenes. Miller does not recall the memories in a chronological way using a flashback technique but rather the present tension on Willy's mind recalls the related experience in his past, and

switches on that particular memory regardless of the sequential place it has in his life. The memory scenes bring forth Willy's guilt, failure, wrong decisions, and fragmentation which increase his torment. He faces an ultimate situation of elusive hope and unfulfilment. The audience watches a rift between his personal life and social life. Success and happiness which he takes for granted in "the greatest country in the world" (p. 16) become a dream for him which he follows with no direction or hope. Everything seems disintegrated and distorted as in a dream: There is a jumping back and forth in time and space, discontinuity in speech, distorted forms of all kinds of relationships, focusing and refocusing of attention in an abrupt way, and change in mood, tone, and syntax.

The Expressionists show "man to be ill at ease at the presence of events and situations eluding his grasp just as primitive man to have been in the face of terrifying, anonymous, and inscrutable nature."²⁷ Edward Munch's self-portrait shows him naked in hell, sick, with a bottle in front of him, and an oppressive nature in the background. The primitive man had many challenges before him, and, above all, he was isolated, like Willy Loman. His suffering was terrible. The Expressionists always sensitive and inquisitive admitted grotesque and even repulsive elements in their art to shock their viewers. Their purpose was to invoke a sense of hatred against the socio-political oppression and economic exploitation. James Ensor in his paintings of 'masks and skeletons' accuses and mocks a humanity from which he felt excluded. The Expressionists as highly subjective artists discovered that there was a huge difference between the visual surface harmony and the underlying disorderliness. They mixed man with animals and vegetation, and chose images from external nature to depict his internal state of mind. They changed the proportion and even the shape of the figures and objects, sometimes beyond recognition, and rearranged them to give a total new reality which evokes a better truth about them. Thus, the familiar shapes were distorted and depicted with intensity rather than with beauty. Miller does not go that far as to distort the visage of his protagonist after the animals, as O'Neill does in

The Hairy Ape, but rather mutilates it by showing him 'naked in hell' like Edward Munch's self-portrait.

Schneider explains the play in psychological terms, finding it an accomplished example of the technique of "The psychic projections of hallucination of the guilty expression of forbidden wishes dramatized."²⁸ Ben and Biff both cause obsession to Willy's disintegrated mind, and he "breaks under the invasion of primitive impulses no longer capable of compromise with reality."²⁹ The psychological terms Schneider uses to explain such a condition of the mind is the "return of the repressed."³⁰ He takes into account the "symbolic prehistoric power"³¹ of the play: "It is not only modern man exploited: it is also Neanderthal man raging against the restraint of civilization's dawn."³² It looks like Schneider is taking the same view of the problem which the Expressionists took: putting man against the oppressive forces of Nature. The primitive man was engaged, because of fear and insecurity, in the survival of the power of his primitive impulses against the onslaught of civilization, which tended to cow him down to gentleness. Willy shows that trait of aggression in his defiance to the powers of contemporary industrial civilization. He would not let it deprive him of his primitive lust and power. His sexual engagement with the woman in a Bostan hotel, his pacifism (But I got a couple of fearless characters there), (p. 50) his taking money from Charley with no intentions to give it back as if it is his birth right, his dominating behaviour with his wife and sons being the head—the protector and the sustainer—of the family, and his suicide—doing the necessary whichever the shape it takes, are the manifestations of sustaining in him the power and irrepressibility of the primitive man.

Sex is one thing which is characteristic of irrepressibility, power of propagation, and mysteriousness. It has a regressive tendency. Sexual expression for a primitive man was natural, without any sense of guilt attached to it. Civilization made it look different by ordering the sexual

channels into matrimony, and by making it necessary to obtain a social sanction for it. Any sexual philandering is the violation of the moral code of the social life and ends up in social and moral chaos. It ultimately takes us to the annihilation of the social and moral condition. Willy's sexual involvement is emblematic of his spiritual decay, in dramatic and thematic terms, which comes down to his philandering sons, who chasing some ready-to-go girls mock him in the hotel where he is supposed to be entertained on a nourishing feast. This mockery of Willy's sexual potency and social authority means that he is no more a man strong enough to protect his family or to defend himself. In primitive terms, he must die. His suicide, dramaturgically, is a very valid development where all action must come to an end.

Perhaps, encouraged by Miller's view that the question of form should be solved "anew in every age,"³³ Raymond Williams, along with the other critics, thinks Miller's 'form' as yet 'unsolved'³⁴ and uses the term 'social Expressionism'³⁵ to define the form of *Death of a Salesman*. He argues that *Death of a Salesman* displays "actually a development of Expressionism of an interesting kind,"³⁶ and it shows "the split of Expressionism into 'personal' and 'social' kinds...."³⁷ and furthermore, "the continuity of the social Expressionism remains clear, however, I think, in the end, it is not Willy Loman as a man, but the image of the salesman that predominates."³⁸ In his opinion, Willy Loman finally becomes a saleable commodity whose price, with the passage of time is reduced drastically to be 'economically discarded.'³⁹

One thing which should be clear to us is the variety of the Expressionists' thematic and technical concerns: they dealt with the inward impulses, forces, and deeper apprehensions (personal and psychological) and the feeling and anquish for the 'littleman'; (social) they dealt with infinity and the mystic union of man and the universe (metaphysical) and the primitive society, socialism, pacifism, antipathy with materialism, universal brotherhood, new relationship between man and man, man and society,

and man and woman; (social) they dealt with isolation at all levels, pre-occupation with death, longing for eternity, redemption through suffering, visions of the abstract, creativity, intuition, ecstasy, (personal and religious) and so many other topics the list of which is long. Their artistic techniques were as varied as their themes; it was a highly subjective art characteristic of distortion, grotesqueness, intensity, shock, ecstasy, and obsession; and application of strong unmixed colors as symbols dramatized the state of the mind of the sitter as well as the painter; the human figures, animals, vegetation were mixed to create a new kind of reality, different from the realistic and the visible structure of the elements; there were emotive paintings with explosive and demonic forms; style was deliberately formless; the technique was anti-Realistic, anti-Naturalistic, anti-Impressionistic, and anti-classic; it tended to alter, to deform, and then to create a new and better truth. With such a wide range of themes and techniques, I wonder, how *Death of a Salesman* could possibly create a 'social Expressionism' separating 'social' from the 'personal'; and how the 'social' theme, in the end, is continued in Willy's suicide giving Raymond the realization of the death of a salesman rather than of a human being, Willy Loman? It is questionable also on the grounds that the play gives a shock to the viewers to realize that the external social forces have made a saleable commodity of a human being. The economic system is a powerful solvent that dissolves every human value that comes its way. The final realization is in human rather than in economic terms, because it comes out of the plight of a man molasted by an unfeeling system. We confront a 'man as a whole' crushed by the total cultural realities. Besides, the Expressionism of the play confirms this fact in the sense that the death of the salesman is only an external visage, a mask of the intimate and immost reality of the death of Willy Loman, a human being. Raymond's view that "the Expressionist method, in the final form of the play is not a casual experiment but rooted in the experience"⁴⁰ confirms that the salesman has emerged as a deformed image of Willy Loman, the human being, to shock an audience to realize the need for a new humanity.

Spectacle, the sixth constituent of Aristotle's definition of tragedy has gained enormous importance on the modern stage. The Expressionists have used modern facilities—lighting arrangements, scenery, colors and music to create an effect of the fantastic, the monumental, and the misterious. The Expressionist stage is, of course, "stripped of kinck-knacks"⁴¹ of Realistic drama and "intsead it reveals symbolic designs"⁴² which create a more indepth "consciousness of time and space."⁴³ The illusory scenic space on the stage makes us focus on the artistic entity of the play and yet at the same time increases our awareness of its realistic foundation. The symbolic designs depicted in the forms of the salesman's house, car, valises, refrigerator, silk stockings, hotel room, all appear and reappear in the mobility of time in different contexts and present full-life experience. They project the subjective as well as the objective experiences of the protagonist.

The salesman's home is the most importantly working symbol of the play which sets the action moving. Miller wants it to be put on the back-stage surrounded by the tenement buildings which obstruct sunlight, open air, and the beautiful scenes of Nature. The forestage is used to play the other scenes with an easy flow, unobstructed by the dominating image set of the salesman's home. The stage is conducted in a renaissance tradition, yet the play is difficult to manage because the time and space is so violently squeezed and appauled at the same time with unobstructed fluidity. Jo Mielziner could do it with translucent colors and magic lanterns, by lightening up and fading out the lights quite smartly on different parts of the stage. He used "faded old wallpapers"⁴⁴ and effect of the light on them to obliterate the salesman's home and to convert it into a cheap hotel room. This way, Mielziner also managed to create an effect of the "fragile-seeming house" with "an air of the dream" (p. 11) clinging to it. Instead of the traditional heavy linen, he used "the unbleached muslin, a much lighter material"⁴⁵ on which the tenement buildings were painted, and with the use of the proper lights behind the backdrop, be managed to create the desired effect of the 'transparent' (p. 12) setting of the scene.

The walls on the stage are 'imaginary' (p. 12) as Miller says, but defined in great detail. A character in a scene in the present moves through the non-existent doors, but in the scenes of the past, those boundaries are not observed and he moves 'through' "a wall onto the forestage." (p. 12) These directions are very carefully devised and delivered, before the action of the play starts, to create an effect of the "dream arising out of reality." (p. 11) The consciousness of the reality is never lost, the play, however, has its effect purely on artistic level.

To create the desired effect of the visual symbols within the structural framework of the drastically compressed time and space is probably impossible without the help of the fluid lighting effects. The color of the light, its fading out and brightening up, its relationship with the different areas of the stage at different junctures, and its fluidity play a very important role, especially in the Expressionistic presentation. And, especially with the invention of the screen technology, it has gained a tremendous momentum and unlimited freedom by which the very subtle and hitherto impossible effects can be created with ease and imagination. Lighting can be used to create structural effects, emotional effects, and spatial effects. The colors it puts on different objects, areas, or characters on the stage have an inseparable relationship with the action at a particular juncture, and they help establish the working value of the visual symbols of the scenes.

Miller mentions the blue lights of the sky which fall upon the salesman's home surrounded by the tenement building imbued with "an angry glow of orange." (p. 11) Blue being the color of love, especially for the Expressionists, contrasted with the angry orange sets a thematic foundation for the play right in the beginning. Miller also mentions a golden pool of light, the moonlight, and the silver athletic trophy which are positive colors of beauty and innocence contrasted with the light of green leaves that "stains the house which holds the air of night and dream" (p. 109) and the red-glow which rises behind the screen to show us the young waiter in the restaurant where the chance girls are picked up. The Expressionists often used red as the color of passions and green for showing shadows

falling on something suggesting confusion and mysteriousness. Throughout the play, there are illumined and darkened settings which appropriately tell on the states of mind of the characters and produce other atmospheric effects.

Miller judiciously uses the colors in an Expressionistic way, but the intensity and emphasis which the Expressionist painters produce with the use of the colors, do not quite show up in *Death of a Salesman*. The Expressionists reinforced the effect by contrasting the extreme coloration. Von Gogh defines his *Night Cafe* as "a clashing contrast of the most alien reds and greens."⁴⁶ The dense quality of the colors eliminated the possibility of transition which created an indelible print on the minds of the viewers. They were used to the expression of tension, and the depiction of the state of mind of the artist rather than the object in question. The landscape was painted by violating the external details of Nature but keeping in mind the extremity of the forces underlying the order of the universe. "Visually and psychologically tense color relationships have a value in creation of non-realistic space."⁴⁷ There was an uninhibited application of strong unmixed colors used for their suggestive qualities. Von Gogh's mastery in creating the color relationships in an unusual clash, deforming the actual shapes and establishing the deep psychological realities, enabled him to create a mystic union of man and the universe. The Expressionists, especially the Die Brücke group in Dresden—Kirchner, Heckel, Schmidt—Rottluff, Peckstein, Nolde and others—took him as their father in art.

Paul Gauguin, another great artist of the late nineteenth century, speaks of the musical use of colors. Colors must be made alive enough to tinkle. His influence is visible especially on Nolde and Peckstein who show their keen interest in primitivism and the symbolic union of man and Nature, and the music therein. The Expressionists put the new and old music face to face, acknowledging the value as well as the meaninglessness of the traditional music in the modern context.⁴⁸ However, the traditional music must get rid of its classical restraint and order to be

transformed into the modern trait. The new music announces the new man claiming his validity and inevitability in the new world.

The flute music in *Death of a Salesman* is reminiscent of the olden times of the American dream of success and glory. It is alluring, emotional valuable but, nevertheless, out of place. Miller's attitude towards the flute music is quite ambivalent yet it is meant to provide solace and peace. Biff's whistling is natural and inspiring but is denied to those who want to become 'executives,' the successful men in a commercial society. The other types of music produce fear and neurosis: there are traffic sounds, car crashes raucous music, the music which rises to mocking frenzy, a single trumpet note jarring the ear, Bens idyllic music full of mystery and fear, frenzy of sounds, and finally there is a dead march. However, the last note of the play rings in the flute music, left on the 'darkening stage' emblematic of the living American dream that finally must be realized. Miller's pattern of music in *Death of a Salesman* is Expressionistic in the sense that he confronts the old and the new sounds, but, in the final analysis he does not bring about the meaninglessness of the traditional music but rather develops a realization of understanding of the values of all times.

The most valuable statement regarding the language of a play, comes from Miller himself :

When one is speaking to one's family, for example, one uses a certain level of speech, a certain plain diction perhaps, a tone of voice, an inflection suited to the intimacy of the occasion. But when one faces an audience of strangers . . . it remains right and proper to reach for the well-turned phrase, even the poetic word, aphorism, the metaphor. . . . It is true to say, I think, that the language of family is the language of private life—prose. The language of society, the language of public life, is verse.⁴⁹

There are situations in *Death of a Salesman* where the language is stylized with poetic style: "that just the spirit I want to imbue them with," (p.52) It's a measly manner of existence, (p.22) "Miss Forsyth, you have just seen

a prince walk by. A fine troubled prince . . . ; (p.114) and there are other situations where the common American idiom based on the Jewish inflection of New York is used which may be called a spurious street language far away from the niceties and strength of standard English, but, nevertheless, expresses a wide range of sentiments, and proves its validity an appropriateness by leading a natural atmosphere to the action of the play. This language has the use of counterpointing, metaphor, strength of intimacy and commitment to be used with charm and beauty in familial context. It may not be called clichéd language, as many critics do, because its strength is intact and its wisdom is neither jarring nor boring. It is, as Miller puts it in the above-cited statement, "a certain level of speech, a certain plain diction." The clichéd utterances in the play are quite lifeless and do not invoke the desired inspiration or rationality: "Nobody is worth nothing dead," (p.98) The man who makes an appearance in the business world, the man who creates personal interest, is the man who gets ahead." (p.33) However, there are certain pronouncements which are sound in wisdom and establish an objective atmosphere of the play: "A small man can be just as exhausted as a great man," (p.56) "the jungle is dark but full of diamonds," (p.134) "the world is an oyster, but you don't crack it upon a mattress, (p.41) when a deposit bottle is broken, you don't get your nickle back." (p.44) The Expressionists tended to make such independent and universal statements. Further, the alterations and jumps in conversation and abrupt shifts in tone and utterances are also because of the Expressionistic nature of the play. Through these devices, many times, Miller produces forceful comic and ironic situations to strengthen the atmosphere and to spell out the themes of the play.

Miller, of course, does not use Expressionism as the total artistic expression in *Death of a Salesman*, though the overwhelming artistic mode of the play is Expressionistic. His quest for developing a dramatic form which contains both social and familial aspects of life, synthesized into one movement, made him choose from different modes of art which were necessary for his purpose. His fascination with the Greek dramatists

made him write *Death of a Salesman* as a piece of art rather than of life, and Willy Loman as a fiction character rather than a protagonist. Thus, he enlarges the scope of his story as set in humanity and Willy Loman as man confronting the forces of his surroundings. Miller's subject-matter was the identity of man vis-a-vis his responsibilities towards humanity. His values were obliterated by the compelling necessity of modern civilization. Expressionism provided him an unlimited freedom for expression but the thought it not sufficient because it altogether discarded the psychological characterization of the realistic drama. He used the elements of Realism as a basis on which the whole artistic edifice of *Death of a Salesman* was built. It helped him create "a very open form" by fusing the realistic and non-realistic elements which brought about a fuller awareness of the themes of the play, and wherein certain mocking and ironic dramatic situations were developed for effective realization of his subject-matter. The artistic form of the play works in its intensively passionate character, and all elements with which it deals, namely, the subject-matter, the time and space references, spectacle, colors, music, language, psychology of the characters and of the situations, all are comprehensively dealt in an Expressionistic way. Thus it becomes quite hard to agree with John Gassner that "Measured by the potentialities of Expressionism, Arthur Miller's treatment of Willy Loman's mental state in *Death of a Salesman* is elementary."⁵⁰ Not elementary, but comprehensive, in the sense that whatever the extent of the use of Expressionism in the play, it comes out as one of the few most forceful plays in the modern drama.

REFERENCES

1. Matthew C. Roudane, "An Interview with Arthur Miller," *Conversations with Arthur Miller*, University Press of Mississippi, Jackson & London), p. 36.
2. Ibid., p. 364.
3. Ibid., p. 365.
4. Arthur Miller, "The Family in Modern Drama", *The Atlantic Monthly*, 197, April 1956, p. 41.
5. Ibid.
6. Arthur Miller, *Death of a Salesman*, New York : Compass Book Edition, The Viking Press, Inc., 1965, p. 56.
7. Ibid., p. 37. "The technical arsenal of Expressionism goes back to Aeschylus."
8. Arthur Miller, "The Shadows of the Gods", *Harper's*, 214, August 1958, p. 38.
9. Ibid., p. 38.
10. Arthur Miller, "Family", op. cit., p. 38.
11. Ibid., "The Shadows of the Gods", op. cit., p. 38.
12. Wassily Kandinsky, *Concerning the Spiritual in Art ; The Documents of Modern Art*, New York : George Wittenbon, Inc., 1947. "When religion, science and morality are shaken (the last by the strong hand of Nietzsche) and when outer supports threaten to fall, man withdraws his gaze from externals and turns it inward. Literature, music, and art are the most sensitive spheres in which the spiritual revolution makes itself felt." p. 33.
13. Williams Raymond, "The Realism of Arthur Miller", *Critical Quarterly*, Vol. I, Summer 1959, p. 147.
14. Ibid.
15. Ibid.
16. Arthur Miller, "Family", op. cit., "Thus it is that the problem was left unsolved by Expressionism, which evaded it by foregoing Psychological realism altogether and leaping over to a portrayal of social forces alone." p. 40.

17. Ibid., p. 40. "Today the difficulty in creating a form that will unite both elements in a full rather than partial onslaught on reality is the reflection of the deep split between the private life of men and his social life."
18. Arthur Miller, "The Shadows of the Gods", op. cit., "A great drama is a great jurisprudence. Balance is all. It will evade us until we can again see man as a whole...." p. 41. Paul Hundermann in his essay, "Expressionist Literature and Painting" *Expressionism as an International Literary Phenomenon*, (ed.), Ulrich Weisstein, Paris, 1973, explains a situation where 'man as a whole' should be taken into consideration in terms of Expressionism: "Rather than restricting itself to a search for new technical solutions, it tended to engage the entire man, the very sense of his existence, and the consciousness of his being." p. 126.
19. Arthur Miller, "Family", op. cit., p. 41.
20. Roudane, op. cit., p. 364.
21. Ibid., p. 363.
22. Ibid.
23. Ibid., "When I directed *Salesman* in China which was the first time I had attempted to direct it from scratch, I became aware all over again that the play is taking place in the Greek unity of twenty four hours."
24. Ibid., 367.
25. Ibid.
26. Ibid., 363.
27. Ulrich Weisstein, (ed.), *Expressionism as an International Literary Phenomenon*, Paris, 1973, p. 23.
28. Daniel E. Schneider, M. D., "Play of Dreams" *Arthur Miller : Death of a Salesman*, (ed.), Gerald Weales, New York : Viking, 1949, p. 252.
29. Ibid.
30. Ibid.
31. Ibid., p. 254.
32. Ibid., pp. 254-255.
33. Arthur Miller, "Family", op. cit., p. 41.
34. Williams, Raymond op cit. The contrast of success and failure within both

All My Sons and *Death of a Salesman* points finally to the radical and still unsolved difficulties of form."

35. Ibid., p. 146.
36. Ibid.
37. Ibid.
38. Ibid.
39. Ibid.
40. Ibid.
41. Arthur Miller, "Family", op. cit., p. 37.
42. Ibid.
43. Ibid.
44. Jo Mielziner, "Designing a Play : *Death of a Salesman*", *Arthur Miller : Death of a Salesman*, (ed.), Gerald Weales, Viking New York, 1949, p. 197.
45. Ibid., p. 192.
46. B. S. Myers, *The German Expressionists*, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, p. 27.
47. Ibid.
48. Henry A. Lea, "Expressionist Literature and Music", *Expressionism as an International Literary Phenomenon* (ed.), Ulrich Weisstein, Akademiai Kiado, Budapest, 1973. Henry says that "confronting the old with the new is a characteristic trait of Expressionistic music, which was the familiar in order to transform it while retaining an emotional link to it. Especially striking is the ambivalent attitude towards the familiar which is part of the composer's cultural heritage but has been reduced to meaninglessness in modern context", p. 152. And Lea declared that Schonberg shared the view that "a new sound is instinctively discovered symbol and announces the new expressing himself". p. 159.
49. Arthur Miller, "Family", op. cit., p. 38.
50. John Gassner, *The Theater in Our Time : A Survey of the Men, Materials and Movements in the Modern Theater*, Crown Publishers, Inc., New York, 1963, p. 202.

NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS

Journal of Research (Humanities) is published twice a year, in January and July. It is an organ of the FACULTY OF ARTS.

SUBSCRIPTION

Pakistan.

Single Issue	Rs. 15.00	} Postage included
Annual (two issues)	Rs. 25.00	

Foreign Countries

Single Issue	\$ 5.00	} Postage included
Annual (two issues)	\$ 10.00	

All correspondence should be addressed to Mr. Muhammad Ismail Bhatti, Chief Editor & Secretary, *Journal of Research (Humanities)*, Department of English Language & Literature, University of the Punjab, Lahore (Pakistan).

CONTENTS

	Page
I. ABDIEL'S CAREER AND THE ARGUMENT OF <i>PARADISE LOST</i> <i>Dr. Zahir J. Khattak</i> ..	1
II. NAPOLEON III : A CASE STUDY <i>Dr. Sadiq A. Gill</i> ..	9
III. DEMAND FOR EXPATRIATE PAKISTANI WORKERS IN IRAQ AFTER CEASE-FIRE <i>Fareed A. Fareedy</i> ..	39
IV. DEMAND FOR CHILDREN : A MICRO-ECONOMIC APPROACH <i>Dr. A. Rauf Butt</i> ..	51
V. MILLER'S EXPRESSIONISM IN <i>DEATH OF A SALESMAN</i> <i>Nasim Riaz Butt</i> ..	63