

CENSORING EUGENE O'NEILL¹

Steve Wilmer

Eugene O'Neill was a social rebel and some of his plays subverted the hegemonic values in the United States during the 1920s. Local governmental authorities censored or threatened to censor several of his plays including *The Hairy Ape* and *All God's Chillun Got Wings*. In the case of *The Hairy Ape* the New York police filed a complaint ostensibly because of the play's "obscene" language but the real reason was more likely because of the Marxist and anarchist ideas expressed in the play.



Eugene O'Neill encountered censorship problems with a number of his plays, most notably *All God's Chillun Got Wings*, *Desire Under the Elms*, *Strange Interlude* and *The Hairy Ape*. *All God's Chillun* aroused a great deal of controversy because it treated the subject of interracial marriage. Before the play opened at the Provincetown Playhouse in 1924, the newspapers announced that a white actress, Mary Blair, would kiss the hand of a black actor, Paul Robeson, during the performance. Right-wing groups including the Ku Klux Klan were irate and threatened members of the production team. The playwright Augustus Thomas, when asked for his comment by the *Brooklyn Eagle*, responded, "In the first place, I should never have written such a play, and in the second place, I should have been willing to do what is usually done in such cases, to permit a white man to play the part of the negro. The present arrangement, I think, has a tendency to break down social barriers which are better left untouched" (Gelb 548). This last comment ironically reinforced the theme of O'Neill's play, that a black and white couple cannot cope in a society which so rigidly enforces racial segregation and racial stereotypes.

Another newspaper, the *American*, ran stories about the play for weeks before it opened. In one they quoted a statement from John Sumner, secretary of the Society of Vice: "From my information the play is at least a tactless thing, and if it does nothing more than lead to race antagonisms the police

Γράμμα / Gramma: Journal of Theory and Criticism 2 (1994)

© 1994 by Aristotle University of Thessaloniki.

powers of the city should be used to prevent its presentation. Such a play might easily lead to racial riots or disorder, and if there is any such possibility, police powers can be exercised" (Gelb 548). The *American* suggested that an octoroon (in other words a light-skinned African-American) might be substituted for the white actress (so that the audience would be more comfortable with the knowledge that two African-Americans were kissing on stage rather than a black man and a white woman), or that, if this were not done, the license commissioner should intervene. When the license commissioner revealed that the Provincetown Playhouse was outside his jurisdiction because it was a private club, the *American* called for the Mayor to take action. O'Neill responded with a press statement which denied that his play was about the "race problem." "It is primarily a study of the two principal characters and their tragic struggle for happiness. To deduce any general application from *God's Chillun* except in a deep, spiritual sense, is to read a meaning into my play which is not there...Nothing could be farther from my wish than to stir up racial feeling...Finally, and plainly, all we ask is a square deal. A play is written to be experienced through the theatre, and only on its merits in a theatre can a final judgment be passed on it with justice. We demand this hearing. We shall play it before our subscribers only, and abide by their verdict in the fullest confidence that the play, produced as it should be, can give no offense to any rational American of whatever creed or race" (Gelb 550-1).²

Although the press printed extracts of his statement, the controversy continued to rage. According to Kenneth Macgowan, "It is no risk at all to say that *All God's Chillun* received more publicity before production than any play in the history of the theatre, possibly of the world"(Gelb 551). O'Neill later wrote to a friend about the personal attacks that he suffered. "It seemed for a time there as if all the feeble-witted both in and out of the K.K.K. were hurling newspaper bricks in my direction — not to speak of the anonymous letters which ranged from those of infuriated Irish Catholics who threatened to pull my ears off as a disgrace to their race and religion, to those of equally infuriated Nordic Kluxers who knew that I had Negro blood, or else was a Jewish pervert masquerading under a Christian name in order to do subversive propaganda for the Pope!"(Gelb 551-2).

O'Neill even received a threat that he would never see his two sons again if the play went ahead and James Light, the director, recalled, "We also got a bomb warning from someone, stating that if we opened the play we would have a theatre full of dead people on our hands. We didn't let any of this interfere with our plans, but there was a lot of tension all around"(Gelb 552). Finally the Mayor's office found a technicality by which to stop the play. The first scene required child actors who needed a license to perform. The Mayor's office refused to grant the license at the last minute. However, the performance went ahead with the first scene being read by a member of the production team. By contrast with the dire warnings of trouble on opening

night, the performance proceeded smoothly and the result was something of an anti-climax. O'Neill himself had been half expecting a riot, and had stayed sober so that he could participate. He told one of his friends, "If there's going to be a row over one of my plays, I'm too Irish to miss the fun"(Gelb 555).

Desire Under the Elms, unlike *All God's Chillun*, did not receive adverse pre-production publicity, and it was only after the play had moved to Broadway that it encountered censorship problems. Possibly because of tasteless billboard advertising of the production and because of the title of the play, but also because of its themes of incest and infanticide (since it was based loosely on Euripides's plays *Hippolytus* and *Medea*), the play came to the attention of the District Attorney who ordered it to close. However, the Provincetown Playhouse proposed to fight city hall again. The District Attorney threatened the management with a grand jury hearing, but Kenneth Macgowan countered, "We do not intend to accede to any peremptory demand to take the show off the stage by Wednesday...If we are indicted we will defend the play in the courts. We are gathering many opinions from persons of eminence, who consider this play a fine, strong work"(Gelb 576). In the end it was agreed that a play jury should assess the performance, and they voted that it should remain on the stage unaltered. Despite this victory, the play continued to cause controversy. It was banned in Boston, and in England it was refused a license until 1940. When it went on tour out west in 1925, the entire cast was arrested in Los Angeles and tried in court for performing in an obscene play. A policeman testified in court, "I was painfully shocked...I blushed. I sat there so embarrassed that I feared for the time when the act would end and the lights would again be turned on. After I left that place I couldn't look the world in the face for hours" (Gelb 578). O'Neill felt that, although the free publicity helped box office receipts, the play suffered. "We got a large audience, but of the wrong kind of people...They came for dirt and found it in everything. It ruined the actors because they never knew how a line was going to be taken"(Gelb 577).

Strange Interlude in 1928 also encountered problems on the road as it touched on such controversial topics as abortion and adultery. Boston again banned it, and so it was performed in a small suburb outside Boston called Quincy, Massachusetts. Because the performance lasted over six hours with a dinner break it helped to put on the map a small restaurant owned by a man named Howard Johnson who then developed a chain of restaurants. Some people manage to profit from censorship! O'Neill himself was not averse to taking advantage of bad publicity to create interest in his plays. In the case of *All God's Chillun* he suggested taking legal action against the authorities for refusing licenses for the child actors, because this was sure to create renewed controversy and free publicity in the press.

Another of O'Neill's plays to suffer from the threat of public censorship in New York and the one I want to examine more closely was *The Hairy Ape*. When it opened in 1922, the play attracted criticism partly because of its

language. Alexander Woolcott called the stokers' speech "more squalid than...heard before in an American theatre," and the New York police filed a complaint asking that the play be closed down because it was "obscene, indecent and impure" (Wainscott 111). Although the language may have been mildly shocking to the audience at the time, more alarming to the establishment was the political content of the play.

The Hairy Ape is usually placed in the safe critical category of expressionist theatre. There are a number of expressionistic features, not the least being the gross caricatures, the somewhat ludicrous ending and the structural similarity both to O'Neill's earlier expressionistic play *The Emperor Jones* and to Georg Kaiser's *From Morn to Midnight*. However, it should also be seen as O'Neill's most polemical attack on American capitalist society. The first six scenes of the play are structured like a Brechtian *Lehrstück*. The first two scenes of the play highlight the class divisions on an ocean liner with the first class passengers on the sun deck grossly contrasted with the stokers in the bowels of the ship. When Mildred, the daughter of a multi-millionaire, visits the filthy stoke-hole in the third scene, dressed in white in order to "discover how the other half lives" (433), she destroys the social equilibrium by which the ship has managed to sail. Despite good intentions — "I would like to help them. I would like to be some use in the world" (433) — she faints when she sees the bestial conditions and behaviour of the stokers. Yank, who has previously been at home in the stoke-hole, suddenly feels estranged and tries to understand his position in society. Mildred's aunt had previously signalled the dangers of social work by the rich — "how they must have hated you, by the way, the poor that you made so much poorer in their own eyes!" (433) — and so Yank develops an antipathy not just for her but with the aid of his socialist friend, Long, her whole class.

O'Neill provides in the first four scenes a Marxist metaphor, demonstrating the alienation of man from his labor in the industrial society. Yank in the beginning of the play seems at home in the stoke-hole. He feels at one with his work and his work-mates, but by the end of scene four after the entrance of Mildred into the stoke-hole, he no longer feels that he belongs because he now is beginning to see the true relationship between himself and those above him. The alienation of man from his work in the industrial world is underlined by the Irish sailor Paddy in the first scene who expresses surprise that Yank can feel at home in an ocean liner. He looks back to the days of sailing ships, "'Twas them days men belonged to ships, not now. 'Twas them days a ship was part of the sea, and a man was part of a ship, and the sea joined all together and made it one. (*Scornfully.*) Is it one wid this you'd be, Yank — black smoke from the funnels smudging the sea, smudging the decks — the bloody engines pounding and throbbing and shaking — wid divil a sight of sun or a breath of clean air — choking our lungs wid coal dust — breaking our backs and hearts in the hell of the stokehole" (431). In the

fourth scene, anticipating the end of the play, Paddy compares the characters in the stoke-hole to apes in a circus or a zoo. "In this cage is a queerer kind of baboon than ever you'd find in darkest Africy. We roast them in their own sweat — and be damned if you won't hear some of thim saying they like it!" (438).

Thus, in the first four scenes of the play, O'Neill portrays the effect of industrial capitalist society in separating man from the product of his labor and forcing him to work in unhealthy and unfulfilling conditions. The do-gooder Mildred is satirized as ineffective because she and her kind will not alter the basic inequalities of the society, but simply call attention to them and thereby make them worse. In scene five Yank begins to receive an education about the class system. As they wait on Fifth Avenue for the rich to get out of church, Long makes Yank aware of the prices in the jewelry shops, "More'n our 'ol bloody stokehole makes in ten voyages sweatin' in 'ell! And they — her and her clars — buys 'em for toys to dangel on 'em! One of these 'ere would buy grubb for a starvin' family for a year!" (441). Long becomes alarmed at his success in arousing class hatred and cautions Yank, "Easy goes, Comrade. Keep yer bloomin' temper. Remember force defeats itself. It ain't our weapon. We must impress our demands through peaceful means — the votes of the on-marching proletarians of the bloody world!" (441). Yank, however, has been whipped into a fury and rushes at the Fifth Avenue gentry looking for a fight, which results in his arrest and imprisonment.

Yank's revolutionary education progresses in prison in scene six, where a fellow prisoner reads a newspaper report of a speech condemning the activities of the Industrial Workers of the World. The I. W. W. is misrepresented by a U.S. Senator in the same type of language that gave rise to the Palmer raids (the government suppression of radical activists that were occurring in the country at that time and in particular encouraged the imprisonment or deportation of members of the I.W.W. and the growth of the Ku Klux Klan). The reactionary Senator declares, "There is a menace existing in this country to-day which threatens the vitals of our fair Republic — as foul a menace against the very life-blood of the American Eagle as was the foul conspiracy of Cataline against the eagles of ancient Rome!... I refer to that devil's brew of rascals, jailbirds, murderers and cut-throats who libel all honest working-men by calling themselves the Industrial Workers of the World... They plot with fire in one hand and dynamite in the other. They stop not before murder to gain their ends, nor at the outraging of defenceless womanhood. They would tear down society, put the lowest scum in the seats of the mighty, turn Almighty God's revealed plan for the world topsy-turvy, and make of our sweet and lovely civilization a shambles, a desolation where man, God's masterpiece, would soon degenerate back to the ape!" (444-5).

By quoting Senator Queen's speech at length, O'Neill lampooned the American government's over-reaction to the threat from radical elements in

society and deliberately evoked sympathy for the I.W.W. He also suggested that it was not the radicals but the establishment who had turned such individuals as Yank into apes. Yank's political conversion is portrayed in a favourable light, despite its crudity. After reading the report himself — "I can't read much but I kin manage" (445) — Yank discovers, "Sure — her old man — President of de Steel Trust — makes half de steel in de world — steel — where I thought I belonged —... to make her — and cage me in for her to spit on!... He made dis — dis cage! Steel! *It don't belong, dat's what! Cages, cells, locks, bolts, bars — dat's what it means! — holdin' me down, wit him at de top!*" (445). The childlike quality of his reasoning gives way to a violent reaction to the circumstances in which he now finds himself, and which ironically recall the first scene in which his workplace was also depicted like a cage or jail, and also anticipates the end of the play when he eventually finds himself reduced to a gorilla's cage. Rattling the bars of his cell and ultimately bending the bars, he threatens revolution, comparing himself to a fire that is so hot it can melt steel and undermine the system. "I'll be fire — under de heap — fire dat never goes out — hot as hell — breakin' out in de night" (445).

Up to this point, the play could be viewed as socialist propaganda, caricaturing the oppressors and eliciting sympathy for the oppressed, which, unusually, are likewise caricatured. The Fifth Avenue church is included amongst the oppressors for siding with the rich, opposing social change and collecting money for its own unnecessary restoration project. As the overdressed worshippers stream out of church, they march across the stage like "gaudy marionettes, yet with something of the relentless horror of Franksteins in their detached, mechanical unawareness" (441). Oblivious of Yank and Long, they speak in "toneless, simpering voices" (441) incriminating themselves and the church for their lack of humanity. "Dear Doctor Caiaphas! He is so sincere! What was the sermon? I dozed off. About the radicals, my dear — and the false doctrines that are being preached. We must organize a hundred per cent American bazaar. And let everyone contribute one one-hundredth per cent of their income tax. What an original idea! We can devote the proceeds to rehabilitating the veil of the temple. But that has been done so many times" (441). In the first production of the play, the designer used masks for the Fifth Avenue gentry much to O'Neill's delight. The masks gave an inhuman uniformity to their faces and they appeared, according to one of the critics of the day, like "masked manikins," "who walk like automata and prattle" (Wainscott 117-8).

In structure, the play can be seen, until the last two scenes, as anticipating Brecht's *Lehrstücke*, such as *The Mother*, in which the simple-minded mother grows from ignorance to political sophistication through a series of confrontations with authority figures. However, in the last two scenes of the play, Yank fails to benefit from the knowledge he has gained and remains alienated from the rest of humanity. In the seventh scene, he visits an I.W.W.

office. But rather than finding himself at home in the office of his fellow workers, it transpires that he is there on false pretenses. He has believed Senator Queen's speech as reported in the newspaper, and he has come to the I.W.W. office because he thinks that they are a terrorist organisation. Equally ironic is their response to him. Because he says he wants to blow up the steel industry — "Dynamite! Blow it offen de oith — steel — all de cages — all de factories, steamers, buildings, jails — de Steel Trust and all dat makes it go" (447) — they assume that he is an agent provocateur sent by the government to discredit their organization (as had been happening in the U.S. at the time). The I.W.W. secretary implies that his organisation aims "to change the unequal conditions of society by legitimate direct action" (447) and has him thrown out, rather than trying to convert him to their way of doing things. Yank, on the other hand, dismisses them as a bourgeois trade union organization, trying to improve the living and working conditions of their members, but doing nothing to affect the inner value of their members as human beings. He scoffs, "Tree square a day, and cauliflowers in de front yard — ekal rights — a woman and kids — a lousey vote — and I'm all fixed for Jesus, huh? Aw, hell! What does dat get yuh? Dis ting's in your inside, but it ain't your belly. Feedin' your face — sinkers and coffee — dat don't touch it. It's way down — at de bottom. Yuh can't grab it, and yuh can't stop it. It moves, and everything moves. It stops and de whole woild stops" (448).

This point in the script marks a shift in ideology from Marxist to humanist, from concern with the external class struggle to a preoccupation with the inner value of the individual. Yank asserts that he was better off when he was working under the illusion that he was important to the product of his labor. Now that he recognizes that he is alienated from it, he feels lost. "Steel was me, and I owned de woild. Now I ain't steel, and de woild owns me. Aw, hell! I can't see — it's all dark, get me?" (448).

What he does not say, but what O'Neill seems to convey through Yank's plight is that a radical transformation of society is necessary in order to reintegrate industrial workers, but O'Neill does not seem to be willing or to be able to identify how that social transformation might take place. One clue seems to be in O'Neill's apparent sympathy with Paddy's sentiment expressed at the beginning of the play that the pre-industrial days allowed men to be unified with their work, but that industrialization has alienated man. Rather than offering a solution, O'Neill in the last scene leaves Yank in a zoo cage of a gorilla with whom Yank hopes to wreak vengeance on the establishment. "I'll take yuh for a walk down fif Avenoo. We'll knock 'em offen de oith and croak wit de band playin'. Come on, Brother" (449). The harsh criticism of American capitalism that underlies *The Hairy Ape* is undercut by Yank's pathetic yet ludicrous attempt at befriending the gorilla, his acceptance of the label of "the hairy ape" and the final stage directions after Yank has been killed by the gorilla, "perhaps at last the Hairy Ape belongs" (449).

The ending of the play, although it is in keeping with the style of the rest of the play, seems a bit far-fetched, and it is clear that O'Neill at first was not sure how to end it. In the early stage of writing, he planned for Yank to return to the stoke-hole of the ship, having been alienated from it but having no other place to go (Gelb 489). Furthermore, it is interesting to note that O'Neill had written a short story in 1917 called "The Hairy Ape" which had been rejected by *Metropolitan* for which his friend John Reed (who later started the American Communist Party) had been writing. Although it is unclear how close the short story was to the play, it is significant that the managing editor in turning down the story, argued, "the ending strikes me as not so good as the rest. To take your man through so much simply human feeling in order to have him join the I.W.W. as the outcome, seems unfinished, or not just the right turn" (Sheaffer 389). That O'Neill considered such a political ending for a short story by the same name and that it was rejected by a publisher seems to indicate an earlier experience with a subtle form of censorship.

Although the final scene of the play tends to soften the harsh criticism of American capitalism that precedes it, the play was in fact a strong indictment. It confronted prevailing social values in a direct and inflammatory manner and criticized the government's treatment of the I.W.W. Today the play is accepted in western criticism as important because of its expressionist style rather than for its social analysis, which is again a way of subverting its political message. However, I would argue that it makes a strong political as well as aesthetic statement. Like his later play *The Iceman Cometh*, *The Hairy Ape* reflects O'Neill's life on the docks with anarchists and members of the I.W.W. In 1917 O'Neill wrote a poem "Submarine" which expressed some of his early anarchist sentiments:

My soul is a submarine
My aspirations are torpedoes.
I will hide unseen
Beneath the surface of life
Watching for ships,
Dull, heavy-laden merchant ships,
Rust-eaten, grimy galeons [sic] of commerce
Wallowing with obese assurance,
Too sluggish to fear or wonder,
Mocked by the laughter of waves
And the spit of disdainful spray.

I will destroy them
Because the sea is beautiful.

That is why I lurk
Menacingly
In green depths.

(Cargill 395)

A second poem that indicated O'Neill's attitude that war was a capitalist enterprise was printed in *Call* in 1914,

"A good war haloes any cause."
What war could halo this cause, pray?
The wise man's words had given pause
To him, were he alive today
To see by what unholy laws
The plutocrats extend their sway.
What cause could be more asinine
Than yours, ye slaves of bloody toil?
Is not your bravery sublime
Beneath a tropic sun to broil
And bleed and groan — for Guggenheim!
And give your lives for — Standard Oil!

(Cargill 398)

Marx influenced O'Neill's analysis of the evils of capitalism, but Nietzsche informed his view of the spiritual sterility of man. He criticized social reformers for trying to compensate for their own weakness by gaining control over others. The social reformer and the revolutionary in his mind were similar to the capitalist — out for themselves rather than for the good of others (Cargill 399-401).

Lest it appear that O'Neill had been an anarchist in his youth and had grown out of these ideas, Crosswell Bowen, who interviewed him in 1946 at the time of rehearsals for *Iceman Cometh*, felt his anarchism had not changed. "An eager, aggressive young actor stood up and asked O'Neill where he stood on 'the movement.' Two of the characters in the play are disillusioned radicals. 'I am a philosophical anarchist,' O'Neill said, smiling faintly, 'which means, "Go to it, but leave me out of it.' ". ...As his words took on more and more vigor, I got the feeling that O'Neill was, in a sense, the conscience of America asserting itself. I realized that one could say of him even today what his boss on the New London Telegraph had said of him in 1912: 'He was the most stubborn and irreconcilable social rebel that I had ever met' " (Cargill 84).

O'Neill maintained a love/hate relationship with American society. "I'm going on the theory that the United States, instead of being the most successful country in the world, is the greatest failure"(Cargill 390). Bowen quoted him as saying, "America is due for a retribution. There ought to be a page in the history books of the United States of America of all the unprovoked, criminal, unjust crimes committed and sanctioned by our government, since the beginning of our history — and before that, too. There is hardly one thing that our government has done that isn't some treachery — against the Indians, against the people of the Northwest, against the small farmers. ...This American Dream stuff gives me a pain... Telling the world

about our American Dream! I don't know what they mean. If it exists, as we tell the whole world, why don't we make it work in one small hamlet in the United States?... The great battle in American history... was the Battle of Little Big Horn. The Indians wiped out the white men, scalped them. That was a victory in American history. It should be featured in all our school books as the greatest victory in American history"(Cargill 83-4).

O'Neill's friend Slim Martin, an I.W.W. supporter, suggested "some of the atmosphere and dialogue" for *The Hairy Ape*, according to Arthur and Barbara Gelb (488), who also suggest that O'Neill may have been prompted to write the play because of the death in Russia of his friend, the American communist John Reed. Although its members misunderstand Yank, the I.W.W. is portrayed as a legitimate and responsible trade union organization in an era when it was being outlawed across the U.S., accused of sedition and espionage. Yank's conclusion that something more radical than the I.W.W. is necessary to cure what's ailing him is all the more surprising given the social context in which the play was first performed.

The Hairy Ape was a strong indictment of the American way of life, imbued with Marxist and anarchist ideas, stronger in some ways than the plays of Odets. While *Waiting for Lefty* implies that a strike will solve America's social ills, *The Hairy Ape* suggests that the problem lies much deeper. Arthur Miller in his memoirs remarked on the political impact of *The Iceman Cometh* which he saw in 1946. "I was nevertheless struck by O'Neill's radical hostility to bourgeois civilization, far greater than anything Odets had expressed. Odets's characters were alienated because — when you came down to it — they couldn't get into the system, O'Neill's because they so desperately needed to get out of it, to junk it with all its boastful self-congratulation, its pious pretension to spiritual values when in fact it produced emptied and visionless men choking with unnameable despair"(228).

The same comment could be applied to *The Hairy Ape* and O'Neill should be recognized, not just as a story-teller, theatrical innovator and explorer of human psychology but also as a writer who felt the need for a profound transformation of society. Rather than defining O'Neill, as does C.W. Bigsby, as "a playwright whose territory was the mind and its conflicts rather than the social world," he should be seen as both. The German playwright Gerhard Hauptmann called *The Hairy Ape* "one of the really great social plays of our time"(Gelb 757). And the reaction of some of the critics to the initial production demonstrated its immediate social relevance. Heywood Brown in *The World* claimed that O'Neill had "become a propagandist"(Gelb 494). J. Rankin Towse of the *Evening Post* assumed that the play was "designed, primarily as a tract in favor of the I.W.W."(Gelb 498). The *Marine Worker*, a trade union journal, recommended the play to its members and R. Robins in *Industrial Solidarity* was grateful for its sympathetic portrait of the I.W.W. (Jordan Miller 359-61).

O'Neill himself felt the play ran "the whole gamut from extreme naturalism to extreme expressionism" as it probed "in the shadows of the soul of man bewildered by the disharmony of his primitive pride and individualism at war with the mechanistic development of society" (Gelb 490). In answer to his critics, he explained that while the play was expressionistic, the characters were not mere symbols. Hinting that his work was more effective as a piece of didactic theatre because of its subtlety, he compared it with Gorki's work. "In special pleading I do not believe. Gorki's *A Night's Lodging*, the great proletarian revolutionary play, is really more wonderful propaganda for the submerged than any other play ever written, simply because it contains no propaganda, but simply shows humanity as it is — truth in terms of human life. As soon as an author slips propaganda into a play everyone feels it and the play becomes simply an argument" (Cargill 110). In a letter dated shortly after the play opened, O'Neill maintained that *The Hairy Ape* "is also very much a protest against the present" (O'Neill 166). Furthermore, after transferring to Broadway, the play was threatened with censorship by the New York Police Department, as already noted, for being "obscene, indecent and impure." Perhaps the bad language was simply an excuse to silence the political attitudes expressed in the play. However, partly because his second Pulitzer Prize (for *Anna Christie*) was announced within the same week, it was difficult to sustain the charge and the Chief Magistrate did not take action.

O'Neill, who called the U.S. "the most reactionary country in the world" (Cargill 396), wrote other plays critical of American capitalism including *The Great God Brown* (1926) and *Marco Millions* (1928). *All God's Chillun* was an equally savage attack on the racist behaviour of Americans. However, it was *The Hairy Ape* which made the most outspoken comment. At the time it was threatened with censorship on the grounds of indecent language, but it may have been the political content that was the more troubling aspect and which continues to be. And so critics and theatre historians who find it unpalatable that the father of modern American drama should have held such antipathetic political views prefer to censor his political content by confining his most outspoken plays to the domain of expressionism.

Both *All God's Chillun* and *The Hairy Ape* use expressionist devices to convey the effects of society on the main characters. In both, society is the oppressor. At the beginning of each play neither Yank nor Jim are aware that they are oppressed. Both innocently believe that they belong in their environment. Suddenly they both recognise that they do not belong, and this knowledge torments them. For example, the walls of the apartment close in on Jim Harris, and Yank finds himself enclosed in different varieties of cages. These expressionistic devices are not merely arbitrary but are used as symbols of social oppression. Both Yank and Jim Harris allow themselves to become victims of the people who surround them. At the heart of both plays is a radical criticism of American society which is represented as alienating

its citizens (particularly its workers and African-Americans). Both Yank and Jim Harris suffer from the feeling that they do not belong and cannot extract themselves from a self-destructive treadmill on which they find themselves. They are tragic in the sense that they can find no solution to their problems. O'Neill said, "Yank can't go forward, and so he tries to go back. This is what his shaking hands with the gorilla meant. But he can't go back to 'belonging' either. The gorilla kills him" (Cargill 110-1).

It is arguable, as Doris Alexander has suggested, that O'Neill did not see a solution either. She concludes, "O'Neill's social criticism cancels itself out, for he not only condemns all of society as it is, he rejects all solutions for making it something better. He accepts no answer to life, but death" (Cargill 407). However, this contradicts O'Neill's own view of his plays which he expressed in 1946. "In all my plays sin is punished and redemption takes place" (Cargill 82). Although Alexander's criticism is partially valid, it is overstated and fails to acknowledge that O'Neill was more of an anarchist than a nihilist. Like Beckett, O'Neill portrayed a grim world in which many of his characters led meaningless lives. But unlike Beckett who deracinated his characters from contemporary society and placed them in a void, O'Neill, particularly in *All God's Chillun*, *The Hairy Ape* and *The Iceman Cometh*, painted characters oppressed by and alienated from society. His focus on the problems of contemporary society did not allow the audience to escape intellectually into an absurd void, but rooted them in the reality of contemporary social issues. Although these plays are far from dogmatic, they demonstrate a belief in social and individual improvement. In an interview in 1924, he said, "*The Hairy Ape* was propaganda in the sense that it was a symbol of man, who has lost his old harmony with nature, the harmony which he used to have as an animal and has not yet acquired in a spiritual way" (Cargill 110).

Politically engaged writers often offer the answers to the questions that they raise about society in their plays so that the spectators can depart the theatre either accepting or rejecting the author's solution. O'Neill did not. On the contrary, plays such as *The Hairy Ape*, *All God's Chillun* and *The Iceman Cometh* left the audience to find a solution for themselves, thereby achieving an equally disturbing political effect. It was because O'Neill undermined American hegemonic social values that the authorities sought to censor him.

Trinity College Dublin

Notes

1. This article has been developed from a paper given at a French Association of American Studies conference in La Colle sur Loup that was published in *Cycnos*, (Nice), No. 9, 1992.
2. In the event, the play pleased neither race. According to the African-American writer Loftin Mitchell, "The critics disliked the work. They were many steps behind Negroes, who hated it" (83). The play has remained controversial and rarely performed because of the subject matter and its treatment. A discussion of the reception of the play is beyond the scope of this article, but one factor worth mentioning relates to the current debate about the appropriation of one culture by another. In the 1920s Harlem experienced a renaissance and African-American culture was in vogue amongst white New Yorkers. White writers like Ridgeley Torrence, Paul Green, Marc Connelly as well as O'Neill capitalised on this and wrote plays about African-Americans for a white audience. They have often been accused of reducing their black characters to stereotypes and trading on their exotic features.

Works Cited

- Bigsby, C. W. *A Critical Introduction to Twentieth-Century American Drama*. Vol. I. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1982.
- Cargill, Oscar, et al. eds. *O'Neill and his Plays*. London: Peter Owen Ltd., 1962.
- Gelb, Arthur and Barbara. *O'Neill*. New York: Harper & Row, 1973.
- Miller, Arthur. *Timebends*. London: Methuen, 1987
- Miller, Jordan. *Eugene O'Neill and the American Critic*. London: Archon Books, 1962.
- Mitchell, Loftin. *Black Drama: The Story of the American Negro in the Theatre*. New York: Hawthorn Books, Inc., 1967.
- O'Neill, Eugene. *The Collected Plays of Eugene O'Neill*. London: Jonathan Cape, 1988.
- . *Selected Letters*. Eds. Bogard and Bryer. New Haven: Yale UP, 1988.
- Sheaffer, Louis. *O'Neill: Son and Playwright*. London: Dent & Sons Ltd., 1969.
- Waincott, Ronald. *Staging O'Neill*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1988.

Ο Eugene O' Neill ήταν κοινωνικός επαναστάτης και μερικά από τα έργα του υπέσκαπταν τις ηγεμονικές αντιλήψεις στις Ηνωμένες Πολιτείες κατά τη δεκαετία του 1920. Οι τοπικές αρχές λογόκριναν ή απείλησαν με λογοκρισία αρκετά από τα έργα του, συμπεριλαμβανομένων των *Hairy Ape* και *All God's Chillun Got Wings*. Στην περίπτωση του *Hairy Ape* η αστυνομία της Νέας Υόρκης καταχώρησε μια διαμαρτυρία, επιφανειακά λόγω της "αισχρής" γλώσσας του έργου, αλλά πραγματικός λόγος (το πιθανότερο) ήταν οι Μαρξιστικές και αναρχικές ιδέες που εκφράζονται στο έργο.