

Anita Neziri

University of Aleksander Moisiu, Durres
Tirane /Albania

The Innovative Qualities in “Catch-22” of Joseph Heller

Abstract

This abstract is a study of Catch-22 (1961), a specific early document of American postmodern literature. In particular, this one is going to present the critical argument on this novel as parallel to the wider concept of the postmodernism. My claim is that, this novel is going to be treated in accordance with postmodern thought to paradox, irony, black humor, which is a line between fantasy and reality and readers of the novel are unsure about the point at which realism fades into fantasy and a collapsed literary possibility, traditional techniques in literature, for these literary issues in fact have come out many interpretations. So to attain best this argument is an approach to Catch-22 of Joseph Heller. In attempt to, firstly, demonstrate how critics have reduced the potential meaning of the novel in imposing its own notions of a literary historical circle and secondly, how readings of Heller's characters in the novel can reveal an untapped possibility for further exploration of the broadest definitions and interpretations of the project of postmodernism. Through this work will be obviously explained some of the most essential and basic postmodernist devices especially through the art of writing and language used. Not only marginalized, lateral characters will be on the spotlight of observation and analyses but also the major and protagonist ones will characterize the typical features of postmodern notion.

Keywords: Black Humor; Catch-22; War; Madness; Bureaucracy

1-Introduction

Joseph Heller's darkly humorous war novel *Catch-22* is a modern-day Juvenalian satire, one whose "angry" humor, rather than affirming conservative norms that its audience can agree on, questions and undermines many values at the heart of American life. "Aggressive capitalism, bureaucracy, and certain 'insane' and destructive elements of modern civilization which endure at the expense of humanity and compassion" are caricatured in Heller's novel. Heller's caricatures are often made grotesque by "the psychological equivalent of character reduction" (Balliet 248) monomania. His capitalism empire is made to stand for corporate greed and amorality by Heller's hyperbolic portrayal of his single-mindedness. Such satire, betrays a new twist on the Juvenalian satire. Heller and other dark humorists of the postwar period are informed by a radical agenda. A well-known critic, James Nagel identifies this sensibility as "essentially opposed to war, capitalism, bureaucracy, and traditional religion, and in favor of freedom, peace, agnosticism, sex, and life." In one of the earliest reviews of Joseph Heller's *Catch-22*, Whitney Balliett, writing in the *New Yorker*, charges that Heller uses nonsense, satire, slap-stick, and farce. He dips into his own laughter, and finally drowns in it. What remains is a piece of sour jokes, stage anger, dirty words, synthetic looniness, and the sort of antic behavior the children fall into when they know they are losing our attention. It seems somewhat strange now to remember such initial misgivings about the humor of *Catch-22*, particularly in view of the fact that Heller's novel has become increasingly conspicuous among those discussed in studies of the comedy of horror, black humor, or, indeed, "angry" humor.

1.1 *The paradox*

The paradox inherent in each of these phrases indicates something of the complexity of any attempt to codify the humor of the novel. There has not yet been published a single substantial article which specifies precisely what is funny about it, what the implications of such humor are, and what generic associations are implicit in its form. The importance of genre classification for a study of the novel is, of course, a matter of attempting to come to it on its own terms, without imposing irrelevant standards and obscuring fundamental themes. This is a problem which many reviewers encountered when they judged *Catch-22* as a realistic "Novel" and found it wanting in verisimilitude, depth of characterization, and plot. However, a few recent critical studies attempt some classification of genre. In the best of these, Constance Denniston develops an interpretation of the book as a "romance-parody." In other articles, Eric Solomon argues that it is a parody of serious war fiction, and Victor Milne calls it a mock-epic. These discussions, although they make some important contributions, do not satisfactorily describe the generic properties of *Catch-22*, for it is demonstrably a satire, essentially a Juvenalian satire which functions within the historical patterns of that form. What pure "comedy" exists is evidently superficial, if enjoyable, and serves only as a surface for the underlying thematic foundation of the novel.

1.2 *The Pun, the Gag and the Black Humor*

The humor of *Catch-22* is not the gentle entertainment of comedy but the harsh derision and directed social attack of satire. Unlike comedy, which depicts failures or excesses of basic human nature, the satire of Heller's novel is selective, hitting

out against definable groups within American society and creating a unified front against a corrupt and ridiculous enemy. In effect, as David Worcester theorizes, "Satire enters when the few convict the many of stupidity." In the case of *Catch-22*, one might say "stupidity and wickedness," for its objects of satire are portrayed as being both fools and knaves, and a sympathetic reader, laughing at the satirized subjects, feels himself to be a member of a select aristocracy based on virtue and intelligence. As Northrop Frye has indicated, satire requires at least two elements: humor resulting from the portrayal of fantasy, the grotesque, or the absurd; and a definable object of attack. *Catch-22* easily meets these requirements: (Frye; 244) Milo's bombing of his own squadron on Pianosa is fantasy; the old man of the whore house, to mention just one character, is grotesque; and the continuing logic and inexorability of the regulation *Catch-22* lapses into absurdity. The attack seems to center upon aggressive capitalism, bureaucracy, and certain "insane" and destructive elements of modern civilization which endure at the expense of humanity and compassion. As an art form, *Catch-22* uses the standard devices of satire to enforce its traditional thesis that "vice is both ugly and rampant" and that the solution of the problem is to "live with fortitude, reason, honor, justice, simplicity, the virtues which make for the good life and the good society." (Solomon, 851–66) To make these points, the method of characterization becomes caricature: Heller's military officers, like Swift's Yahoos and Pope's Dunces, are reductive and distorted projections of human personality types. In this matter, Heller's novel is not so purely Juvenalian as Philip Roth's *Our Gang*, which launches a vituperative assault on thinly disguised individual human beings. Rather, in *Catch-22* each character becomes associated with an "aspect of the civilization under attack, the whole range embracing a wide variety of social levels and attitudes." (Heller; 9)

The psychological equivalent of character reduction is monomania, and Heller is a master at portraying this condition: Milo Minderbinder, a modern reincarnation of Defoe's economic man, is a myopic encapsulation of the Madison Avenue mentality. He can make a profit on anything from making chocolate-covered cotton to selling supplies to the Germans, an enterprise he justifies in classical business terms. At one point he even has a Piltdown Man for sale. Lieutenant Scheisskopf, who becomes a General before the novel is over, is perfectly willing to nail men together in formation, or to wire their hands to their sides, if it will result in more orderly parades. His decision not to do so is not the result of compassion but of the inaccessibility of nickel-alloy swivels and good copper wire. In addition to Milo and Scheisskopf, Captain Black (with his Loyalty Oath Crusade), General P. P. Peckham (who wants all the tents to face Washington and thinks the USO should take over military operations—which it finally does), and Colonel Cathcart (who wants desperately to be featured in the *Saturday Evening Post*), are caricatures who cannot be evaluated by realistic standards. If they are to develop any functional thematic depth at all, they must be seen in their satiric roles as symbols of social attitudes, traditions, and patterns of behavior. Just as the characterizations of *Catch-22* are within the framework of satire, so are other elements of the novel. For example, a traditional satiric plot tends to be both episodic and cyclical, as are the rapid, almost jarring, shifts of scene in *Catch-22*. Also conventional in satire is the pattern of action which intensifies, rather than resolves, the central conflict.

1.3 Satire and the Subtle Irony

In addition, the setting of satire is often chaotic, crowded, and filled with images of corruption and decay. Alvin Kernan says that the satiric scene is one where “the deformed faces of depravity, stupidity, greed, venality, ignorance, and maliciousness group closely together for a moment, . . . break up, and another tight knot of figures collects. . .” (Heller;12) Kernan cites as examples Juvenal’s Rome, Pope’s land of Dunces, and Don Juan’s London, but he could easily have used Heller’s setting: Aarfy for depravity, Cathcart for stupidity, Milo for greed, the old man for venality, and almost any of Yossarian’s superiors for maliciousness. Yet another characteristic of satire, the ubiquitous image, has several expressions in Heller’s novel: images of a soldier covered entirely in white, of Yossarian naked in a tree at Snowden’s funeral, of the trunk of Kid Sampson tottering momentarily on a raft, and of the horrible moment when Yossarian opens Snowden’s flight jacket. These brutal and shocking images underscore the serious threats to human life which are behind Yossarian’s dilemma. Perhaps the most significant dimension in which it is important to distinguish the humor of *Catch-22* from simple comedy is that of the normative values which are essential to satire. As Northrop Frye points out, unlike a comedy, a satire’s “moral norms are relatively clear, and it assumes standards against which the grotesque and absurd are measured.” (Frye;59). From this point of view, a critical reading of the novel as a satire, indeed any reading of the novel, must formulate and describe those norms which are the basis of ethical conflict and which make the satire operative.

In his essay “Notes on the Comic,” W. H. Auden says that “satire flourishes in a homogeneous society with a common conception of the moral law, for satirist and audience must agree as to how normal people can be expected to behave, and in times of relative stability and contentment, for satire cannot deal with serious evil and suffering.” (Auden; 73) Auden’s premises would seem to be viable in dealing with traditional satire but wholly inadequate in describing the mode of *Catch-22*. America is not a homogeneous society; it has no unifying moral law; these are not times of stability; and Heller’s satire does deal with serious problems. What has happened to the satire of modern America is that the traditional conservative norm has been abandoned in favor of a “radical” one, one not endorsed by the majority of the population. One of the effects of this fundamental alteration is to create an uneasy humor resulting from the singularity of the normative base. Such humor, often employing scenes of violence or even horror, has been variously described in criticism as “angry” or “black” comedy. The social implication of this device is to call into question the prevailing ethical structure of the society, rather than to use its norms as a point of reference. Heller’s method is the inversion of the satirical mode employed by Aristophanes in *Lysistrata*, in which war and society are satirized from the perspective of conservative norms. *Lysistrata* emphasizes that a return to the style of life of the recent past, a style clearly defined historically, would be a solution to the problems, whereas in *Catch-22* what seems to be advocated is a movement forward toward some ill- defined yet positive and brave new world. In intellectual terms, such a stance is tenuous at best, and yet even this amorphous norm is effective in the satire. At this time of social misgiving and disenchantment, *Catch-22* allows its readers to celebrate their ethical superiority over, and distance from, the military machine and bureaucratic structure, which are made to look ridiculous and insane in the novel but seem unassailable and incorrigible in reality.

1.4 Modern Angry Humor

Modern angry humor, which has its historical foundation in Juvenalian satire, is an attack on the basic principles and fundamental order of society. Such an attack is not far beneath the surface of Heller's novel. The knaves and fools of *Catch-22* are all embodiments of the weaknesses in American middle-class morality. There is a Texan who believes that "people of means—decent folk—should be given more votes than drifters, whores, criminals, degenerates, atheists and indecent folk—people without means (Milne; 50–69). Appleby, whom Yossarian hates and whom Orr smashes in the head with a Ping-Pong paddle, is "a fair-haired boy from Iowa who believed in God, Motherhood and the American Way of Life, without ever thinking about any of them. Major Major's father is described as a "long-limbed farmer, a God-fearing, freedom-loving, law-abiding rugged individualist who held that federal aid to anyone but farmers was creeping socialism". The humor here results, at least in part, from the revelation of the corruption within the middle-class ethic itself, a theme made even clearer in the description of Major Major, who always did exactly what his elders told him:

"He never once took the name of the Lord his God in vain, committed adultery or coveted his neighbor's ass. In fact, he loved his neighbor and never even bore false witness against him. Major Major's elders disliked him because he was such a flagrant nonconformist" (Worcester;77). Nearly every facet of American life is made laughable through either diminution or hyperbole, from Milo's incredible capitalism to the Anabaptist chaplain's Christianity, which is expected to assist in getting tighter bomb patterns. The American economic classes are well represented in Nately, a wealthy but somewhat simple romantic, Aarfy, an economic striver who is the most blind and corrupt character of all, and Dunbar, the son of a poor man who worked himself to death trying to compete within the system. Perhaps this economic theme is most clear in the chapter "Nately's Old Man," in which Nately's father, who never wears anything but Brooks Brothers shirts and knows all the answers, is contrasted with the lecherous old man of the whore house who has no answers at all but professes the life ethic that Yossarian finally adopts: "anything worth dying for . . . is certainly worth living for" (Heller; 82). The old man is pragmatic and unpatriotic, but he convinces Nately that his father is a "Son of a Bitch" (John W.; 115-118).

Nately thus moves toward the radical norm, as indeed do Dunbar, Orr, and Yossarian. Even the chaplain, who had always believed in an "immortal, anthropomorphic, English-speaking, Anglo-Saxon, pro-American God", wavers in the faith, develops lust for his wife, comes to sympathize with Yossarian, and finally lies to get himself into the hospital. It would seem clear that the normative values of Heller's satire are essentially opposed to war, capitalism, bureaucracy, and traditional religion, and in favor of freedom, peace, agnosticism, sex, and life. The conflict between these two sets of values is related to the most pervasive theme of the novel, that of insanity. Madness is, of course, a consistent motif in satire: as Kernan says, the satirist "typically believes that there is no pattern of reason left in the world." The logical order of daily existence has somehow gone awry, leaving the satirist "alone in the lunatic world to stay its progressive degeneration. . . . He becomes the only champion of virtue who dares to speak the truth in a world where the false insolently maintains itself as the real." (Clinton S Jr; 120). This assessment of traditional satire goes a long way toward defining the operative norms of modern angry humor—especially in Ken Kesey's *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest* and *Catch-22*. From

the beginning it is clear that Yossarian's mind is not in harmony with the established thinking around him. Either he is maladjusted to a logical world, or the world is itself insane.

2- The Structure of the Novel

The structure of the novel moves systematically to a demonstration that the latter is the case. In the first chapter Yossarian reveals his position when he says to the chaplain, "insanity is contagious. . . Everybody is crazy but us. This probably the only sane ward in the whole world, for that matter" (Heller; 29). What is sane about them is, of course, that they have opted out of the war by going to the hospital. The Narrator's judgments, which intrude frequently, support Yossarian's perspective: "Men went mad and were rewarded with medals. . . . The only thing going on was the war, and no one seemed to notice but Yossarian and Dunbar. And when Yossarian tried to remind people, they drew away from him and thought he was crazy" (Mck. Henry; 138). But Yossarian is "mad" only in terms of his inability to accept the absurdity of war and in his compulsive desire to remain alive. Many of the other characters are "deranged" in more destructive ways.

In addition to the obvious monomaniacs, Milo and Scheisskopf, McWatt is crazy in that he does not mind the war and flies straight in over a target, and because he risks lives unnecessarily by flying low over Yossarian's tent. The dangerous potential of his acrobatics is realized when he zooms over the raft and slices Kid Sampson in half. In *Catch-22*, insanity becomes definable as an inability to recognize the reality of danger. Clevinger is insane because he doesn't believe Yossarian's conviction that "the enemy . . . is anybody who's going to get you killed" (Heller; 297). Aarfy is also insane in his complacent indifference to danger. The resolution of this theme comes when Yossarian is analyzed by a psychiatrist, Major Sanderson, who pronounces him mad. Sanderson says, "The trouble with you is that you think you're too good for all the conventions of society. . . . You have a morbid aversion to dying. . . . You have deep-seated survival anxieties. And you don't like bigots, bullies, snobs or hypocrites. . . . You're antagonistic to the idea of being robbed, exploited, degraded, humiliated or deceived. Misery depresses you. Ignorance depresses you. Persecution depresses you. Violence depresses you. Slums depress you. Greed depresses you. Crime depresses you. Corruption depresses you.

You know, it wouldn't surprise me if you're a manic-depressive!" (Heller; 299). A moment later, when Yossarian seeks assurance from Doc Daneeka that "they're not going to send a crazy man out to be killed, are they?" Daneeka responds, "Who else will go?" It is clear that the military, with its form letter of condolence, its power struggles, its bureaucracy, its bombing of villages to block roads, is the insane factor in the novel and that Yossarian, who really does feel himself "too good for all the conventions of society," endorses a much more humane standard for sanity. By the end of the novel, Kraft, Mudd, Snowden, Clevinger, Dunbar, the soldier in white, Hungry Joe, McWatt, Kid Sampson, the old man, Michaela, and Nately are all dead. In such a world, standing naked in formation, walking backward with a gun, and taking off for Sweden may well be the actions of a sane man. In Yossarian's desertion at the conclusion of the novel, there seems to be little humor. Such a development is within the tradition of Juvenal, whose works move from comic to tragic satire when the protagonist is left alone as the enemy becomes increasingly

more powerful. Yossarian's rejection of Cathcart's deal is not only a moral act in itself, but is consistent with the traditional response of the reader to Juvenalian satire. As Ronald Paulson explains, "with Horace the reader's experience is to feel complicity in the guilt; with Juvenal it is to feel repugnance at the evil." (Ronald;148). Yossarian's rejection of Cathcart and his world allows him to escape the role of tragic victim and to become an agent in his own destiny. He declares himself apart from and above the military world, and as he does, the poles of values become distinct and stable. *Catch-22* conforms to Maynard Mack's description of traditional satire: "madness and blindness are . . . the emblems of vice and folly, evil and good are clearly distinguishable, criminals and fools are invariably responsible (therefore censurable), and standards of judgment are indubitable."

3-Conclusion

In conclusion, the basic assumptions and organization of American society are effectively satirized and, through juxtaposition with idealistic norms, are shown to be wanting in fundamental humanity. It is in this dimension, as social commentary, that Heller's satire develops its most profound themes, themes which emerge with clarity and force from the depth of its angry humor. It tells the ironic and critical portrait of dozens contemporary problems of America at 1960-s. Classifying Joseph Heller as a postmodernist has led some critics to consider the author's tendency towards literary pastiche and his treatment of paranoia.

Although Heller certainly incorporates earlier texts into his fiction, his literary borrowing is not quite the form of pastiche Frederic Jameson identifies as central to postmodern creation,

nor is it merely an empty echoing of previous work. Instead, Heller's pastiche transcends Jameson's narrow definition and functions as a variety of the broader concept originally called *pasticcio*. By borrowing famous literary characters, situations, and styles which deal with absurdity, mortality, and futility, Heller draws his reader's attention to the ubiquity of these themes throughout literary history and emphasizes their relevance to the individual today. Finally, Heller reveals that the paranoia so prevalent in the postmodern world is little more than a manifestation of the very human fear of mortality. Rather than suggest the existence of the massive conspiracies which characterize the fiction of such postmodern writers as Thomas Pynchon, Heller depicts a world where delusions of persecution would be a way to avoid the harrowing secret in Snowden's entrails: that man is nothing more than dying matter.

Heller's characters, on the other hand, cannot blame a conspiracy for human suffering; death comes to everyone: "sooner or later God murders us all, doesn't He, and back we go to the dust from which we came". Life, then, is the individual's futile struggle against mortality, a fight so consuming that it leaves no room for delusory neuroses. Thus, as death is inevitable and Yossarian's fear of mortality is considered to be paranoid behavior, paranoia must be the human being's fear of the inevitable, Sartre's existential nausea. Although some influential critics dismiss *Catch-22* as a *Period Piece*, professors, students, businesspeople, retirees, and individuals from all other walks of life continue to read the novel.

REFERENCES

_____, Elements in Catch 22, Twentieth Century Literature, Vol. 19, No. 4., 239-250.
Aldridge, John W. (1979), The Deceits of Black Humor: Harper's March, _____

Balliett, W. (1961), New Yorker, 37-248.

Burhans, Clinton S. Jr. (1973), Spindrift and the Sea: Structural Patterns and Unifying, _____

Frye, N. (1975), Anatomy of Criticism, Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press

Henry, G. B. Mck. (1966), Significant Corn: Catch-22, Melbourne Critical Review, No.9, 138.

Joseph, H. (1961), "Catch-22", _____

Milne, Victor J. (1970), "Heller's 'Bologniad': A Theological Perspective on Catch-22," Critique, 12, No. 2, 50-69.

Ronald, P. (1961), "New Yorker, _____

Solomon, E. (1969), "From Christ in Flanders to Catch-22: An Approach to War Fiction," Texas Studies in Literature and Language, 851-66.

Worcester, D. (1940), The Art of Satire; Cambridge: Harvard University Press