

University of Minnesota Interlibrary Loan

ILL#

.6 L334

10 3:53

trial De

library, U

The Campus Strikes Against War

by

JOSEPH P. LASH

National Secretary, Student League for Industrial Democracy;
Member, National Student Strike Committee



Foreword

JOHN CRIPPS

UNIVERSITY OF
MINNESOTA
LIBRARY

STUDENT LEAGUE FOR INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY

112 East 19th Street, New York



10 CENTS

FIGHT WAR EFFECTIVELY,
ON EVERY FRONT, AND
YOU FIND YOURSELF
FIGHTING FOR SOCIALISM

THE CAMPUS STRIKES AGAINST WAR

Copyright, 1935, by
STUDENT LEAGUE FOR INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY

341.6
L334

FOREWORD

THE NEWS of the Student Strike Against War has already winged its way to the students of countries all over the world carrying encouragement and incentive to the building of a student anti-war movement that will ring the world in its steely embrace. The famous motion passed in the Oxford Union Society two years ago provided a common intellectual basis upon which students of all countries can unite in their opposition to war. The students of America, who came out on strike this year and last, have shown to the world an effective method of organizing student opinion against war.]

Such expressions of opinion cannot but create a profound impression upon public opinion in all countries. But the organization of student strikes must be only the beginning, and not the end of our opposition to war. Past events have shown that there are economic and social forces at work within every capitalist country which cannot be checked by mere expressions of opinion however well organized they may be. The latter can only serve to delay the outbreak of war. This delay is valuable mainly because it offers to students the world over an opportunity to fight for the elimination of the economic causes of war, which are inherent in the capitalist system itself.

The Student L.I.D. has played a leading part in the anti-war strikes because its members understood better than the other participants the causes of war and the method of fighting them. It will continue to lead this movement and its leadership will provide an inspiration to students far beyond the confines of this country. There is a growing feeling of solidarity among students all over the world and it is this solidarity of students with students, and students with workers in all countries that provides the only sane basis for the struggle against war and against the capitalist system of which it is a part.

JOHN CRIPPS

University Labor Federation of England

636115

Student League for Industrial Democracy
SECT. NON



Roger Baldwin leading 3,500 students from Columbia, Barnard, Union Theological Seminary, New College and Teachers' College in Oxford pledge on April 12, 1935.

The Campus Strikes Against War

THE 1935 student strike against war which brought out of the classrooms 175,000 students and in one way or another affected every institution of higher learning in America was, in a world haunted and terrified by the spectre of war, a historical demonstration for peace. It was more than that; it was a mobilization against war inspired by a clear-eyed vision of the causes of war and the ways of combatting it. The student strike neither marked the beginning nor the culmination of the anti-war movement in the schools. It was a dramatic episode in a movement of which the community will hear more in the future.

What accounts for the present attitude among students toward war and peace? Patrioteers ask whether the generation of 1935 lacks guts. The liberal *New York Post* pats us on the back for our demonstration against war and genially takes it for granted that we will defend our country despite all our resolutions to the contrary. How serious are we about our slogans, "Strike against Imperialist War," "Schools not Battleships," "Abolish the R.O.T.C."? Will our movement hold up when the propaganda apparatus is mobilized for war? These and many other questions have been raised by the student strike against war.

The Anti-War Movement in 1917

In 1917 there was slight resistance to the war frenzy that swept the school system. Indeed the whole intellectual class, writers, ministers, scholars and artists, outdid themselves in order to prove their loyalty to the United States in wartime. "Kill the Hun!" echoed in newspaper columns, church pulpit and classroom with an equal ferocity. In the high schools students collected peach pits—a necessary ingredient in the manufacture of gas masks. In the mens' colleges, undergraduates waited to be called to the colors. The sex appeal of the womens' colleges was enlisted in

recruiting drives. German clubs were disbanded and the German language no longer taught. The faculties of the University of Chicago on March 19, 1918 met together and solemnly revoked Ambassador von Bernsdorff's honorary LL.D.¹

These examples can be multiplied endlessly. It is more significant to inquire into the student anti-war movement that existed in 1917. That is the proper background against which to evaluate today's anti-war movement in the schools.

THE INTERCOLLEGIATE SOCIALIST SOCIETY

[The center of anti-militarist activity in the colleges before the war was the Intercollegiate Socialist Society, the predecessor of the Student L.I.D.] The outbreak of the World War and the failure of the European socialist movement to put up any opposition to it had had a sobering effect upon American socialist students. How little the student movement had been aware of the problem of war can be seen from the following statement of the Chairman of the Yale Chapter of the I.S.S. in 1914: "The subject of militarism, its cause and effect, has not yet been made a special course of study and discussion among our chapters." It was the proposal of the Yale Chapter that the I.S.S. should invite the Cosmopolitan Clubs and the International Polity Clubs for joint discussions of the forces leading to war.

In 1916 the I.S.S. was confronted with an act of Congress which gave tremendous impetus to the introduction of military training in the universities. It set about to organize an opposition. The *Intercollegiate Socialist Review* for April, 1916, reports: "Some of the prominent students in our large eastern universities are leading a fight against the introduction of military training and last year the daily papers of several colleges openly criticised the boards of trustees and the faculties for encouraging military agitation in the colleges."

¹ "The University of Chicago and the Kaiser," Georg Mann, *Soapbox*, April, 1935, published by the U. of Chicago Socialist Club.

[But already in 1916 it was difficult to carry on the fight against the growing American war-mindedness, for even the ranks of the I.S.S. were divided over whether war with Germany might not be justified. This division was reflected in the 1916 summer conference of the I.S.S. in which J. G. Phelps Stokes argued his belief in defensive wars "where the liberties of a people are deemed by the people to be at stake" and even in aggressive wars "where deemed by the people essential to the overthrow of tyranny." George W. Naysmith declared on the other hand that men "by affirming their willingness to join in a war of defense, would place too great a weapon in the hands of the ruling class, inasmuch as it is possible for almost any ruling class to convince its people, at the outbreak of war, that the war is defensive as far as its country is concerned."

This debate was ended by the actual declaration of war in 1917. The active spirits in the I.S.S. backed the inspiring St. Louis declaration of the Socialist Party:

"The Socialist Party of the United States in the present grave crisis solemnly reaffirms its allegiance to the principles of internationalism and working-class solidarity the world over, and proclaims its unalterable opposition to the war just declared by the government of the U. S. . . . As against the false doctrine of national patriotism we uphold the ideal of international working-class solidarity . . . We brand the declaration of war by our government as a crime against the people of the United States and against the nations of the world. In all modern history there has been no war more unjustifiable than the war in which we are about to engage."

When the I.S.S. refused to support the war, many of its members resigned and it was practically shattered. In some places chapters survived by pointing out they were study and not propaganda societies, but even their activity was severely limited. Professor John R. Commons of Wisconsin would not allow Dr. Harry W. Laidler, field organizer of the I.S.S., to address Wisconsin students unless Dr. Laidler repudiated the St. Louis declaration, which of course he would not do. Mobs raided meetings of the chapters. They were called pro-German.

In very few instances did the students see the issues clearly, nor was there any student anti-war movement as such. Instances such as the following of refusal of support to the government were rare because students lacked insight into the imperialist basis of modern war and the shrewd techniques the capitalist state uses to conceal this basis. Carl Haessler, a member of the I.S.S. had just received his Ph.D. from the University of Illinois and was slated for a teaching job. For refusing military service he was court martialed and sent to Leavenworth. This is his statement to the Court:

"I, Carl Haessler, Recruit, Machine Gun Company, 46th Infantry, respectfully submit the following statement in extenuation in connection with my proposed plea of guilty to the charge of violation of the 64th Article of War, the offense having been committed June 22, 1918, in Camp Sheridan, Ala.

The offense was not committed from private, secret, personal, impulsive, religious, pacifist or pro-German grounds. An admixture of quasi personal motives is admitted, but they were in no sense the guiding or controlling factors. I have evidence for each of these assertions, should it be required.

The wilful disobedience of my Captain's and of my Lieutenant-Colonel's orders to report in military uniform arose from a conviction which I hesitate to express before my country's military officers but which I nevertheless am at present unable to shake off, namely, that America's participation in the World War was unnecessary, of doubtful benefit (if any) to the country and to humanity, and accomplished largely, though not exclusively, through the pressure of the allied and American commercial imperialists.

Holding this conviction, I conceived my part as a citizen to be opposition to the war before it was declared, active efforts for a peace without victory after the declaration, and determination so far as possible to do nothing in aid of the war while its character seemed to remain what I thought it was. I hoped in this way to help bring the war to an earlier close and to help make similar future wars less probable in this country.

I further believe that I am and shall be rendering the country a service by helping to set an example for other citizens to follow in the matter of fearlessly acting on unpopular convictions instead of forgetting them in stress. The crumbling of American radicalism under pressure in 1917

has only been equalled by that of the majority of German Socialist leaders of August, 1914.

Looking at my case from the point view of the administration and of this court, I readily admit the necessity of exemplary punishment. I regret that I have been forced to make myself a nuisance, and I grant that this war could not be carried on if objections like mine were recognized by those conducting the war. My respect for the administration has been greatly increased by the courteous and forbearing treatment accorded me since having been drafted, but my view of international politics and diplomacy, acquired during my three years of graduate study in England, has not altered since June, 1917, when I formally declared that I could not accept service if drafted. Although officers have on three occasions offered me noncombatant service if I would put on the uniform, I have regretfully refused each time on the ground that "bomb proof" service on my part would give the lie to my sincerity (which was freely granted by Judge Julian Mack when he and his colleagues examined me at Camp Gordon). If I am to render any war services, I shall not ask for special privileges.

I wish to conclude this long statement by reiterating that I am not a pacifist or pro-German, not a religious or private objector, but regard myself as a patriotic political objector, acting largely from public and social grounds.

I regret that, while my present view of this war continues, I cannot freely render any service in aid of the war. I shall not complain about the punishment that this Court may see fit to mete out to me."

Signed: Carl Haessler

A true copy.

Captain, Inf. R. C. 46 Inf. Judge Advocate.

As another gauge of anti-war sentiment in the universities before the World War as contrasted with today, Dean Gauss of Princeton compares the acceptance that Norman Angell's book, *The Great Illusion* gained twenty-five years ago among college men with today: "If only one in ten considered his thesis favorably twenty-five years ago, today they would probably approve it by about four to five to one. . . ."

The Christian student groups which supported the anti-war strike loyally supported the war machine in 1917. Indeed the

Y's earned the undying gratitude of the ruling classes by their co-operation. Lillian Symes in *Rebel America* states:

"Much of the brutal treatment to which the conscientious objectors were subjected by petty guards and officials was condoned by Y.M.C.A. secretaries and army chaplains. In his carefully documented book on this subject, Norman Thomas quotes a letter from one objector who writes, in part: 'I think it was a common experience of conscientious objectors that their most bitter and intolerant enemies in the army were the chaplains and the Y.M.C.A. men. No doubt there were individual exceptions, but I believe this enmity was the general rule. I think these representatives of "the church in arms" must have felt that the very existence of the conscientious objectors implied a vital criticism of the whole program of these militant churchmen.'"

Today's Anti-War Movement

No one who has participated in any of the many student anti-war conferences of recent years, no one who took part in the anti-war strike can assert that we have not travelled a long way from 1917. [To explain the powerful student anti-war movement of 1935 we must first deal with the turbulent events going on in the world outside the university and school which undoubtedly have exercised the chief influence on student thinking about war.] The following is an attempt to enumerate these leading influences. Although many students are only vaguely aware of them, they find sharp and critical formulation in the program of such organizations as the Student League for Industrial Democracy.

THE GREAT BETRAYAL

[The men and women who fought the World War believed they were fighting in defence of their fatherlands. The populations of the Allied countries were honestly convinced that it was the lust of Prussia for world dominion that had caused the war and made a sacrifice of 13,000,000 lives, 20,000,000 wounded and \$250,000,000,000 necessary. But in the twenties the researches of historians in the war archives of foreign offices annihilated the "War Guilt" clause of the Treaty of Versailles and its corollary that German lust for world-domination had precipitated the war. These researches proved that neither the Triple Alliance nor the Entente could alone be blamed for the war. They showed that the Foreign Offices of none of the Great Powers wanted a war, if they could have realized their ambitions in a peaceful manner. And in destroying the myth of "war guilt" these men demonstrated the real causes of the war, imperialism, nationalism and militarism.]

But American public opinion still under the benevolent spell of

Wilson's idealism was in for an even greater shock with the publication of Walter Hines Page's memoirs:¹

Page's Cable to President Woodrow
Wilson, March 5, 1917

"... The pressure of this approaching crisis, I am certain, has gone beyond the ability of the Morgan financial agency for the British and French governments. The financial necessities of the Allies are too great and urgent for any private agency to handle, for every such agency has to encounter business rivalries and sectional antagonism.

"It is not improbable that the only way of maintaining our present pre-eminent trade position and averting a panic is by declaring war on Germany. The submarine has added the last item to the danger of a financial world crash. There is now an uncertainty about our being drawn into the war; no more considerable credits can be privately placed in the United States. In the meantime a collapse may come."

CAPITALIST INSTRUMENTALITIES OF PEACE

Thus the Great War which was to end war and autocracy proved to have been basically inspired by a drive for profits. Yet out of the war had emerged one hope—the League of Nations and the World Court. Education and propaganda for the League and the Court found a ready response among students. This was

Wilson's message to Congress.
April 2, 1917

"... I am not now thinking of the loss of property involved, immense and serious as that is, but only of the wanton and wholesale destruction of the lives of non-combatants, men, women and children engaged in pursuits which have always, even in the darkest periods of modern history, been deemed innocent and legitimate. Property can be paid for; the lives of peaceful and innocent people cannot be. The present German submarine warfare against commerce is a war against mankind...."

"Our object, now as then, is to vindicate the principles of peace and justice in the life of the world as against selfish and autocratic power, and to set up among the really free and self-governed peoples of the world such a concert of purposes and of action as will henceforth ensure the observance of those principles."

reflected not only in student support of the League of Nations Association, but as late as 1925, the National Student Federation of America was founded to support the World Court and all peace institutions. Yet today all the instrumentalities of peace, the pacts and treaties as well as the League have shown themselves impotent when defied by a great power. The seizure of Manchukuo, the unchecked war in the Gran Chaco, and finally Hitler's repudiation of the Versailles treaty were the finishing blows to the system of collective arbitration; and the world stands today where it was in 1914. How could it have been otherwise? [The League and the other instrumentalities of peace did nothing to end the basic cause of war—the expansive drive for profits which ends in imperialism. And therefore it was impotent to destroy the other causes of war such as militarism and nationalism.] Geneva became the Leipzig fair of world diplomacy and when a nation could not get what it wanted at Geneva it withdrew or disregarded it. To date the League has been chiefly effective as a mechanism through which the Allied Powers led by France prevented any revision of the Versailles Treaty.

MERCHANTS OF DEATH

[The failure of the League of Nations under capitalism was accompanied by the failure of attempts to bring about disarmament and the revelations of the part that munitions makers play in capitalist society in fomenting war.] This is not the place to examine what is now common knowledge about the merchants of death. But certain unforgettable facts stand out from the testimony given before the Senate munitions committee and the researches of independent investigators:¹

"For without a shadow of a doubt there is at the moment in Europe a huge and subversive force that lies behind the arming and counter-arming of nations; there are mines, smelters, armament works, holding

¹ The following juxtaposition is not Ambassador Page's.

¹ From *Arms and the Men*, a pamphlet which originally appeared in *Fortune* and was reprinted in the Congressional Record on March 6, 1934 at the request of Senator Nye.

companies and banks, entangled in an international embrace, yet working inevitably for the destruction of such little internationalism as the world has achieved so far. The control of these myriad companies vests finally, in not more than a handful of men whose power, in some ways, reaches above the power of the State itself. Thus, French interests not only sold arms to Hungary in flat violation of the Treaty of Trianon, but when Hungary defaulted on the bill the armorers got the French Government to lend Hungary the money to pay the French armorers. Thus, too, the great Czechoslovakian armament company, controlled by Frenchmen, promoted the rise of Hitler in Germany and contributed millions of marks to Hitler's campaign. These same Frenchmen own newspapers that did more than any others to enrage France against Hitler."

Unquestionably the armaments makers foment wars and preparedness races. But it would be a mistake to conclude that taking the profits out of the munitions business would end war. Armament men are like shyster doctors. They prolong and aggravate illness because it is profitable. They take advantage of an already diseased patient. But the armaments industry will flourish so long as imperialist nations have to settle economic rivalries by war. The socialising or nationalising of the armaments industry does not end the likelihood of war. It may in point of fact expedite the war preparations of a nation. Hitler and Mussolini might nationalise the munitions industry in their respective nations, but certainly not to prevent war. Nor can the socialisation of the armaments industry alone be effective unless such closely associated industries as iron, steel, chemicals and aviation are also socialised. These together wield sufficient political power under capitalism, they have enough representatives in every capitalist government, to render any hope for their socialisation under capitalism a naive illusion.

FASCISM—STRIPPING A NATION FOR ACTION

[Student thinking had been profoundly influenced by the growth of fascism in the modern world for the triumph of fascism has accelerated the approach to war.] Fascism today represents nations stripping for action. Just as a boxer approaching the night of his main bout turns from all habits and activities that do not help him

get into fighting trim, so fascist nations slough off all civilized and humanistic values which might impair the efficiency of the fighting machine. The nation becomes a huge barracks.

The whole vocabulary of fascism is militaristic. Hitler has described the fascist state as follows:

"The state is totalitarian when there is no longer any private domain, when every person, every administrative officer, every group is a function of the state; every activity an official function; every establishment a public institution, everything in the service of the state. Total mobilisation is the correlative of the totalitarian state. It is the military despotism of wartime extended over the whole nation and its institutions. There are now only soldiers—all nourished by the same rolling field kitchens, all receiving approximately the same pay."¹

[For the student the triumph of fascism has far reaching effects, for the university has an honored place in this "total mobilisation." The traditional objectives of the university—*Lux, Veritas, Scientia*, etc. are obliterated from university escutcheons and in their place substituted such devices as the "Book and Musket" of Italy, or the Body, Character, Mind (in descending order of importance) of Hitler. Under fascism the primary objective of the university and school is the training of soldiers. The trinity, Body, Character and Mind, represent the virtues of a good infantry man—strong, loyal and with just enough intelligence to carry out commands. That is the aim of education under fascism.]

Health comes first, declares Hitler, and then the inculcation of character traits that are useful on the battlefield:

It is only after having built the body that the State will look to the formation of character. Loyalty, spirit of sacrifice, discretion are the virtues necessary to a great people, and the acquisition of which in schools are more important than most of the ancient techniques of education. Our young people will have to be stoical. When one neglects to teach youth to suffer without complaint, one should not be astonished later, during the critical hours of battle, that the combatant is unable to undergo the hardships of the front."

¹ These quotations all come from Hitler's *My Combat*, Houghton Mifflin.

Science and all the intellectual disciplines are perverted under fascism in order to prepare for war:

"Even in science, the racial state can only see a method of inculcating a fiery nationalism. It is not alone the history of the world, but the whole history of civilization which ought to be taught from this point of view. . . . Finally this education from our point of view will attain its full fruition in military service."

Under fascism not only is education corrupted from its true purposes, but the number of entrants is severely limited. It is no wonder then that the student anti-war movement should condemn fascism as a breeder of war and oppose the R.O.T.C. which, as shall be shown later, is trying to foist a fascist ideology on the school system.

A typical scene on April 12, 1935.



SCHOOLS NOT BATTLESHIPS

In his budget message of January 7, 1935, President Roosevelt asked Congress to provide a total of \$870,922,292 for national defense in all its phases for 1936. This embodied an increase of \$48,595,075 for the Army; the R.O.T.C. was allowed \$3,323,246, an increase of \$193,652; and the Navy received an increase of \$186,853,499. On the other hand the appropriation for the Children's Bureau was decreased by \$7,000 to \$337,030, and the Office of Education was given \$8,648,110 a decrease of almost \$3,000,000 from the previous year.¹ With schools shut down, with relief woefully inadequate, the Roosevelt Administration turns over almost one billion dollars to destructive purposes!

What possible justification does this almost billion dollar war budget have? Preparedness is the guarantee of peace, declare the patrioteers. Is it? From 1900 to 1913 the Triple Alliance expended 1,383.3 in millions of pounds sterling for armaments. The Entente spent 2,360.2 in millions of pounds sterling. Armaments proved no guarantee of peace then. Nor will they prove so today. Indeed America stands in no danger of invasion. No country could build a war apparatus large enough to carry an aggressive war to American shores. The inescapable conclusion is that we are building a huge army and navy because we expect to make war. The question that the students of America ask of the Roosevelt Administration is not why do we need such a large military establishment, but against whom is the Administration preparing to make war?

MUST WE FIGHT IN ASIA?

There is one hypothesis which makes the Roosevelt war preparations intelligible. It is that the present Administration is convinced that we must fight Japan because of the latter's drive for complete hegemony in Asia. America is a highly developed industrial nation. Under its capitalist organization of distribution, it

¹ *America in the Depression* by Harry W. Laidler, L. I. D. pamphlet.

produces huge surpluses which it must export. The Far East today represents the only market, one of huge possibilities, which has not been definitely allocated among imperialist nations. The United States has a foothold in that market, in the form of concessions, spheres of interest, investments. Japan considers monopolistic control of the Far East vital to her welfare. She has seized Manchukuo (a fact which we have officially refused to recognise) and has already begun closing it to other nations as a field for investment and financial exploitation. She intends to do the same with China, and has already declared her right to exercise a veto over the acts of other powers in relation to China.

American capitalism cannot renounce its interests in the Far East. The Roosevelt Administration realises this. Therefore, it is preparing for war with Japan. The question still remains, however, Must We Fight in Asia? The answer is no. The establishment of socialism in America would end the problem of surplus production and capital which begets imperialism, and therefore end the threat of our being drawn into a war with Japan. Socialism would end the grim paradox of starvation amidst plenty by immediately increasing the purchasing power of the great masses of people. Socialism would aim at maximum production, not in order to glut world markets, but in order to increase living standards at home. President Roosevelt is not going to introduce socialism. Quite logically, therefore, he is preparing for war.¹

¹ For an excellent presentation of these alternatives see Nathaniel Peffer's *Must We Fight in Asia?* Harper & Brothers, 1935.

The Student Anti-War Movement

This then is the climate of ideas and events which is nurturing the student anti-war movement. Modern developments in the instruments of war make the opening shot of another war the crack of doom for civilization. Yet not since 1914 has the world been so close to war. Is it any wonder then that students strike against imperialist war and fascism, crying, "Our Lives Are at Stake"?

But the anti-war movement within the schools has a history and development of its own arising out of the situation that confronts the student as a student, which we must now examine.

THE RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS

Military instruction in the colleges was established under the Morrill Land-Grant Act of 1862 in the section which read:

That the proceeds of the land-grant sales were to be "devoted to the endowment, support and maintenance of at least one college where the leading object shall be, without excluding other scientific and classical studies and including military tactics, to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and mechanical arts in such manner as the legislatures of the states may respectively prescribe in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions of life."

It was during the World War, however, that military training received its real impetus in the schools. In 1916 and 1920 two enactments of Congress provided the military departments in the colleges with additional personnel and better and more complete equipment and made them integral parts of the plans for national defense. The following figures compiled for 1932-1933 show the present extent of militarism in American education.¹

¹ These statistics were obtained from the Committee on Militarism in Education, 2929 Broadway, N. Y. C., an organization devoted to the abolition of the R.O.T.C., which has much useful information on this subject.

The War Department through Federal subsidy aids or conducts military training or rifle practice in schools and colleges under three different plans as provided for in Sections 40, 55c and 113 of the National Defense Act. Under Section 40 instructors, courses of study, uniforms and equipment are provided; under Section 55c the same are provided excepting the uniforms, though the instructors may or may not be; under Section 113 the equipment alone is provided, sometimes in connection with military drill, sometimes in connection with simple rifle practice. Following are the latest complete figures for each Section:—

Under Section 40, or the R.O.T.C., During 1932-1933

91 Colleges and universities enrolled in compulsory military units.....	66,243
35 Colleges and universities enrolled in elective military units.....	10,194
28 Civil secondary schools enrolled in compulsory military units.....	10,802
37 Civil secondary schools enrolled in elective military units.....	24,409
37 Military secondary schools enrolled in compulsory military units..	5,365
228 Institutions during 1932-1933 enrolled in the R. O. T. C.....	117,013

Under Section 55c During 1932-1933

45 Secondary schools enrolled in elective military units.....	11,230
8 Colleges and universities enrolled in elective military units.....	1,151
53 Institutions during 1932-1933 enrolled in 55c units.....	12,381

Under Section 113 During 1932-1933

3 Colleges and universities enrolled for military training	216
21 Secondary schools, many military, enrolled for military training	1,637
23 Colleges and universities enrolled in rifle clubs.....	1,508
114 Secondary schools, mostly civilian public, enrolled in rifle clubs.	15,244
161 Institutions during 1932-1933 enrolled under Section 113.....	18,605

Recapitulation for 1932-1933

160 Colleges and universities enrolled in courses for military training and/or rifle practice.....	79,312
282 Secondary schools enrolled in courses for military training and/or rifle practice.....	68,687
442 minus 43 ¹ means 399 institutions during 1932-1933 enrolled.....	147,999

¹ The 43 has reference to the rifle clubs in 16 schools and colleges having R.O.T.C. units and those in 27 others having 55c units. Enrollment figures, however, do not overlap.

The Costs: The total cost of these activities is not obtainable. Each year Congress appropriates about four million dollars for the R. O. T. C. and 55c units and amounts varying from fifty thousand to a quarter of a million dollars to the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice— which administers the fund for the Section 113 activities. These appropriations, however, do not include the figures for the pay and allowances for War Department personnel assigned to these various activities (1,658 War Department officers and enlisted men were on R. O. T. C. and 55c duty as of October 1, 1933), nor do they include the costs of materials and equipment issued out of regular War Department stocks. (During 1925 it was computed that the total cost of the R. O. T. C. alone for that one year was \$10,696,504.) As of October 1, 1933, there were 2,054 horses and 6 mules on duty with various R. O. T. C. units.]

ABOLISH THE R.O.T.C.

[The R.O.T.C. has been the *bête noire* of the student opposed to war and militarism, since it presented to him in a concrete, personal manner the preparations for war going on in the world.] Although as early as 1923 the University of Wisconsin changed its policy with regard to the compulsory feature of military drill, and on a ruling of the Department of Interior lost no Federal support because of this action, few university administrations followed suit. Opposition to military drill has come chiefly from peace-minded students.

Sporadic revolts of undergraduates were crystallised in 1925, when on Armistice Day the Editor of the City College newspaper, Felix S. Cohen, published a book review of the manual used in the military course. The review consisted mostly of quotations concerning the approved methods of gouging out eyes and cultivating the "inherent" desire to kill. However, its publication led highly patriotic Congressmen, the Ku Klux Klan, the American Legion, and the other peripheral organizations of the War Department to launch bitter attacks against the City College editor and the student body. This campaign against military drill, however, was conducted by the students with shrewdness and ingenuity and was soon receiving nation-wide publicity. When the President of the

college forbade the student paper to mention the military course in its columns, the paper came out with blank columns where the stories of the R.O.T.C. campaign had formerly appeared. Heywood Broun turned over his column in the old *New York World* to the Editor. The final coup was administered to the administration by the students, when the President of the college sent a letter to the student paper explaining why he had imposed the censorship. The editors replied they could not publish this communication since it contained the forbidden words, R.O.T.C.

Following the auspicious example of the City College of New York, opponents of the R.O.T.C. focused their attack upon the hypocrisy of a course which in one breath spoke about honor and good citizenship and in the next, taught the approved method of gouging out opponents' eyes. The War Department thereupon eliminated bayonet drill, admitting that the practical value of R.O.T.C. as an item in national preparedness was slight. It advanced other justifications for the course.

It asserted that the course was invaluable as citizenship-training.

But what is a good citizen in the eyes of the War Department? Evidently one who neither believes in democracy, nor internationalism, nor pacifism. This may be inferred from the definitions of these ideals in the Department's Official Manual on Citizenship Training (T.M. No. 2000-25):

Democracy declared the Manual, is "a government of the masses; authority derived through mass meetings or any other form of 'direct' expression; results in mobocracy; attitude toward property is communistic—negating property rights; results in demagogism, license, agitation, discontent, anarchy."

Pacifism is "baneful in its influence. It promotes distrust of country; debases the spirit of nationalism; is destructive of patriotism; undermines the policy of national defense; co-operates with destructive forces for the overthrow of national ideals and institutions."

Discipline and health have been advanced as other justifications of the course. No one has seriously argued, however, that physical training free from military features could not accomplish the health purposes of the R.O.T.C. equally as well if not better. Indeed there is much medical evidence to demonstrate that R.O.T.C. drill is injurious to a rounded physical development. As for the disciplinary virtues of the course—it all depends on what you consider a good citizen. Were the citizens of Athens superior to those of Sparta? Despite the advent of fascism the answer still remains, yes. Military discipline teaches slavish obedience to superiors, which at the present time means obedience to the capitalist rulers of society, who of course would like nothing better than unquestioning obedience. That is why they have such an affection for fascism.

Because the R.O.T.C. taught doctrines which in the twenties were associated in the student mind with Prussianism, and today with fascism, because it tried to invest war with the aura of adventure and romance, by recruiting girl colonels, natty uniforms and prancing polo horses, it has become identified with those forces that were bringing the world into another war. Today there is scarcely a college in America which has not been the scene at one time or another of struggle over this issue. The roll call of students expelled because of their opposition to military drill extends from the University of Maryland to the University of California. It includes students of all denominations and political creeds.]

THE HAMILTON CASE

Albert Hamilton, son of a Methodist minister, a leader of Methodist youth and chairman of the Student League for Industrial Democracy, refused to take military drill and was suspended from U.C.L.A. He appealed his suspension to California courts and finally to the Supreme Court of the United States.

With a unanimity that has become rare in recent years in matters involving important social questions and the civil liberties of

minority groups, the United States Supreme Court on December 3rd, 1934, upheld the right of the Regents of the University of California at Los Angeles to make courses in military training compulsory, and to suspend Al Hamilton and Alonzo Reynolds, for refusal to take such courses. It held that the state had the right to determine what conditions should be imposed upon students entering the university, and that it had infringed no "immunities" or "liberties" guaranteed by the Constitution. Speaking through Justice Butler, the Court said,

"Government federal and state, each in its own sphere owes a duty to the people within its jurisdiction to preserve itself in adequate strength to maintain peace and order to assure the just enforcement of the law. And every citizen owes the reciprocal duty, according to his capacity, to support and defend his government against all enemies."

Plainly this was and was intended to be, an unequivocal and clear answer to the agitation that has been growing in the colleges and universities against the R.O.T.C. Perhaps in terms of legal precedents and judicial logic the decision may seem plausible. Nevertheless, objectively, the Supreme Court has placed itself beside those who, both within and outside educational institutions, regard it as imperative to preserve such instruments of the war machine as are necessary to perpetuate the attitudes and habits of militarism, despite the obvious fact that these have no proper place in institutions dedicated to education and study.

This is nothing new in the history of the Supreme Court. The Constitution is a flexible document, and its content and meaning is inspired by judges who interpret it largely in the light of the experience and the values of the social groups from which they come. It is a very human institution, one that is constantly changing, but one that nevertheless reflects prevailing ideas extraordinarily faithfully. At a time when the peace of the world seems to rest on very precarious foundations, and when there are demands everywhere for increased naval and military preparations, it is not surprising to find the Supreme Court asserting the right of the government to demand of every citizen that he observe his "duty,

according to his capacity, to support and defend government against all enemies."

This proposition was hardly warranted by the question with which the Court was presented. The decision went far beyond the precise issue involved in this case. The phrase above quoted states clearly a theory of the relation of individuals to the state that is not very far from that held by Hitler in Germany and Mussolini in Italy, nor from that which is on the lips of fascists everywhere, including the United States. Capitalism demands obedience, and if it cannot be to the masters of industry and finance, as it was in earlier days, then it must be to the "nation," "national honor," the "government," those institutions around which patriotism sheds a holy aura. And the significance of this is apparent in the concurring opinion of Justice Cardozo, Brandeis and Stone. They disagreed, not with the result, nor the judgment, but with the scope of the decision. As Justice Cardozo declared:

"There is no occasion at this time to mark the limits of governmental power in the exaction of military service when the nation is at peace."

Be that as it may, the implications of the decision are extremely important. It should blast once and for all the hopes and illusions of those who expect to combat the war makers by resort to the courts and the constitution. This case closes the door to conscientious objection to war and military training. These were never very sure foundations upon which to build a vital anti-war movement, depending too much upon the strength of will of individuals, as such.

The decision of the Court could well have been predicted from previous decisions in the Schwimmer, MacIntosh and Maryland cases. Moreover, it clarifies a much muddled situation among pacifists. It demonstrates conclusively the fundamental correctness of those who believe that the only way to fight militarism and the R.O.T.C. is by organization directed to compelling a change in existing conditions.

THE INTERLOCKING DIRECTORATE

The struggle against the R.O.T.C. has demonstrated to thousands of students the class conflict that is basic in our society. The student who fights military training finds himself opposed not only by the War Department, but by such distinguished and eminently respectable groups as the Daughters of the American Revolution, the American Legion, the college Boards of Trustees, the National Security League. These form an Interlocking Directorate, a ring which not only embraces military and so-called patriotic societies but the Boards of Directors of the steel trust, the munitions industry and the House of Morgan. It is an Interlocking Directorate which never holds board meetings, but maintains a surprising unanimity of opinion and action. One can find it at Washington lobbying against the munitions investigation, introducing sedition bills and fighting all liberal legislation. This Interlocking Directorate is the ruling class.

There is no college administration but feels its pressure. As President Robinson of City College, among other college officials, has told his students: when you demonstrate against the R.O.T.C., you imperil the college's source of funds. Pressure from this directorate persuaded the faculty of Ohio State in 1931 to reverse its vote of 83 to 79 for optional drill, and vote 5 days later 144 to 9 against optional drill, and stand tamely by when Herbert A. Miller, distinguished professor of sociology was dismissed! Students have learned in the course of their fight against militarism in education that it is a system that they are opposing, not merely the malevolence and stupidity of a few men in the War Department.

In the recent fight in the Congress over Mr. Roosevelt's war budget the attempts by Senator Frazier and Congressman Marcantonio to defeat the appropriation for compulsory R.O.T.C. units were snowed under by an avalanche of Administration votes.

Instead an increase comparable to that received by the other branches of the service was voted. Can there be any question among

students whether or not the R.O.T.C. is part of the war preparations of the Administration?

"NOT TO SUPPORT KING OR COUNTRY"

The student anti-war movement has expressed itself by supporting the now famous Oxford pledge. In its original form, the pledge is a resolve "not to support King or Country in the event of war." Here the formula is: "This House will not support the government in any war it may undertake."

This pledge first circulated in 1933, has won student support for many reasons. Some vote non-support to the government because they believe that passage in this extreme form will shock the war mongers into reasonableness. Others vote for it because they will have no traffic with war under any condition; because a war for democracy installed dictators all over Europe; because a war to liberate colonial peoples merely changed their rulers; because France fought a 'defensive' war against Germany, and Germany a 'defensive' war against France; because another war would be sheer suicide.

With the absolute pacifist, many revolutionary students are in disagreement. Nevertheless, they support the pledge, because it is carefully worded to state that the student will not support the "government," which is taken by them to mean the imperialistic, capitalist government. Many revolutionary students, convinced that the struggle for world markets will continue so long as production for profit creates surpluses, and so long as the working people do not gain control of the government, are unwilling in this era of fascism to repudiate the right of the working class to take up arms in defence of its rights.

The circulation of the Oxford pledge has raised the question of offensive and defensive wars. Whereas only one student in about five would serve in an American expeditionary force, four students out of five will fight for the Government if the United States is invaded. The Student League for Industrial Democracy rejects this distinction between offensive and defensive warfare. It does so for

many reasons. In the first place the slogan "we are defending the fatherland" is used as a cloak to cover aggressive designs. Every nation in the World War claimed it was fighting a war of defense. Japan seized Manchuria and said it was a war of defense. Mussolini today is making similar pretensions as he prepares to subdue Abyssinia. A nation which is determined to go to war can always find some incident which can make it appear that another nation is provoking the war. Such incidents occurred weekly between the Soviet Union and Japan and it was only the Soviets' will for peace that prevented any of them from becoming the pretext for a war. Defensive war is a dodge whereby imperialist nations induce their populations to wage war. Our only safeguard against being taken in by such a dodge is to resolve now not to fight in any war our Government may undertake. On the eve of war we will not have the facts whereby to determine who is the aggressor.

Secondly where imperialist war is concerned there is no one aggressor. It is the convergence of mutually antagonistic imperialist policies that produces war, and this is inevitable under capitalism. No single capitalist nation can be blamed for a war. It is capitalism that produces war, and we must resolve not to fight under capitalism.

The third consideration must be a realistic analysis of how the United States might be drawn into a war. The only country thought of in this connection is Japan. Will a war with Japan arise because Japan wants to annex California? Not even the most rabid Navy man would advance such a hypothesis. Japan is having enough difficulty subduing Korea, nor is it to her economic interest to annex any part of our native land. No, a war with Japan would be to prevent Japanese domination in China, which would imperil our financial interests there. Are we prepared to go to war for that reason? Presented in this light, most of us are ready to say no. Yet that is the war that is in the offing. We must resolve now not to support such a war even if some of our marines and nationals are killed in Shanghai; even if Japan seized the Philippines, for it is such

acts that our Government will use to make the war appear one of defense and vindicating national honor.

ANTI-WAR CONFERENCE

The wide circulation of the Oxford pledge revealed an amazing growth in a basic understanding among American students of the causes of war. This educational work was broadened and intensified by the conference technique.

The revolt against the R.O.T.C. and the circulation of the Oxford pledge have shaken the student body of many a college into reflection. The traditional mood of undergraduate apathy disappeared in the calling of two national student anti-war congresses: the first in November, 1933, the United Youth Conference against War, in New York; and the second, the following month, the Student Congress against War, in Chicago. Fifteen hundred delegates from all over the nation came to these meetings. They returned to their campuses resolved to publicise the findings and declarations of these national convocations, by summoning together local campus anti-war conferences.

Student anti-war conferences have recently been held all over the nation. The Columbia Conference against War was typical. The call was issued by the Columbia Student Board which is the governing body of the college. Students were eligible to come as delegates if they obtained the signatures of ten classmates. The *Columbia Spectator* gave the conference its support, and many fraternity and independent blocs which usually shy away from these affairs, were represented.

The first evening was taken up with a discussion of the causes of war and of the role that Columbia University played in 1918. Undergraduates recalled the fact that President Butler, supported by the *Columbia Spectator*, had expelled Professors Dana and Cattell for refusing to support our entrance into the war; and that the University's facilities had been turned over—lock, stock and barrel—to the War Department. The second evening was

devoted to a discussion of the stand to be taken by the conference and the adoption of plans for continuation work. In all these discussions, faculty members took part, as well as students from the law and medical schools and from the graduate science faculties. Prom queen, football star, bookworm—all were heard.

The Conference set up departmental committees whose job it was to enlist the support of the whole membership of the department. These departmental anti-war committees were urged to discover and broadcast what their departments were doing to bring about war, whether the chemistry department was inventing new poison gases, the history faculty corrupting textbooks in the interests of a false patriotism, or the law school was counselling the government on how it could circumvent the Bill of Rights. The conference program emphasized the need for alliance with the working men and women of the country in an effort to build an effective anti-war movement.

Conferences such as these have usually obtained the co-operation of the faculty. Sometimes, as at Townsend Harris Hall High School, the administration attends, capturing the meeting for the school's conservatives. At Hunter College, the President, a political appointee, would not allow the girls to hold a final session for the purpose of adopting resolutions. Generally, however, the student body has had, if not the support, at least the toleration of the administration.

In most places these conferences were initiated and carefully nurtured by members of either the Student League for Industrial Democracy or the National Student League. These two organizations, the former Socialist in sympathies, and the latter Communist, are the mainsprings of the student anti-war movement. Together they have some one hundred and eighty chapters in the colleges which, as in the case of the anti-war fight, undertake co-operative activities, working together in a united front. These organizations have been strengthened by virtue of the expression and leadership they have given to student opposition to war.

The First Student Strike Against War

To crystallize student opposition to war, the student strike of April 13, 1934 was jointly organized by the Student League for Industrial Democracy and the National Student League.¹ Everywhere the students desired and were demanding peace, yet the world was plunging straight into war. Everywhere schools were shutting down, teachers were unpaid, yet millions were being spent on armaments. This threat of war and these war policies produced the strike of 1934. Although it was neither well organized nor publicized, some 25,000 students participated, the bulk of them students in the New York Colleges. Although no attempt was made to enlist the support of high school students, principal after principal (on the morning of the strike) had to lock doors and marshal men teachers and detectives to prevent their charges from literally breaking out of the building in order to take part.

THE PROFESSOR AND THE STRIKE

The attitude of the faculty and administration toward this strike was instructive. At Brooklyn College, the Association of Instructors, Tutors and Fellows, a strong faculty union, declared open sympathy with the strike. At Seth Low, the Dean told his students to strike if they considered it "a practicable means of obtaining support of the anti-war movement." The Acting-Dean of Columbia University took a neutral stand on the walkout. But in general, the question addressed by the *N. Y. U. Bulletin*—"we would like to know why our administration and other college administrations chose to ignore so vital a cause as this"—remained

¹ As a point of historical record and because of the many inquiries, it is necessary to state that the original proposal for a student strike against war came from the Student League for Industrial Democracy. The proposal was made in the office of Donald Henderson, then Secretary of the American League against War and Fascism. At that time the Student L.I.D. was affiliated with the American League. After it withdrew, it together with the N.S.L. organized the first strike.

unanswered except by the students themselves, who pointed to reactionary Boards of Trustees and to the lack of organization among faculty members. Some Deans and Provosts forbade the strike with threats of expulsion. The Dean of the City College called in the police to break up the strike meeting. Only a handful answered the appeal of the *Columbia Spectator* made on the eve of the strike:

"You members of the Faculty must see that you can avoid another 1917 only by participating directly in organized mass movements such as this nation-wide strike. We see no alternatives to these weapons of open and effective manifestations of our strength.

"We have long appreciated your words. This is, however, a campaign of immediate, relentless action.

"By joining this strike, by leaving your classrooms with your own students, by participating in the strike program, you will show your determination to unite with us in this struggle. You will demonstrate that in this struggle we carry on side by side."

"Guardians of the Peace" at C.C.N.Y. in 1934.



THE CITY COLLEGE OF NEW YORK

A remarkable demonstration occurred at the City College of New York, which has always been a source and center of anti-war agitation. Here undergraduates have been more aggressive than elsewhere, because, coming from workers' families, they are more sensitive to the objective world situation that is making for world war. In the spring of 1933, when the college administration set aside one day for a parade and review of the military corps, the student body labeled the occasion "Jingo Day," and called a counter-demonstration. "Jingo Day" turned out to be rainy, but both the review and demonstration were held. The latter was taking place on a corner opposite Lewisohn Stadium, when the President of the College, Frederick B. Robinson, came walking up the street, flanked by a General, to attend the review. Seeing the demonstration, he became extremely angry and walked over toward the students. Exasperated, President Robinson started lashing out with his umbrella, thwacking his students over the head. The students seized the umbrella and wrenched it away. Then the police charged and escorted President Robinson out of the throng. Subsequently, twenty-one students were expelled and several were suspended. The charters of the three liberal clubs in the college were revoked. For days afterwards the sound of police sirens and riot wagons were common in the neighborhood of the college. Student after student stood up at mass meetings to denounce the administration, although doing so meant expulsion.

Remembering these expulsions, few persons believed that a strike would be successful at the City College that semester. Yet, when the eleven o'clock gong sounded, 2,000 students crowded around the flagpole on the campus. Although the Dean of the school ordered the strikers to disperse and took down names, students climbed on the shoulders of classmates—since police occupied the base of the flagpole—and delivered anti-war speeches. The attempt of the police to disrupt the meeting was unsuccessful. The students linked arms and chanted, "Police off the campus."

Fifteen thousand students went on strike in New York City. But the movement was nation-wide. At Syracuse, three hundred undergraduates took part. At Vassar, the demonstration was significant because the students marched, not behind placards piously exclaiming for peace, but behind the militant pennant of "Fight against Imperialist War." At Springfield College the demonstrations were ingenious. During the night before the strike, white crosses were planted all over the campus lawn in memory of the Great Betrayal of 1917. The hour of anti-war demonstrations was solemnly ushered in by two students blowing trumpets from the ramparts of the college. At Wellesley, the girls wore anti-war placards to classes all during the day.



If you look closely you can see some hands raised in Nazi salute. Scene in Harvard Yard, 1934.

UNDERGRADUATE ROWDYISM

Small students groups attempted to discredit the strike by tomfoolery and rowdyism. Both at Johns Hopkins and Amherst, R.O.T.C. men threw firecrackers and rotten vegetables into the ranks of the demonstrators. At the former university, the R.O.T.C. turned the water hose on speakers, faculty as well as student.

The most challenging of these skirmishes took place at Harvard University, where members of the Student L.I.D. and the N.S.L. with boldness, had called a strike. A group of *Harvard Crimson* cub candidates was organized by that newspaper into the Michael Mullins Chowder Club, which was to run a counter meeting in favor of war in an effort to discredit the whole strike. The Freshman Dining Halls at Cambridge would supply the pro-war exponents with eggs and tomatoes.

At eleven o'clock some 2,000 students appeared in front of the Widener Library. The Chowder Club came out in regalia, one clad in towels holding a "Down with Peace" sign, another in black robes with a bomb, another in boy scout togs tooting a bugle and leading cheers for "We Want War," and the prize of the lot clad as a Nazi Storm Trooper.

When the Chowder Club failed to break up the strike meeting, it went to the opposite ledge flanking Widener and staged a mock meeting. In between was massed the throng of 2,000. On one side heads inclined faithfully in the direction of the pacifists. On the other side several hundred hands were raised in a fascist salute. Today this is only fascist tomfoolery. Tomorrow it will be fascism in earnest.

Like their colleagues in Germany all their canons of chivalry were abandoned when dealing with pacifists and radicals. An instructor's wife climbed on the ledge to speak for the strikers. The Chowder Club forced her to turn her face so that her profile could be snapped, and generally manhandled her, yelling "We Want Love."

Yet in the end spectators were impressed with the courage and sincerity of the strikers, and were revolted by the placards and antics of the war proponents. The last speaker for the strikers was warmly applauded when he pointed out that the other side was using the fascist tactics that had triumphed in Germany, but that the strikers were here to see that those tactics did not win in America, and that the strike was a dress rehearsal for what students would do should war come.

The first student strike against war was significant because it focused public attention on the student anti-war movement, but it had an even greater significance in proving to the students themselves that they were a powerful factor in the alignment of social forces. We sensed our strength as a student movement. The strike had a cohesive force weaving a bond of solidarity from campus to campus. When news was received at Columbia University that police were attempting to disrupt the strike at the City College, Columbia wanted to march up to St. Nicholas Heights.



4000 take part in 1935 strike at the University of California, Berkeley.

The Great Student Strike

If war was imminent in 1934, in 1935 hostilities seemed about to commence. The call for the student strike issued in February brought a nationwide response. 175,000 students went out on strike on April 12th for one hour. There may have been more, for in many places student bodies went on strike almost spontaneously, no local unit of any of the national organizations endorsing the strike being present on the campus. This is especially true of the south. The strike was genuinely national in scope with Philadelphia, Boston, Chicago, Washington, D. C., Los Angeles each contributing more than 10,000 participants. In New York City some 30,000 went on strike. Little colleges in small towns played their part as did Negro schools, high schools, and professional schools. It was a tremendous demonstration organized in the face of often bitter and sometimes subtle sabotage. It was an orderly, serious and intelligent demonstration, in which the few cases of rowdiness undisputably were inspired by reactionary administrations and irresponsible students. It was a demonstration of which America and all men of good will could well be proud.

WHY A STRIKE?

Why did the national organizations who were sponsors of the strike call it that rather than a one hour holiday or demonstration? In the first place everyone recognizes a strike as the most intensive form of protest and it gets that much more attention. On Armistice Days we have held assemblies, demonstrations and anti-war conferences all over the nation, yet few of them received adequate notice in the newspapers or came to the attention of many students. On the other hand our student strike in 1934 made page 1 column 1, of the *New York Times*, started discussion on hundreds of campuses and threw consternation into the ranks of the R.O.T.C. which immediately called an emergency conference in Washington. Just because the word strike is provocative

it helped in the newspaper build-up for the strike and started hundreds of discussions among undergraduates. It was not seeking publicity for its own self that animated the Strike Committee, but a realization that student and public opinion could be reached and influenced only through wide publicity.

Students were asked to strike and come outdoors from 11 to 12 because such an action made them conscious of the solidarity of the student anti-war movement and of its powers. Many undergraduate editors said that to protest against war was important but what could students accomplish by any sort of a demonstration in the present mad race into war? The 175,000 students who came out of their classes on April 12th answered these doubters, for the strike became a dress rehearsal of what students intend to do should war be declared. A few conscientious objectors in 1917 hindered the war machine; thousands of student strikers would aid in crippling it.

THE ADMINISTRATION

The calling of a strike placed the administrations of universities and schools in a quandary. Many of them were opposed to war, yet felt that to sanction the strike would be to imperil the university's relation with state legislatures and wealthy endowers. Consequently some of them merely kept quiet about the strike. Others came out in open opposition. Some university administrations did not like the clear-cut militant point of view of the student strikers. All seemed to fear the concerted student action, spontaneously entered into by the students themselves, which the strike implied. It might put too many ideas in student heads as to who rules the university. The reaction of the administration took many forms and we will cite some typical examples.

At Los Angeles Junior College, prior to the day of the strike, the administration tolerated all sorts of intimidation on the part of reactionary students. And on April 12th it outdid even California precedents for university reaction.¹ . . . "at Los Angeles Junior

¹ Time Magazine, April 22, 1935

College, 25 peace demonstrators mounted the library steps, started to harangue a few hundred followers. College officers first tried to draw them out by roaring into microphones of the campus public address system. Next Director Roscoe C. Ingalls stationed himself in front of the speakers, blew a tin whistle until he was red in the face. Unavailing, he advanced on the library with a burly "Red squad" of policemen. When the students swarmed around them, the flustered policemen swung nightsticks, knocked out two girl students. Finally Director Ingalls turned on the sprinkler system, cleared the campus in two minutes."

More frequently the administration attempted to browbeat and dissuade students from striking by argumentation and threat, rather than physical force. Dr. T. W. McQuarrie, President of San José State Teachers' College, declared in his usual philistine manner:

"Don't make any mistake about it. I'm not in favor of war myself, and I don't know of any one who is. It's a silly disturbing, wasteful and unsatisfactory method of settling disputes. I'm thoroughly in sympathy with any move that will avert wars, and I gladly pledge myself to use any influence I have to that end. However, I'm not going to take the program of a disloyal group of vicious and partly demented people and state beforehand that I will not support my country if war should be declared."

It is no wonder then that the strike meeting at San José broke up in a splutter of eggs, vegetables and water. This may be the acknowledged technique of answering arguments which is encouraged under fascism.

In most places administrations realized they could not stop the April 12th action and adopted a different tactic. Since the sponsors of the strike were anxious to bring in all students who were against war, the administration brought pressure to bear upon the strike committee through the conservative students in order to blunt the militant character of the demonstration. Proffering their co-operation university presidents offered the use of auditoriums and speakers providing the demonstration was not called a strike,

and that it was after school hours. For instance at the University of Minnesota, the strike committee was asked to hold its demonstration at 5 o'clock in the afternoon and the University offered Newton D. Baker as main speaker! The Ex-Secretary of War seems to be a great favorite with university presidents for at Western Reserve University he was again offered this time as chairman by the administration. Western Reserve is a good case in point of how the administration attempted to capture the strike. Following the first meeting of a strike committee which enlisted the support of many campus groups, the administration made it known that it too was against war and would support the April 12th action under the following conditions: that it be not called a strike and that it be held indoors in Severance Hall. In return it would dismiss classes and pay the expenses of any speakers the committee desired to bring to Cleveland. This seemed a fair compromise in the eyes of the students. However, two weeks before the strike, Dean Trautman put in an appearance. First he began to make pleasant little speeches about the necessity for dignity. These speeches ended with the suggestion that the committee not go through with its plan for a parade on the day of the strike, for a parade represented an emotionalism not worthy of college students. Dean Trautman was in favor of a new psychological state of mind, "a dynamic silence." When he discovered the committee was not very sympathetic to his suggestions, he suddenly became imperious and stated as administrative orders that the April 12th meeting could pass no resolutions without the approval of the administration; that Newton D. Baker had to be present in some capacity; that the meeting could only be against war as a method of settling international disputes and in no way more specific. When some of the conservatives on the committee showed themselves amenable to the Dean's demands, the representatives of the Law School, the Student L.I.D. and the N.S.L. withdrew and went ahead with their plans for a strike. The student body at Western Reserve, which has been extremely conservative, was aroused by the Dean's interference. Even the Cleveland papers criticised the adminis-

tration's attempt to color and take over what was supposed to be a student demonstration against war. Two days before April 12th the administration withdrew from the field and turned the demonstration back to the students.

At Vassar, President McCracken supported the strike. This was true in a few other colleges where the administration dismissed classes, although refusing to recognize the action on April 12th as a strike. At City College the situation was the reverse of 1934 when striking students had to clear the police off the campus. Since that demonstration 21 more students had been expelled during a protest against a visit of Italian students for propaganda purposes. A cleavage had developed in the faculty between the reactionaries led by President Robinson who want membership in the Student L.I.D. and the N.S.L. to be made a criminal offense, and the liberals led by Dean Gottschall who believe the suppression is not the way to answer the arguments of Socialists and Communists. Preparations for the strike were made at City College while President Robinson was in California resting. The strike was endorsed by the Student Council and the college paper, and the Anti-Fascist Association which represents instructors, tutors and fellows at the College. It was the attitude of the administration (minus Robinson), however, that was interesting. Every effort was made by Dean Gottschall to co-operate with the Student Council committee preparing for the strike. His statement: "A demonstration simultaneously participated in by students throughout the United States and even in other countries is a worthwhile gesture; and the spirit of solidarity developed by such demonstration may in the long run be of some effect in influencing public opinion," contrasts very favorably with that of Nicholas Murray Butler who opposed the strike declaring: "To organize a strike against war is to show a strange lack of sense of humor, for the strike itself is a form of war." Although in the end faculty support of the strike at City College was not achieved, because the students rightly insisted that the demand for the ousting of Robinson had to be made at a strike against war and fascism, nevertheless the meeting in the Great

Hall (provided by the faculty) drew out the majority of the students and demonstrated that previous disorder at the College was caused by Robinson's reactionary inclinations.

A "GOOD" EXAMPLE FOR YOUTH

The National Student Strike Committee this year made a serious effort to enlist high school students in the fight against war. The Committee, in the case of high school students, was primarily interested in getting them to consider and to grapple with the problems of war and peace. If there had been intimidation on the part of college authorities, it was trebled by high school principals and superintendents. We do not have space to list the Honor Roll of students suspended and expelled all over the nation because of their sincere devotion to peace. But high school authorities resorted to even more drastic measures. The following is an affidavit from a student in Crane Technical High School, Chicago:

Lester Schlossberg, who lives at 1358 South Springfield, Crawford 3841, says that he is not a member of the National Student League. He says that he was in the Drum and Bugle Class, taught by Miss Muriel Smith, in Room 111. On the fourth of April at about 1:35 P.M. a boy came in and handed Miss Smith a note. She told Schlossberg he was wanted in the office. Schlossberg went to the office of Mr. Grant, the Assistant Principal. Mr. Grant and Mr. Hagen the Principal, were there. Hagen shook him and shoved him into a chair; asked him where he got the pamphlets. Schlossberg told him that he got them from two boys named Rosenthal and Siegel, who had been suspended from school that morning. Mr. Quick, the Dean came in. Mr. Hagen went out and Mr. Myers, the Athletic Director, came in. All of these men talked to Schlossberg about the Student Strike. Mr. Quick took him into the next room, which is the office of the Student Government. There were about six boys there. Mr. Quick said, "Who wants to take his arm off, boys?" One of the boys said, "I will." Three or four of the boys took him down into the basement. Quick called down the stairs, "don't forget, boys, I want at least eight more names out of him." They gave him a pencil and paper and told him to write. They pummelled him, striking him with their fists. They made him sit backward in a chair and pulled him backward out of the chair by his hair onto the floor. Four more boys came in. One of the boys stood him under a shelf and caused the shelf

to fall on his head. They kept asking him for names, mentioned that Quick wanted them. They made a pretense of hanging him, by putting a rope around his neck. They made a lash of a piece of rope and struck him across the back with it making marks on his back. Schlossberg wept and cried out during the whole proceeding. They put out the lights again and pounded him in the dark. Mr. Quick came down, sent the boys upstairs, and gave Schlossberg a talk on allegiance to the flag. Quick took him back up to the Student Government Office. The boys were there and told him to write down what he told them before about his father giving him money for the pamphlets. Schollberg denied having told them such a thing. Mr. Grant came in and told them to let him go. Grant instructed Schlossberg to go to the Meeting of April 4th, which was advertised in the pamphlet and to come back next day and tell him what Crane boys were there. It was then about five minutes to three and Schlossberg's last class was in progress. Schlossberg left the building.

Schlossberg visited Supt. Bogen on Saturday April 6th and was instructed to return to school. On Tuesday, April 9th he was again beaten by a crowd of boys somewhere near the school grounds.

On the day of the strike in New York City, police and plainclothes men lined up outside of school buildings. Police patrolled the corridors. Men teachers stood guard at all the exits. Even though many students were intimidated from going out on strike, no work went on in the classrooms from 11 to 12. At James Monroe High School the principal set up loud speakers in all the halls which blared forth from 11 to 12 on why the students should not strike. What sort of an impression must have been made upon students by these tactics on the part of school authorities! The Board of Superintendents declared that a student strike against war would break down respect for authority in the high schools. What sort of respect can students have for principals who pledge not to take punitive measures against those organizing the student strike, but after it has taken place, suspend them? High school principals have always talked piously about student self-government, but at De Witt Clinton, for example, Henry Quinto, a senior, was deposed as president of the General Organization by the faculty adviser for his part in the strike. Other students had their honorary Arista pins snatched from their lapels. Although the public school

system has always lent itself to the campaigns of "patriotic" societies, the Board of Superintendents refused to consider the proposal of the National Student Strike Committee that the meetings take place in school yards and be addressed by speakers recruited from the student body and faculty.

But for the student anti-war movement the high schools present a serious problem. Undoubtedly, the antagonism of the school authorities placed thousands of high school students in opposition to our strike—not because they were opposed to the objectives of the strike or even to the tactics, but because encouraged by the school authorities they just didn't think about these things at all, and came out in a spirit of fun to disrupt our meetings. We get nowhere even if we preserve the purity of our principles if we thus align the majority of the students against us. . . . Our task for the next year in the high schools is to get these students to listen to us and to consider our point of view with seriousness. We cannot make a gift of these hundreds of thousands to the fascists.

STUDENT UNITY

The step that was largely responsible for the increase in the number of striking students as compared with 1934 was unquestionably the adhesion on an invitation from the Student L.I.D. of the National Council of Methodist Youth representing a million and a half Methodist young people to the movement. The National Student Strike Committee which was sponsor of the 1935 strike was composed of one representative of: Student League for Industrial Democracy, National Council of Methodist Youth, Youth Section of the American League against War and Fascism, Inter Seminary Movement (Middle Atlantic Division), American Youth Congress, and the National Student League. In addition unofficial representatives of the Student Christian Movement and the National Student Federation of America sat in at meetings of the Strike Committee and co-operated throughout. Two divisions of the N.S.F.A., the Middle Atlantic and the New England, officially

endorsed the strike on April 11th. The total cost of the strike was \$200; so there can be no question of Moscow gold. Since all decisions had to be taken unanimously, every organization on the Strike Committee had veto power over the proceedings, and so there can be no question of Moscow domination. The Committee functioned efficiently and harmoniously throughout, and the success of the strike on April 12th showed the necessity and value of joint action among student organizations.

The most serious lack of unity manifested during the strike was the divergence of point of view among the students who participated, and the failure of some of the local units of national organizations to support the strike locally. Intensive educational work is necessary in order to achieve homogeneity among the students who are against war. The genuine co-operation between the Student L.I.D. and the N.S.L. during strike preparations did much to cement good will between these organizations. To all practical intents and purposes these two organizations worked as one unit in building the strike, a hopeful sign in a movement so torn by dissension.

WORLD FRONT

[The Student Strike Against War was endorsed last July at the Liège Congress of the International Socialist Student Federation. Again at the Brussels Student Congress against War and Fascism which took place during Christmas week, 1934, the strike was endorsed by 27 participating countries.] Unfortunately, April 12th was an inopportune time for an international demonstration. In Porto Rico alone, acting upon a letter from the Student League for Industrial Democracy, the Socialist students there brought out 18,000 university and high school students. Their telegram to the Student L.I.D. read, "*Universities and High Schools Arose at Eleven Against War.*" The National Student Strike Committee is now making plans for the holding of a Pan-American Student Anti-War and Anti-Imperialist Conference. The holding of such a conference was first urged at the Socialist Student Congress in

Liège. Its need was again emphasized at the Brussels Congress. Since one of the basic causes of the conflict in the Gran Chaco at present is American imperialism, it is fitting that the American Student Anti-War Movement should take the leadership in calling such a Congress.

The 1935 Student Anti-War Strike enlisted much public support. Not only did ministers and newspapers endorse the move, but even several United States Senators. Senator Nye declared: "I think the strike is far from futile and I hope it will be engaged in to the fullest extent in an orderly manner by the students in Washington. The time has come when those who profess an aversion to war must openly endorse drastic action to prevent it."² Many trade unions, as well as the Socialist Party, endorsed the action. The Student L.I.D. believes that it is necessary to emphasize the need for co-operation between students and workers if war is to be prevented. This is necessary on two scores. A declaration of war will not be made ineffective by a strike of students alone. To achieve this it is essential that the workers who supply the military forces with food, clothing and transportation, strike with us. Secondly, the threat of war can only be eliminated by the establishment of a socialist society. It is the exploited section of the population, the workers and farmers, to whose interest it is to establish a socialist society. Therefore, the student who is against war must align himself with workers and farmers. The Student L.I.D. hopes in the future to enlist the support of all sections of the community in a strike against war. That would be a really significant demonstration.

ENLIST IN THE PERMANENT STRUGGLE

175,000 students and teachers came out on strike on April 12th. We must not consider that action as an end in itself, or as the climax

² Senator Pope (Dem., Idaho): "I think that the demonstration against war to be made in an orderly fashion is a dramatic method of calling the attention of the world to the fact that students are thinking about war and opposing it. I see no objection to the strike."

of the Student Anti-War Movement. In effect it is only a beginning. It has indicated to us that we are still a minority, and a minority with a lot of internal differences. There is a tremendous job of education and organization to be done. The Student League for Industrial Democracy has advanced the slogan, "Enlist in the Permanent Struggle Against War." It is urging all the organizations represented on the National Student Strike Committee to support the formation of a permanent student vigilance committee against war and fascism. It is making efforts to bring other groups such as the National Student Federation of America and the Y.M.C.A. and the Y.W.C.A. into this committee. Through this vigilance committee, unity and co-ordinated action in the fight against war and fascism can be achieved on a significant scale.

But the Student L.I.D. is also firmly convinced that the fight against war and fascism cannot be one of prevention only. What would we think of a doctor whose only prescription for a chronic condition of boils was to treat each one as it appeared, without prescribing for the internal conditions that were producing the boils? The Numan bills, the R.O.T.C., the various fascist measures are all like boils produced by a fundamental disorder in our economic and social system. An intelligent fight against war and fascism must be a fight against capitalism. These words, War, Fascism, Capitalism, imply one another. To end them we must have a socialist system. To the student and teacher the Student L.I.D. exclaims, however, **FIGHT WAR EFFECTIVELY, ON EVERY FRONT, AND YOU FIND YOURSELF FIGHTING FOR SOCIALISM.**

THE STUDENT OUTLOOK is the Official Periodical of the Student League for Industrial Democracy

Undergraduates receive a year's subscription to it along
with the following pamphlets by becoming a \$1.00 member:

The Campus Strikes Against War, by Joseph P. Lash

America in the Depression, by Harry W. Laidler
A pamphlet of Facts

Italian Intellectuals under Fascism, facts and documents collected by the Student L.I.D.

The Communist Manifesto with an essay on Karl Marx, by Harold Laski

Socialism's New Beginning, by Miles
(Indispensable to an understanding of the triumph of Hitler and
what German youth is now doing in the underground movement.)

Incentives under Capitalism and Socialism, by Harry W. Laidler

Poor Old Competition, by Stuart Chase

Handbook of the Student L.I.D., a statement of our program

And still other pamphlets as they are published during the year

If you want to fight against War, Fascism, Retrenchment, Racial Discrimination and for
a new social order based upon production for use instead of for profit—
JOIN THE AMERICAN STUDENT MOVEMENT WITH THESE OBJECTIVES

The Student League for Industrial Democracy

New York, N. Y.

112 East 19th Street

THE STUDENT LEAGUE FOR INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY
112 East 19th Street, New York

☐ Enclosed find \$1.00 for membership. (50 cents of this fee goes to six issues of
THE STUDENT OUTLOOK.)

☐ Enclosed find \$.25 for auxiliary membership.

☐ Enclosed find \$.10 for high school membership.

Name

Address

School Year

School Address

AGITATE!

EDUCATE!

ORGANIZE!

Only on the united forces of labor, farmers, and professional workers can a new
society be built. With these, we of the Student League for Industrial Democracy must
work for the social ownership of our natural resources, of the means of production,
and the elimination of the all-pervasive profit motive as the ruling principle of our
social system.

We are irreconcilably opposed to international war, as necessarily destructive of the
interests of the workers. We must wage an unrelenting campaign against war prepa-
rations and propaganda. On the campuses we must work for the complete elimination
of the R.O.T.C.

We must see to it that the rights of academic freedom, and of liberty of speech,
press, organization and assembly are maintained. The campus must be a place of
free and open discussion. We must insist on the broadening of educational influence,
and combat retrenchment and other destructive policies.

We know no barriers of creed, color, or nationality. All these are divisive and
must be fought as undermining our very purpose.

The Student League for Industrial Democracy pledges itself to a program of educa-
tion for a new social order based upon production for use, and not for profit.

STUDENT LEAGUE FOR INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY

National Executive Committee

Chairman
Albert W. Hamilton

Vice-Chairman
Ruth Oxman
Hunter '34

Secretary
Joseph P. Lash
C.C.N.Y. '31

Donald P. Donahoe
U. of Idaho, So. Branch

George C. Edwards, Jr.
Southern Methodist U. '32

Lynnel Florant
Howard

Fred Graham
U. of Missouri

Henry Haskell
Pomona

Vernon Holloway
Yale Divinity School

Georg Mann
U. of Chicago

Morris Milgram
C.C.N.Y. '34

Robert G. Spivack
U. of Cincinnati

Monroe M. Sweetland
Wittenberg '30

Jean Symes
U. of California

Officers of the League for Industrial Democracy

President
Robert Moss Lovett

Vice Presidents
John Dewey
John Haynes Holmes
Vladimir Karapetoff
James H. Maurer
Alexander Meiklejohn
Mary R. Sanford
Vida D. Scudder
Helen Phelps Stokes

Treasurer
Stuart Chase

Executive Directors
Norman Thomas
Harry W. Laidler

Executive Secretary
Mary Fox

Membership Secretary
Anna Caples

Secy. Lecture Circuits
Mary W. Hillier

Acting Secy., Chicago Office
Ethel Watson

Student Department
George C. Edwards, Jr.
Joseph P. Lash
Monroe M. Sweetland

CHALLENGE TO DEATH

Introduction by VISCOUNT CECIL

Edited by STORM JAMESON

Foreword to the American Edition by VERA BRITTAIN

**A symposium against war, by some of
the most distinguished minds of our day**

Containing:

STORM JAMESON: The Twilight of Reason
G. E. G. CATLIN: The Roots of War
VERA BRITTAIN: Peace and the Public Mind
PHILIP NOEL BAKER: Peace and the Official Mind
GUY CHAPMAN: The Advocates of War
WINIFRED HOLTBY: Apology for Armourers
IVOR BROWN: War's New Ally, Fascism
GERALD HEARD: And suppose we fail? After the next war
VERNON BARTLETT: Security or Rearmament: Peace or War
PHILIP NOEL BAKER: The International Air Police Force
PHILIP NOEL BAKER: A National Air Force no defence
REBECCA WEST: The Necessity and Grandeur of the International
MARY AGNES HAMILTON: No Peace apart from
International Security: An Answer to extreme Pacifists
GERALD BARRY: The Mirage of Isolation
JULIAN HUXLEY: Peace Through Science
J. B. PRIESTLEY: The Public and the Idea of Peace
STORM JAMESON: In the End
EDMUND BLUNDEN: Poem

Peace with Honour

by

A. A. MILNE

The most courageous and devastating attack on War ever made—by one of the most popular and beloved authors of our day—A. A. Milne writing as he has never written before.

HERE is rigid logic, and brilliant irony, an indomitable defense of the position that all war is wrong, disastrous, useless, fraudulent and must be completely renounced.

Falsehood in War-Time

by

ARTHUR PONSONBY

An amazing collection of carefully documented lies circulated in Great Britain, France, Germany, Italy, America during the War.

First published in 1928, this remains a classic exposition of the age-old maxim: "When war is declared, Truth is casualty."

The author, now Lord Ponsonby, a long career of Parliamentary and diplomatic service, which enabled him to bring down, at first hand, the pedigree of most famous and illustrative lies of the great nations in the World.

These books published by E. P. DUTTON & CO., INC., 300 Fourth Ave., N.Y.

ADVERTISEMENT

DEMCO
LIBRARY SUPPLIES
111 South Carroll Street
Milwaukee, Wisconsin