

The **STUDENT** **OUTLOOK**

Formerly REVOLT
The Intercollegiate Socialist Review

SOCIALISM and THE NEW DEAL

by

NORMAN THOMAS

UMBRELLA OVER CITY COLLEGE . . . By George Fenner

THE LITERATURE OF REVOLT . . . By Robert Morss Lovett

THE ARMAMENTS INDUSTRY . . . By A. Fenner Brockway

REPORT ON STUDENT ACTIVITIES
and
THE ANTI-WAR CONGRESS

Vol. II, No. 1 - November, 1933

PRICE TEN CENTS

PUBLISHED BY THE INTERCOLLEGIATE LEAGUE FOR INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY

The Student Outlook

(Formerly REVOLT)

THE INTERCOLLEGIATE SOCIALIST REVIEW

Published Monthly from October to May by

THE INTERCOLLEGIATE
LEAGUE FOR INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY

112 East 19th Street, New York City

VOL. II, No. 1

EDITORS

Joseph P. Lash	Chairman
Robert Asher	University of Chicago
Alvin Coons	Iowa State College
George C. Edwards	Southern Methodist University
Lewis S. Feuer	Harvard
James R. Henson	Lynchburg College
Lucy Kramer	Columbia
Harold Lavine	C. C. N. Y.
Oleta O'Connor	University of California
Betty McDougall	Hunter College
Mildred McWilliams	Bryn Mawr
Maurice Neufeld	University of Wisconsin
Rolla Reedy	Oregon University
Walter Reuther	Detroit City College
Paul Ritterskamp	University of Chicago
Richard N. Scammon	University of Minnesota
Joel Seidman	Johns Hopkins
Monroe Sweetland	Syracuse University

Felix S. Cohen J. B. Matthews Mary Fox
Paul Porter Ruth E. Schechter



Subscription price for twelve issues, \$1.00, One year, 50c.
Single copies, ten cents. Bundle orders at 50% discount

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Whose Student Movement?	
<i>An Editorial</i>	3
Socialism and the New Deal	
<i>Norman Thomas</i>	4
Umbrella Over City College	
<i>George Fenner</i>	6
The Armaments Industry	
<i>A. Fenner Brockway</i>	7
The Literature of Revolt	
<i>Robert Morss Lovett</i>	9
The University of Heaven	
<i>Charles K. C. Leonard</i>	11
Two Drawings	
<i>Gyula Zilzer</i>	12
United Front Against War	
<i>Joseph P. Lash</i>	15
BOOK REVIEWS	
The A. F. of L.	
<i>George Marshall</i>	17
Conditions for Revolution	
<i>Lewis S. Feuer</i>	18
Whad'ye Mean, Class Struggle?	
<i>Robert Delson</i>	19
Free For All	23

A NATIONAL STUDENT CONGRESS

All who achieve real distinction in life begin as revolutionists. The most distinguished persons become more revolutionary as they grow older. . . . Any person under the age of thirty who, having any knowledge of the existing social order, is not a revolutionist, is an inferior.

BERNARD SHAW

Student members of the League for Industrial Democracy from the east have met together; students from the west have frequently convened in Chicago but no national student congress of the League has ever been held. At the Continental Congress in Washington, last May, representatives of the Intercollegiate L.I.D. called such a conference for Columbus, Ohio, this Thanksgiving weekend with the purpose of drawing up as comprehensive a student program as possible. The following is the program for the conference as prepared by the Agenda Committee:

NATIONAL STUDENT CONFERENCE OF THE L.I.D.

December 1st and 2nd

Columbus, Ohio

Friday Afternoon, December 1st 2 P.M.

Informal discussions among arriving student and faculty members

Friday Evening, 8 P.M.

Shall the Intercollegiate Student Council be Reorganized?

Saturday Morning December 2nd, 9:30 A.M.

Reports and discussion of matters of policy:

<i>Wages of college employees</i>	<i>Student cooperatives</i>
<i>Retrenchment in education</i>	<i>The negro student</i>
<i>War and the R. O. T. C.</i>	<i>Campus politics</i>
<i>Academic liberties</i>	<i>United Front</i>
<i>International Socialist Student Affiliation</i>	
<i>Relation of L.I.D. to Socialist Party and to unions</i>	

Saturday Noon, 12 M.

Luncheons for Canadian students, student editors and faculty members

Saturday Afternoon, 2:30 P.M.

Continuation of the morning discussions

Saturday Evening

Public mass meeting with Professor Reinhold Niebuhr and others as speakers

All Sessions at Ohio State University

Students Intending to Come Should Write to the Intercollegiate L.I.D., 112 East 19th Street, New York City

The STUDENT OUTLOOK

Formerly REVOLT
The Intercollegiate Socialist Review

VOL. II

NOVEMBER, 1933

NO. 1

WHOSE STUDENT MOVEMENT?

An Editorial

DIRECTLY after the world war a huge student movement sprang up in Germany. It was a flowering in the name of imponderables, "freedom of the spirit" "against mechanism" "creative self-expression" etc. Bronzed youthful bands with rucksacks and shorts roved all over the German wooded lands and rivers. Their object was to get as far away as possible from the shambles left by the war. Carefree *Wandervögel* they again echoed the gay irresponsibility of the medieval student:

Down the broad way do I go
Young and unregretting
Wrap me in my vices up
Virtue all forgetting.

But such an attitude was difficult to maintain for long. The communion of free souls with nature became too hollow a pretence in a society wracked by unemployment, post-war alarums, bitter political feuds — and so the youth movement split up into as many factions as there were adult groupings.

Because youth doesn't care for its skin it is the backbone of the Socialist *Schutzbund* in Austria, of the Nazi *Sturm-Abteilungen*, of the five-person cells (*Fünfergruppen*) now organizing secretly all over Germany, of the Cuban left-wing movements, of the Chinese revolutionary forces. Just because youth is gay and fervent, sincere and unquenchable it is a valuable political ally.

The last few years have seen the ending of student indifference in this country. Even *College Humor* has become concerned with the social forces causing the disintegration of fraternity life.

But if students are to become responsive to the social and economic currents swirling about and through the campus, where will they align themselves?

Will it be with the old order of things, in which lawyers are forced to be shysters, teachers to be hypocritical,

in which all professional people — physicians, artists, engineers — find their creative talents perverted by the need of making a living? Where the profit motive is a universally blighting influence? Where unemployment stalks the most educated and aristocratic?

Or will they align themselves with the creative forces of labor which are making for a new, cooperative, collective society? Where talents will not be wasted in the chaos of a disorganized world?

The socialist movement needs lawyers to defend it, teachers to impart a new vision of society, physicians to spread the notion of socialized medicine, and artists to body forth in words and colors and sounds the upsurge of this new order of things. And above all it needs youth's enthusiasm, its fearlessness, its flexibility.

The Intercollegiate League for Industrial Democracy is the recruiting ground for socialist students. Out of it have come and will continue to come the Webbs', the Coles, the Leon Blums, and the Thomas' of the American socialist movement. In the fight against R.O. T.C., increased fees, suppression of academic freedom, many great socialists have received their baptismal fire. Join with us in the great adventure, and give your life meaning and usefulness, where it would otherwise be humdrum and futile.

(En route to California)

Have just read of Morris Hillquit's death with deep sense of sorrow and loss. Socialists everywhere will miss his leadership, we in America most of all. To Socialism he freely gave gifts, which employed for ends of personal advancement, would have carried him far on the road to power. It is for us to carry on the struggle for the glorious end for which he gave himself so generously.

NORMAN THOMAS

SOCIALISM and THE NEW DEAL*

By NORMAN THOMAS

ASSUMING that new world war and fresh and very sharp economic collapse does not bring us to immediate disaster, there are two ways only in which the New Deal and the forces it has set in motion can lead us—one is to some sort of Fascism; the other to some sort of Socialism. As Fascists in Italy and Germany have pointed out, we have already gone a considerable part of the way toward the economics of Fascism; that is, toward an economic system in which the state asserts immense powers of control and regulation without repudiating the right of absentee ownership for private profit. It is difficult to see how long we can avoid adding the politics of Fascism; that is, the politics of dictatorship, the concept of the "totalitarian state," the psychology of rampant nationalism to keep the workers hypnotized and quiet.

I do not assume that American Fascism will be purely imitative. It must have its own characteristics. Fascism in neither Italy nor Germany was a simple creation of a capitalist class. On the whole, the middle class, big men and little, preferred it to Socialism or Communism, but many emotional elements and some misguided radicalism went into making it. Some of the factors which favored the growth of Fascism abroad we lack. We have not yet a Socialist or Communist movement sufficient to arouse middle class fear as in Italy or Germany. We have not the wounded national vanity of Italy to which Mussolini appealed or the deeper sense of violated national dignity which Hitler exploited.

But whether N. R. A. is a comparative success or a comparative failure, and even if a consciously Socialist movement should grow less quickly than I hope, sooner or later an owning class will be forced to face the fundamental question: "Why should absentee owners be guaranteed rich rewards by the continued intervention of government? The old feudal lord or captain of industry, whatever his arrogant cruelty, had to take and defend by his own strength or cunning. He got sanctions from his own power, not from an administration in Washington!" Now it is easier to evade this question than to answer it, and the Fascist evasion with its appeal to tribal emotionalism has been proved to work. It will be tried here. It will be helped by our rampant nationalism, our racial prejudices, our growing impa-

tiency of democracy, and our tendency to mass mindedness. Already we have had our K.K.K. and we now have such consciously Fascist groups as the Khaki Shirts and Silver Shirts. Out of them will arise no American Hitler, but they show a dangerous tendency. We are prone to violence. We have gangsters galore ready to be mobilized under more respectable auspices, and a middle class angered and bewildered by life's problems but not ready to capitulate or become a part of an emancipated working class! What is worse is that our workers are not well organized. True enough, the A. F. of L. and independent unions have made great progress. Many of them have aggressively and intelligently taken advantage of the opportunity that they got not by their own direct power but by the wisdom of a President face to face with a great emergency. Spontaneously the unorganized have sought organization. But even now it looks as if some of the craft unions would block industrial unions and so leave the workers a prey to company unions or to absolute disorganization. Some American labor leaders—of course not all—would rather bargain with government officials and industrialists for partnerships in power within industries rather than to fight at the head of an aroused working class for the Cooperative Commonwealth. The whole immensely important subject of labor organization under N. R. A. lies outside this paper. I have discussed it in other articles and speeches. But no false optimism or sincere identification with labor's cause should lead us to overlook features of the American labor movement which threaten its usefulness in the struggle against Fascism—especially a Fascism in disguise under some pleasanter name. That is why the organization of labor on the industrial field and the nature of its inspiration are so vital for the future.

There are no adequate countervailing forces to Fascism which are not essentially Socialist. The day of the old capitalist democracy is done. Only industrial democracy or Socialist democracy has any chance at all, even in countries with a democratic tradition, against the rising tide of dictatorship whether of the left or of the right. Only a passion for the cooperative commonwealth or, better, a Federation of Cooperative Commonwealths can take the place in the popular heart and mind of

*A short section of a pamphlet being published by the L.I.D.

the national worship which Fascism sets up. Only social ownership of natural resources and the great means of production and distribution, their management according to plan for the use of the great company of people, and not for the profit of any can fulfill the promise of N. R. A. and avert the menace. At best it will not be easy to unite the seemingly conflicting interests of all workers as consumers and of particular workers in particular industries, of industrial workers and working farmers. It will take a common emotion, a common philosophy, a unifying political organization and a careful plan to bring about harmony between all workers with hand and brain on farm, field, mine, in factory, office, school, wherever the useful work of the world is done. Conceivably Communism might supply these things, but careful consideration of the American scene makes it overwhelmingly probable that at most a Communist dictatorship in any near period of time would be a possible consequence of a Fascist dictatorship, not an alternative to it. We who want neither must push a vigorous Socialist plan and effective organization to carry it out. Again I must sum up our program.

The codes in industry must not only be improved but correlated under a general economic plan. We can scarcely have experts plan for us unless we own the things which are vital to this plan. We must acquire rapidly our banking system, our coal, oil, electric power and railroads. Speedily we must add other natural resources and basic industries and utilities. We should socialize marketing machinery of what farmers buy and sell. The milk situation, for instance, cannot be solved without socially owned milk distributing companies in place of the present trusts. Taxation of incomes and inheritances in a transitional period should meet most costs of government, though the land values tax can and should be used to end private landlordism. A capital levy must be employed to help reduce debt, care for the unemployed, and facilitate the transfer of the industries to be socialized. In general, under present conditions, compensation for socialized industries—usually in notes or bonds of these industries—*plus such taxation* as I have outlined is likely to prove more equitable and practicable than piecemeal confiscation. For the immediate present we need a far bolder plan of unemployment relief and public works, including housing. Such a program plus social insurance will aid not only in terms of social justice but in economic recovery by its help in redistributing national income a little more equitably.

Even while we are working at this immediate pro-

gram which in the existing state of our institutions and our psychology must be a national program, we should be doing all in our power to reach international agreements. Tariffs ought to be consciously based on consideration of the way in which minimum codes of hours and wages are lived up to in foreign countries. They should not be based on the greed of nationalistic manufacturers. Not only the conquest of war but of the poverty which already science and machinery make wholly inexcusable requires us to think and increasingly to act in terms of an interdependent world.

No program can be carried out merely by wishing. It requires effective organization. That organization must be threefold—organization of consumers in consumers' cooperatives and clubs wherever they are feasible; organization of workers—white collar as well as overall—in industrial unions closely affiliated in the service of labor; and, finally, organization of a political party which will consciously and proudly represent the interests of workers with hand and brain, of farmers and city dwellers alike, in the achievement of the Co-operative Commonwealth. Never was such a party more needed than now when government is the outstanding factor in our economic as well as our political life. It is absurd to suppose that the Republican Party can be the thing we need. If we escape for a while longer a Fascist society the Republican Party will probably be the party of extreme reaction. The Democratic Party after rather violent internal spasms will probably become the party of more or less enlightened business that understands the need of some concessions to workers. It may still talk piously about Jefferson but it will be a party of centralization such as every Democratic president since the Civil War has furthered. It certainly will not directly represent the interest of rank and file workers, though it may venture to make terms with a certain type of labor leader. It will remain a party of Tammany Hall and the Hague machine. It will almost certainly remain the party of Southern Bourbons and Negro haters.

The party which represents the workers is still to be built. It is that party which the Socialist Party wishes to help to create or to become. It opens its doors to all who share its purpose. There is an unfortunate tendency among radicals to spend in their own discussions more time on an attempt to prophesy the degree of violence which will bring about a desirable social revolution than on working for dynamic organization without which ballots or bullets are equally futile. Surely it is clear that the more effective our organiza-

(Continued on page 8)

Umbrella Over City College

By GEORGE FENNER

ON APRIL FOOL'S day, as is the tradition at the City College of New York, the undergraduate newspaper, *The Campus*, published a burlesque issue called *The Crampus*. It was full of jackass jokes, full of digs at "Comrade Frederushka B . . ." as the President of the college was referred to, and at the Military Science Department, especially Colonel George Chase Lewis. In addition, it was obscene, but no more so than previous Crampuses, no more so than the average issue of a college comic. The college administration stated it saw nothing wrong with the issue. Colonel Lewis, however, was nettled, and he sent a copy of the issue to each member of the Board of Higher Education along with a letter demanding punishment of the culprits. The Board not having as intimate contact with college life as the faculty was outraged. Mr. Tuttle, the chairman, remarked that in all his years as District Attorney he had not met with such concentrated obscenity. On June second, four members of the staff learned they had been expelled.

Three days before this, however, had occurred an incident on the college grounds that placed these expulsions completely in the background. May 30th had been set aside for a military review in the Stadium. *The Campus* quickly labeled the occasion as "Jingo Day," and members of the Social Problems Club and the Student Forum called for a counter pacifist demonstration on the campus.

The demonstration, as had frequently been done in the past, was held around the flagpole on college grounds without faculty authorization. Many speeches were made. Tiring of this the students marched over to the entrance to the stadium where the review was being held. They were asked to lay aside their placards. They did so, but were refused admittance anyway. They then pushed their way into the outside iron gates and were caught in a small square between the iron gates and the inner wooden doors which had been locked. There police beat up some and expelled the rest into the street. College authorities later disavowed any intention of keeping these students away from a regular college function. It was a misunderstanding on the part of the doorkeeper, they say.

Bruised and angered the students retired across the street from the Stadium and more speeches were made. Meanwhile President Robinson had come up on the Stadium side of the street, flanked by two guest gen-

erals, a Daughter of the American Revolution and Colonel Lewis. He stopped as he neared the corner, to wait for the lagging Colonel Lewis to catch up. Across the street from him were the speakers and the compact core of the crowd. Only the scattered, open fringe of the listeners reached to the side where the President and his guests were walking.

Such was the setting when the "Umbrella Attack" was made. Spotting khaki uniforms some of the students started booing. The President of the college went blind with rage and ran amuck among his students striking them over the heads with an umbrella he was carrying. After several heads had been soundly thumped some students pinioned the hands of their President and wrenched the umbrella away. The police came into action, dashed in and rescued the savant from his students. A freshman came over and handed back the umbrella to the quivering President Robinson with the caustic statement: "Here is your club, Mr. President." Text-books were grabbed in order to identify members of the demonstration. A man from the City News Association was told by the publicity agent of the college that President Robinson had courageously defended himself and his guests from assault by a pacifist mob. And that is the way the story appeared in most of the newspapers. But most accounts of bystanders agree in stating that the President had to advance several paces to strike someone, that definitely he had not been assaulted nor his path blocked.

Three days later a faculty meeting was held. When President Robinson entered the room there was an ovation and congratulations. It was decided to have a faculty committee of three bring in a full report of the incident. At the same time the faculty voted to suspend the charters of the three liberal clubs on the campus. The committee functioned very efficiently. It systematically went down the rosters of the liberal clubs. It accepted the proffered information of professors and students as to who participated in the pacifist meeting. It enlarged a picture of the meeting and identified students in it. From the nature of the questions asked of the students appearing before it the inquiry turned into a blanket one of radical and liberal activities at City College. Not only were students asked whether they took part in the pacifist demonstration, but whether they had taken part in a strike that was held during

(Continued on page 22)

THE ARMAMENTS INDUSTRY*

By A. FENNER BROCKWAY

ARMAMENT firms are purely profit-making business concerns. They have room for patriotism only when it helps to sell their articles. They have no room for patriotism when it restricts the selling of their articles. They have no room for sentiment or humanitarianism. Their one object is to do business and make profits.

Grasp this realistic conception of the armaments industry and everything else follows. Let us see how it works out.

The purchasers of armaments are Governments. The success of the business, therefore, depends upon persuading Governments to buy.

No Government wishes to spend money. Taxation is unpopular. But every Government will spend money on armaments if convinced that the expenditure is necessary for national defence.

Therefore the first thing an armament firm must do is to convince Governments that its articles are indispensable for this purpose.

An armament firm produces a new type of death-dealing instrument and submits it to a Government. The instrument is costly. The Government knows that no rival Power possesses it, and turns it down.

The armament firm is not discouraged. It knows that it has only to get *one* Government to buy the new type of death-dealer and immediately *all* Governments will buy. Any War Minister who neglected to order the latest weapons in use would betray the sacred cause of national defence.

So the armament firm seeks out some Government which is nervous about the arms of some rival nation. "Take this new invention," says the firm, "and you need fear your rival no longer."

Or the firm seeks out some small nation just launching out in armaments expenditure, with a Government or ruler who will take pride in possessing the first of a new type of armament.

It doesn't matter how insignificant the Government is: once get the new invention on the market and no Government will dare to be without it.

But sometimes there is a difficulty. The Governments of small nations cannot afford to buy. So comes the second principle of armament selling: Governments must be lent money if necessary. That involves a close relationship with the banks.

It will be convenient, therefore, if armament directors happen to be bank directors; perhaps the armament firm will run a bank itself to facilitate the loan. The loan will be made on conditions that orders are placed with the firm.

The next necessity in the technique of armament salesmanship is the use of Press influence. The heavy sale of armaments depends upon the state of tension in international relations. Therefore public psychology must be kept nervous. This not only involves making the Press of your own country suspicious of other countries; the Press of other countries must be nervous of the intentions of your country.

Armament salesmanship therefore requires close connections with the Press. Own newspapers if you can. Some of your directors should certainly also be directors of newspapers. Don't be squeamish about the truth of your stories. Publicity knows no morals. Good business depends upon war scares. Foment them!

Of course, if an armament salesman can directly approach a Government and convince it that there is danger from another country, or that some enemy Power is arming against it, that is best of all. Occasionally even that has been done.

There are grosser things in armament salesmanship, as there are in most salesmanship, about which we do not usually talk. Those who have the responsibility of giving orders may perhaps be encouraged to do so "for a consideration." When the orders run into millions, the "consideration" is sometimes considerable.

But there is also a more subtle form of technique which may be followed to obtain influence in desirable quarters. If an armament firm can promise a Government official a post when he is due to retire, the firm has a double advantage. The official is immediately friendly, and when he joins your staff he has inside knowledge and contacts of great value.

There are still some parts of the world where war lords and even industrial concerns, resort to arms in their private quarrels. China and Mexico are examples. In such cases it is the duty of the armament salesmen to keep the private interests concerned well equipped, just as they do Governments.

So much for methods. Now for organization.

In armament manufacture, as in every other industry, the tendency is trustification. In place of rival competing firms, rings are formed to maintain prices.

*Reprinted with Mr. Brockway's permission from his new book, *The Bloody Traffic*, Victor Gallancz, Ltd., London.

Subsequently amalgamation takes place, so that the whole national industry becomes one powerful combine.

But in armaments the case for extending this process from a national to an international sphere is particularly strong.

All Governments have to be supplied. Why not an international ring to maintain prices everywhere? International tension and fear must be maintained if orders are to be increased. How much easier to do this if your organization is international—then you can collect and distribute information; you can act simultaneously in all countries; you can influence the Press everywhere; you can upset the nervous system of the whole world! One Government must be played off against another. How convenient if you have an international organization which can be approaching two Governments at the same time!

Armament firms have not been slow to realize the value of this technique. I shall prove not only that they have abolished competition within nations, but that they have established international contacts which enable them to pursue a common policy all over the world.

Of course, you must have no qualms about arming enemy countries if you are an armament salesman. In every war of modern times (except one), the armament firms have supplied the weapons of death to both sides. The exception was the Franco-German War of 1870, when Krupp, owing to a quarrel with Emperor Napoleon, did not supply France. That was probably why France lost!

The more one considers armaments as a business proposition, the more attractive they become. They are the best business proposition in the world. Indeed, one begins to wonder why any business man of enterprise troubles about any other form of manufacture.

The demand for the goods of most business firms is limited in two ways. First, by the restricted purchasing power of individuals. Second, by the satisfaction of what is required. The market for armaments is not restricted in either of these ways.

The purchasers are Governments, and Governments can command, in the last resort, all the wealth of the world. They will not only pledge the resources of the present time; they will pledge the future if they can be led to think that armaments are necessary.

Think of what happened in the World War. The British Ministry of Munitions expended £672,164,933 during 1917-18. There was a time when the British Government was spending over seven million pounds a day—and we are still paying a million pounds a day in interest on the national debt.

Even in peace-time the Governments place expenditure upon armaments before everything else. National expenditure upon health and housing and maternity and child welfare and education and unemployment is cut down. Governments tell us that we must all tighten our belts. Yet this year, despite all the stringencies of the economic crisis, the British Government has increased the expenditure upon the armed forces by £4½ millions.

Create the fear that national defence is endangered, and the purse for armaments is limitless.

Secondly, there is no saturation point.

The demand for armaments depends upon fear. The stomach can only accommodate a certain amount of bread, but there is no restriction to the fear a mind can accommodate. The brain is not confined by physical limits. Fear can grow infinitely.

Moreover, armaments have this advantage over other commodities: the more you supply, the greater the demand. Sell a new form of armament to one Government, and all the other Governments will immediately demand it. Convince one Government that her expenditure should be increased: all the other Powers will immediately pour orders upon you.

Yes—armaments are a magnificent business proposition. But don't mix up patriotism with it. You must arm your army, you must deceive and conspire against your own Government, if you are going to get the most out of the armaments proposition.

And don't pretend that it is anything but a beastly business. It sent ten million men to their deaths in the last war. It mutilated twenty million. It flourishes by maintaining the conditions out of which another war, and the mutilation of millions more, will come.

It is good business; but it is bloody.

SOCIALISM and THE NEW DEAL

(Continued from page 5)

tion of unions and a working class political party, the more orderly can be the period of transition. The outstanding task of thoughtful men and women who desire to escape catastrophe and to avert the disaster of Fascism which can only for a time postpone catastrophe, a catastrophe which ultimately it may make more bitter, is to build such intelligent and aggressive organizations of workers in unions and a political party that they will have the strength to oppose the currents which now carry us together with the world towards destruction. The best we can say of the New Deal is that it may make that task easier. The worst we can say is that it may lull us into false security or pave the way for Fascist rather than Socialist organization. Between this best and this worst it is for us to decide!

The Literature of Revolt

By ROBERT MORSS LOVETT

THE FRENCH REVOLUTION was the first great example of revolt as a mass movement. Hitherto rebellion had been impersonated by outstanding personalities, individual heroes. The French Revolution had plenty of such figures, Lafayette, Mirabeau, Danton, Robespierre—how quickly they came and went! Behind them all, however, there was the tremendous power of the people, the mob, which Carlyle was the first historian to recognize in its terrible, unconscious energy.

The influence of the Revolution upon the English romantic poets of the early nineteenth century is shown by the prevalence of the revolt motif. Southey commemorated the rebellion of the workers and peasants in the reign of Richard Second by his drama *Wat Tyler*, full of excellent proletarian doctrine, discovered and published to the poet laureate's confusion, long after he had recanted. Byron wrote the poetry of protest during the Tory reaction, typifying under the theological rebellion of Cain and the political conspiracy of Marino Fabiero, the social unrest of all Europe. But the poet of revolution *par excellence* is, of course, Shelley. His *Queen Mab* is, I suppose, seldom read today. It is a rhythmic handbook of philosophic anarchy.

Power, like a desolating pestilence,
Pollutes whate'er it touches; and obedience,
Bane of all genius, virtue, freedom, truth,
Makes slaves of men, and of the human frame
A mechanized automaton.

The Revolt of Islam is perhaps even less read; but it is the most completely revolutionary epic in existence, a record not only of the phenomena of revolution, but also of its psychology. *The Masque of Anarchy*, written after the massacre of English workers at Manchester, is one of the most tremendous arraignments of power in the literature of politics.

I met Murder on the way—
He had a masque like Castlereagh.
Very smooth he looked, yet grim;
Seven bloodhounds followed him.

And finally in the conclusion to *Prometheus Unbound*, he has set forth in one imperishable stanza the whole ideal of the revolutionist:

To suffer woes which hope thinks infinite;
To forgive wrongs darker than death or night;
To defy power which seems omnipotent;
To love and bear; to hope till hope creates
From its wan wreck the thing it contemplates;

Neither to change, nor falter, nor repent;
This, like thy glory, Titan, is to be
Good, great, and joyous, beautiful and free;
This is alone Life, Joy, Empire, and Victory!

In the years before the French Revolution there developed in England a vigorous fiction of revolt. William Godwin, Shelley's father-in-law, wrote a profoundly revolutionary critique of the British constitution under the title *An Enquiry into the Principles of Political Justice*. The finding of this enquiry is that all power of man over man is essentially wrong. This thesis Godwin made the basis of a novel called *The Way Things Are*, or *Caleb Williams*, which is a precursor of the novel of social purpose as practised by Dickens, Kingsley, Mrs. Gaskell, Charles Reade, and others. This school of social fiction in the eighteenth century was crushed by the French Revolution, not to resume operations until two generations later. Meanwhile the novels of Sir Walter Scott in their celebration of the past became a powerful reactionary influence. They covered with the ivy of romance the decaying institutions of feudalism which Burke defended. There is one great virtue in Scott's novels which becomes a literary value of the highest sort—that is, loyalty in the feudal sense, loyalty of the vassal to his lord, loyalty of the clansman to his chief. Everyone remembers the fine scene in *Waverley* where Evan dhu Maccomlich, on trial with his chief for treason, offers his own life and that of six of his clan if Vich Ian Vohr may go free. Now loyalty in this sense was dissolved by the industrial system. Only for a short time, while capitalism was practised in small units, did the personal bond between employer and worker count for much. Instead there developed an intra class loyalty which we call solidarity. This was accounted a revolutionary symptom of the most menacing character. The combination of workers to fix wages or hours was in England a capital crime, and a century ago four or five farm laborers in Sussex were transported for making such an agreement. This form of loyalty—solidarity—was the basis of the labor movement in the nineteenth century. When the social motive reappears in fiction, the inevitable conflict which was later to be called the class war was perceived by Disraeli, with his uncanny prescience, and set forth by him in his powerful novel *Sybil*, three years before Marx announced the discovery in *The Communist Manifesto*.

"Two nations; between whom there is no intercourse and no sympathy; who are as ignorant of each other's habits, thoughts, and feelings, as if they were dwellers in different zones, or inhabitants of different planets; who are formed by a different breeding, are fed by a different food, are ordered by different manners, and are not governed by the same laws."

The problem of individual freedom versus class loyalty was attacked by Dickens in *Hard Times* and Charles Reade in *Put Yourself in His Place*, which is a terrific arraignment of the unions for their persecution of the independent workman. The right of the workers to organize and to compel loyalty to the organization is explained by Mrs. Gaskell in two novels, *Mary Barton* and *North and South*, written out of her own experience as what we should call a social worker—she called it being the wife of a Unitarian clergyman at Manchester. In *North and South* the heroine is appalled at the cruelty with which the union ostracizes a worker who will not join it. A worker replies:

He laughed grimly. "My lass," said he, "yo're but a young wench, but don't yo think I can keep three people—that Bessy, and Mary, and me—on sixteen shilling a week? Dun you think it's for mysel' I'm striking work at this time? It's just as much in the cause of others as yon soldier—only m'appen the cause he dies for is just that of somebody he never clapt eyes on, nor heerd on all his born days, while I take up John Boucher's cause, as lives next door but one, wi' a sickly wife, and eight childer, none on 'em factory age; and I don't take up his cause only, though he's a poor good-for-nought, as can only manage two looms at a time, but I take up th' cause o' justice."

Finally, the motive of loyalty toward the close of the nineteenth century takes a new form and inspires some of the most eloquent writing, if not the greatest literature, of that age. It becomes the loyalty of the privileged class to the unprivileged. This motive determined the later work of three writers who had already won the highest fame in criticism, fiction, and poetry—Ruskin, Tolstoy, Morris. Ruskin turned from art criticism to social criticism in *Unto This Last* which remains still one of the most powerful pleas for social justice. Tolstoy had become by the publication of *Anna Karenina* in 1878 the leading novelist of Europe. He went to Moscow as a social worker in 1882 and became a revolutionist. His "What to do?" gives a personal answer to the social problem:

I saw that the cause of the sufferings and depravity of men lies in the fact that some men are in bondage to others; and therefore I come to the obvious conclusion that if I want to help men, I have first of all to leave off causing those very misfortunes which I want to remedy,—in other words, I must not share in the en-

slaving of men. I was led to the enslaving of men by the circumstance that from my infancy I had been accustomed not to work, but to utilize the labor of others, and I have been living in a society which is not only accustomed to this slavery, but justifies it by all kinds of sophistry, clever and foolish. I came to the following simple conclusion, that, in order to avoid causing the sufferings and depravity of men, I ought to make other men work for me as little as possible, and to work myself as much as possible.

William Morris was an artist and a craftsman, the poet of the Earthly Paradise who called himself "the idle singer of an empty day," when he, like Ruskin, realized that art could not exist in a world of social injustice. He joined the Marxians in 1883 and spoke some of the boldest words of his generation in favor of the social revolution.

Morris in his lectures represents the social revolution according to the formula set forth by Marx and Engels in the *Communist Manifesto* of 1848, an inevitable movement under inexorable economic forces which in the breaking down of capitalism and the increasing misery of the working class result in the dictatorship of the proletariat, the seizure of raw materials and instruments of production, and the establishment of the cooperative commonwealth. Marxism envisages a period of ruthless exercise of power such as we witness today in Russia, but this not the ultimate stage of communism. When men have learned the lesson of cooperation so that they practise it voluntarily and unconsciously, then human society will take on the gracious and generous form which is in harmony with the best that we know of human nature. Morris has imagined the experience of a wanderer from our present day into this world of the future in that most lovely of all Utopian Romances, *News from Nowhere*, or *An Epoch of Rest*.

This Utopian dream brings Morris close to another representative of the loyalty of the privileged to the unprivileged, Peter Kropotkin. Kropotkin is of a revolutionary creed opposed to Marx, one which holds that all power is in its nature wrong, that mankind can advance directly into a state of society depending on voluntary cooperation. An anarchist—we politely put the adjective philosophic before it—he is the successor of Godwin and Shelley.

It is a remarkable fact that the Autobiography of this extreme radical, the *Memoirs of a Revolutionist*, is the book through which more American readers have approached the subject of revolution than through any other. It was first published in the conservative magazine *The Atlantic Monthly*, and now can be obtained

(Continued on page 20)

THE UNIVERSITY OF HEAVEN—1933

By CHARLES K. C. LEONARD

NOT LONG AGO, when Upton Sinclair wrote *The Goose Step*, he dubbed Syracuse University, then under the autocratic regime of Chancellor Day, the "University of Heaven." He recounted how certain big industrialists dominated Day's policy, and the injustice and even corruption that then prevailed. Today a sequel is in order—Chancellor Day is gone, but the first mortgage he gave to big business still exacts a heavy usury. The alumni, the student body, and the faculty have all felt the stifling effect of these liens upon the University, but the story of the high-handed suppression of liberal, Socialist, and pacifist student activities most clearly demonstrates it.

I.

Picture, if you please, a gentleman, BA., D.D., LL.D., Ph.D., who with utmost grace can balance on one shoulder the heavily weighted title of "Doctor of Divinity," and on the other shoulder the equally ponderous title of "Colonel in the Organized Reserve Corps of the United States Army."

But to complete the picture, you must not fail to see the impressive background of twenty-some trustees and Conference members, representing approximately 120 corporations, trust companies, or banks in which they are directors, presidents, vice-presidents, partners, each or several.

II.

Students as a whole, save for a lonely voice now and then, have shown but little opposition to the reactionary philosophy exemplified by the Syracuse Administration. Only an occasional unaccompanied protest was voiced until the fall of 1931 when liberal students—one or two Democrats, several Socialists, a Communist and sundry non-partisans—began formation of a Liberal Club. The request for recognition sponsored by a score of faculty members, was fruitless, went no farther than the Chancellor's office, and elicited a carefully worded reply from the Administration entitled "—IN RE SOCIETIES: Confidential, not for Publication." Tactful hedging prevailed throughout the document, but it did indicate definitely that the Administration was anxious that the League for Industrial Democracy gain no foothold. Among the members of the Club were several L.I.D. members, and Mary Hillyer had addressed the group at its second meeting. Recognition refused, the Club was forced to meet off campus. During the late fall and winter the Club prospered. Barred from the

campus, meetings were held in the Workman's Circle Hall several blocks away. No week passed but that the Syracuse press carried stories of student Liberal Club activity, now in the picket line during the Lighting Company strike, now selling *DISARM!* during the Armistice Day parade, now organizing the sale of *THE UNEMPLOYED* by unemployed men and women, or sponsoring the L.I.D. lecture series in Syracuse. The D.A.R. and American Legion instituted an investigation of "radicalism" in the city. Liberals among faculty and clergy successfully rallied to the support of the students.

During the summer the long-dormant Socialist Party sprung into action as a direct result of student activity. Murmurings from the right were heard throughout the community as student-conducted street meetings drew crowds of citizens, and student-distributed Socialist literature was regularly found on Syracuse doorsteps.

The Liberal Club aided in the formation of a Peace Council during the winter, composed of about a dozen student groups, four of which were off-campus organizations. Faculty advisers and student members soon became aware that even such a mild group as this was "dangerous" in the eyes of the Chancellor. But the officialdom realized that there was dynamite in forbidding a group of Christians and Cosmopolitans to get together to discuss war, so the customary administrative policy of waiting and sniping began. The Chairman of the Peace Council was a woman student. She suddenly received official "advice" that she should not continue in the position. (The "advice" of the Dean of Women is remarkably persuasive with Syracuse co-eds.) The Peace Council, shortly later, planned a Central New York Peace Conference, later advisedly limited to a "Conference on Disarmament." The students drew up a tentative list of speakers whom they wished to have for the Conference. Among them were Dorothy Detzer of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, Tucker Smith, and J. B. Matthews, each of whom proved to be *persona non grata* with the Administration. Finally Paul Harris, ostensibly because of his Y.M.C.A. associations, Jerome Davis of Yale Divinity School, and a French diplomat (who proved to be a staunch supporter of military training) were approved. But even then the Conference attended by students from 15 colleges, proved a boomerang. The pleas of the Ad-

(Continued on page 14)



The drawings on these pages were contributed by Gyula Zilzer, a young Hungarian artist now residing in this country. They are part of a collection, *Gaz*, 24 lithographs, with an introduction by Romain Rolland. Mr. Zilzer is a veteran in the European socialist movement. His unusual anti-Hitler and anti-war drawings make him one of the most effective propagandists in the radical movement. Unfortunately Mr. Zilzer has been harried by eviction notices thus preventing any persistent work. Persons interested in his work should communicate with the Editor at 112 E. 19th St., New York



The University of Heaven—1933

(Continued from page 11)

ministration sycophants failed to forestall a spirited attack on the R.O.T.C., or to prevent passage of resolutions called for a fight against capitalism as the breeder of war.

Just before the Conference, the Liberal Club issued through the "Daily Orange" an attack upon the R.O.T.C. as being, among other things, out of place in an allegedly Christian University. (Syracuse is affiliated with the Methodist Episcopal Church.) Immediately the editors were reprimanded for having printed the statement, especially for having given it a two-column head. Officers were asked three times to make a public statement, for the *Daily Orange*, but regularly refused. A prominent Syracuse clergyman who spoke at the Conference vigorously attacked the R.O.T.C. and his remarks were featured prominently in the down-town papers. The *Daily Orange*, however, upon advice of its faculty advisers, did not run the story.

Tacit threats, emanating directly from the Administration, held hostage for student quiescence one of the leading faculty friends of the Liberal Club and Peace Council, so that no student demonstration followed the summary abolition of the Peace Council late in April.

The Administration had succeeded in breaking the unity of the various groups in the Peace Council, but the liberal and radical forces were far from routed. On the official "Jingo Day," when the year's final R.O.T.C. Review was held on the campus, pacifists, Communists, and Socialists joined forces to stage a surprise counter demonstration, with large anti-war posters prominently displayed. Around and around the drill field picketed the anti-war forces, joined as they went by a considerable number of students from the sidelines. Printed circulars were distributed at the same time, protesting the use of the University for war preparations, and charging the Administration with having arbitrarily abolished the Peace Council. Belatedly, one of the former advisors of the Peace Council, apparently under duress, stated to the city and student press that the administration had not, to his personal knowledge, dissolved the Peace Council. Perhaps his memory needed prodding, for the other faculty advisor, then in England, advised by cable of his colleague's statement, cabled to his wife and the *Daily Orange*, asking a correction of the statement, saying that the administration had been directly responsible for the dissolution of the Peace Council. To this the Administration has never

Women's self-government is a mockery, as the student officers soon learn. A representative of the Dean of Women's office is constantly present at all meetings, giving "advice" which it is difficult to disregard. Last spring it was demonstrated that the Dean herself has no liking for Jewish women, or girls with foreign-sounding names for the esteemed position of Senior guides.

Prejudice against Negro students, notably Negro women, is rampant, and their attendance has declined more than 500% in five years. They are not allowed to live in the women's living centers maintained by the University. A year ago Herbert Abraham, an Oxford graduate and instructor in the Department of Bible, released to the press the results of an investigation of various discriminatory acts against Negro students. Although it cannot be definitely affirmed that this report was the cause, the fact is that Mr. Abraham was not reemployed for the coming year.

Student opinion has from time to time been aroused over these injustices. But effective protest is hampered by the ever-imminent fear of summary dismissal. Every student signs what the liberals call "the academic yellow dog Contract," which is an agreement not long ago declared binding as a contract by the New York courts, empowering the Administration to dismiss them without a public, or even a private, hearing, nor any statement of reasons.

For five years the chief well-spring of liberal thought and activity in Syracuse has been the women's living center known as "314 Waverly." It was conducted by Miss Candace P. Stone, an instructor in the Department of Political Science, with the assistance of Mrs. Irving Fisher, Mrs. F. R. Hazard, Judge Leonard C. Crouch, and other liberals interested in the house as an educational experiment. Every Sunday evening open meetings were held, so that by now almost every prominent liberal and radical in America can recall a fire-side meeting at "314." Once the reactionary elements began to call on the Chancellor to account for the rising tide of radicalism at Syracuse, liberal "314" was naturally selected for his special attention. This attention culminated in an executive order late in May summarily closing "314," under the guise of a general change in the women's housing system. As a privately endowed institution, "314" was not in any sense comparable to the University-owned cottages, but was essentially similar to the sororities, minus the Greek letters, pins, and rushing season. Committees of prominent alumni, students, and many prominent men and women

(Continued on page 16)

A UNITED FRONT AGAINST WAR

By JOSEPH P. LASH

EVERYONE is aware that effective opposition to an imminent war can only come from the transportation workers who enable the shipments of war materials and the movements of soldiers; from the workers in the chemical factories, steel plants, and food industries.

The Committee arranging the United States Congress Against War held in New York was completely cognizant of this fact. The problem was for the Communists, who two years ago at the Amsterdam World Congress accepted the responsibility for calling such a meeting in this country, to get the forces of labor, the pacifist organizations, the church groups and the Socialist Party to come into a united front with them.

The Arrangements Committee started off last July inauspiciously when a series of attacks in the *Daily Worker* on the Socialist Party led its delegated subcommittee to recommend withdrawal from the Congress. Nevertheless a number of non-Communist organizations, in many cases represented on the Arrangements Committee by Socialists, principally, the League for Industrial Democracy, the Fellowship of Reconciliation, the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, the War Resisters League refused to withdraw believing that the fight against war was so vital and so immediate that someone had to swallow hard in the interests of easing the bitter sectarianism among the radical forces.

Possibly the most valuable result of the Congress was the re-establishment of communications between responsible representatives of the Communist Party and other organizations. And this is mostly to the credit of Mary Fox and J. B. Matthews. At the meeting of the Arrangements Committee the night before the Congress, Dorothy Detzer of the W. I. L. swung around on her chair to Earl Browder of the Communist Party and asked him bluntly what he felt would be the irreconcilable issues at the Congress. Browder stated, that the interpretation of the National Recovery Act as stripping America for war action would be one such issue, and the reliance of the Labor and Socialist International on the League of Nations would be another.

At the Congress itself, however, there was no disagreement on these issues, especially since most American Socialists themselves deprecate the building up of Socialist peace policy around the League of Nations. The pacifist groups did submit a minority report rejecting the calls for and implications of civil war in

some of the reports of the sub-session. These reports did not, therefore, become part of the standing program of the Congress.

Some 2700 delegates from thirty-five states attended the Congress. One national A. F. of L. union was present, the Federation of Full-Fashioned Hosiery Workers and three locals of the I.L.G.W.U. Realizing that the future work of the Congress in this country would depend for its effectiveness on embracing other groups, the Arrangements Committee worked out several principles as a basis for unity: there is to be no criticism of participating organizations, but only of the strategies and policies of these organizations, and there is to be no exclusion from direction of the Congress of leaders representing large groups of people because of political affiliation. There is to be no appeal to rank and file, but to organizations and accredited leaders. The Congress almost foundered on this issue. Sacha Zimmerman, a delegate from Local 22 of the Ladies Garment Workers Union was nominated from the floor to the Presiding Committee but was voted down by the Communist Party because he also was a member of the Communist Party Opposition. It was only when the non-communist groups in the Congress presented an ultimatum demanding that a nominee of Local 22, which has some 30,000 members, be elected to the Presiding Committee, that the Communist Party acceded. Zimmerman as everyone knew in advance was the nominee of this Local and was placed on the Committee.

Again on Sunday night when Zimmerman arose to speak there was such booing and shouting that Earl Browder had to get up and order his followers to keep perfect silence while Zimmerman spoke. Even then one could feel throughout the hall the immense hatred that the Communist Party can instill among its members against a man or group.

Perhaps no more remarkable change in tactics appeared than the attitude of the Communists at the Congress toward the Socialists. Tremendous ovations greeted the delegates of the Philadelphia Local of the Socialist Party who had received permission to attend the Congress from the National Executive Committee, and the cheers were not because their presence betokened a split in Socialist ranks. Again a wild cheer went up when the Provisional Executive Committee which is to continue the work of the Congress announced that

an invitation would be extended to the National Executive Committee of the Socialist Party to join the American League against War and Fascism set up by the Congress.

The Manifesto of the Congress declared that: "By virtue of the mandate granted by the thousands of delegates from all sections of this country and groups of the population which bear the burden of imperialist war, who though of different political opinions religious beliefs and trade union affiliations are bound together by their honest and burning desire for peace, on the strength of its unshakable conviction that the strug-

gle against imperialist war is genuine only to the extent to which it effectively interferes with and check-mates imperialist war plans, this Congress calls upon the working class, the ruined and exploited farmers, the sections of the middle class bankrupted by the crisis, the groups of intellectuals of all occupations, men, women and youth together, to organize their invincible force in disciplined battalions for the decisive struggle to defeat the imperialist war."

And most of the delegates went away from the Congress believing that unity in such an endeavor was at last possible.

The University of Heaven—1933

(Continued from page 14)

of Syracuse, exerted every effort to persuade George Bond, generalissimo of the trustees (and of the Republican Party), and Chancellor Flint to rescind the order, but to no avail. "314" was not opened this fall.

Laura Witkow was one of the most active of the Socialist co-eds. She participated conspicuously in the anti-R.O.T.C. demonstration, and was generally known as a leader in the *sub rosa* Liberal Club. In June she received a notice that she would not be readmitted this September. Although her grades were not remarkable, they were materially higher than many who were not expelled. Private consultation with Dean K. C. Leebrick by various individuals left no doubt as to the motive back of her dismissal. In desperation he even resorted to slanderous imputations in some of the conversations. Her health, her morality, her grades, her radicalism, and her "uncooperative attitude" were variously stated to different persons as reason for her dismissal. Under the "legal" yellow-dog contract nothing can be done about it in the courts—Laura is just out!

The story is not nearly complete. Here can be stated only the incidents which everyone in Syracuse knows. The continuous duress, tacit and direct, under which student and faculty live, breaches of faith and contract, the discriminations, especially on the part of the Dean of Women, against "non-Aryans," non-sorority women, etc., and the spy-system of student stool-pigeons, all take their toll of academic freedom.

One ray of encouragement came to the liberals at Syracuse when Bishop Francis J. McConnell devoted a brilliant baccalaureate address in June to an appeal for more activity on the part of students in public affairs. He spoke directly to the Syracuse situation by saying that no institution could claim to be a true university

which did not encourage student liberalism. However much the Chancellor may have writhed at these utterances, they have as yet borne no fruit in terms of administrative policy. But this courageous speech did serve to state the case against official censorship in a most effective way, and upon a most opportune occasion.

This official suppression can mean only one thing—not that the liberal-radical students will abandon their work, but that effective new ways of carrying on must be devised. Probably Syracuse is not substantially different from many another privately controlled institution. The Trustees call the tune, the Administrative officials are the fiddle, and it now remains to be answered—Will the students dance?

COLLEGE JOTTINGS

University of Denver L.I.D. opens new headquarters in the chapel basement. . . . *Dartmouth* L.I.D. starts the year with a generous order of various pamphlets to be sold on the campus. . . . Ray Dennett is the president-elect of the *Harvard Liberal Club*, and George Edwards, active L.I.D.er at Southern Methodist for several years, is the new Treasurer. . . . *The Cornell Liberal Club* is resuming the fight against the R.O.T.C. after refusal of the trustees to make it optional as requested by the faculty. . . . Betty Muether of the *Wellesley* L.I.D. toured Indiana and Ohio this summer speaking for peace—by the way, Harvard and Wellesley L.I.D. members are extending co-education to the picket lines in the textile and shoe strikes around Boston. . . . Members of the *McGill Labour Club* (*Montreal*) are actively working in the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation, the new labor party which is sweeping Canada. . . . Monroe Sweetland, who abandoned Syracuse Law School to become college organizer for the L.I.D., has made quick organizational sallies into the New England and Middle Atlantic areas.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR: HISTORY, POLICIES AND PROSPECTS, by Lewis L. Lorwin with the assistance of Jean A. Flexner, 1932, *The Brookings Institution*.

THE author of *Labor and Internationalism* and *The Women Garment Workers* has produced another of the most significant labor books written in America. There are a number of useful works on special phases of American trade unionism but Dr. Lorwin's is the first detailed history and analysis of the American Federation of Labor covering the first three decades of this century. Although the discussion centers around the A. F. of L. as an organization and the supposed leader of a movement, as distinguished from the problems of its constituent unions and the labor movement as a whole, it goes very much further. It is given breadth through references to American industrial history, and to the problems of specific trade unions, through discussion of relations with other American labor groups, and through several comparisons with European labor movements.

The book has two main parts, a statistical appendix and an appendix containing scattered facts about a number of national and international trade unions. The first part is a concise historical summary of the outstanding events and problems of the A. F. of L. from its beginning to early 1933, and contains a fund of well organized information which Dr. Lorwin apparently gathered from a mass of material. But unfortunately for the future scholar sources are seldom given.

In the second principal section of the book, Dr. Lorwin analyses the structure of the A. F. of L., its primary functions, and its concepts. It is made clear that the policy of trade autonomy of the national and international unions still dominates the A. F. of L. and that practically every effort in recent years to bring about more concerted action has been curbed by the larger unions which have clung tenaciously to what they have considered their autonomous rights. Further evidence of this tendency was seen lately (after this book appeared) when the metal trades unions spoke of the protection of their jurisdictions in terms of "property rights."

Dr. Lorwin shows that the organizing machinery of the A. F. of L. has changed little since 1900, and that its organizing campaigns have been largely opportunis-

tic, having no general policy, and that since the War practically none have been successful. Among the reasons he gives for its decline and its disability to organize mass industries are its confusion over the idea of group consciousness, and over the effects of mechanized industry on skill; its proportionately declining expenditures on organizing; and its meager contributions for strikes.

In his final chapter, the author has tried to interpret the past and discuss the future of the Federation. What he says is very suggestive, but unfortunately much of it does not grow directly out of the previous chapters and space has not permitted him to support a number of his concise statements with sufficient data. It is therefore to be hoped that he will expand some of his ideas in additional articles or books in the near future.

If economic recovery comes soon, Dr. Lorwin believes present trends will lead to a quasi-public trade unionism in which organizing drives will be reduced, conciliation between unions and employers accentuated, and the Federation would play a part similar to the one played during the War. In exchange for government aid the unions would undoubtedly lose some traditional liberties and be tied more closely to the constructive functions of industry. Dr. Lorwin sees this as part of a world trend, and believes free trade unionism, the product of a rising democracy and competitive capitalism to be doomed. This was probably written before the N. R. A. program got under way. Perhaps this program will verify his prediction.

The book makes a number of suggestions to enable the Federation to change its organization so as to meet the pressing problems of the day. These include the assumption of greater disciplinary powers over affiliated unions through changing the voting system at conventions, reorganizing the executive council and dividing the member unions into more industrial departments; working out a general policy based on research; establishing an organizing department and a department of education; and the forming of a political council with other labor groups. But he sees as the basic problem of the Federation the question, "whether the American skilled workers can rise above their present group egotism, reconcile their own interests with those of the semi-skilled and unskilled, and evolve a labor organization truly national in scope and character."

These suggestions, however, have several weaknesses. First, it is highly improbable that the skilled workers will know how to organize the unskilled and semi-skilled masses; or that they will relinquish what they consider their craft rights and give up their leadership in whole or in part to the unskilled and semi-skilled majorities to be organized. It is difficult to believe that the unions dominated by the skilled "can rise above their group egotism" because of their inherent craft and quasi middle class attitude, and that (especially under the N. R. A.) they will become much more than an appendage to big business interests. It is much more likely that if militant unionism does develop it will come either from dissatisfied groups outside of the A. F. of L. or from temporary government aid resulting in an increased proportion of organized unskilled and semi-skilled, rather than from changes in representation at conventions, from research, or from policies developed by the present leadership.

While criticism should be minimized in connection with a work of the scope and general excellence of this, there are a number of minor points which one regrets were inadequately discussed. For example, it is surprising to find the Amalgamated Clothing Workers relegated to a footnote when one considers the extent to which many of the A. F. of L. unions have copied its policies; and to find the important pre-war trade union activities of the Socialists hardly mentioned.

Of greater importance are certain larger questions that the reviewer believes should have been treated either more fully or differently in order to explain the history and predict the future of the A. F. of L. and the American Labor movement. Thus, it is necessary to analyze more fully the outstanding tendencies, during the formative decades of the eighties and nineties, which resulted in the peculiar crystalization of the attitudes and devices which still dominate the unions of Federation. It must also be clearly understood that most of the leading trade unions have feared the encroachments of the unskilled almost as much as those of the employers. This is important both to understand the struggles to control changing technique, and to comprehend the quasi middle class position that the A. F. of L. and most of its unions have played both in relation to other American workers, and the communities in which they lived, and to workers in Europe and Asia. The degree and importance of this middle class position both in policy and theory has never been adequately appreciated or explained. It cannot be too strongly emphasized that most of the American trade

unions have not been proletarian in the strict sense of the term.

The policies and methods of the unions in the face of problems of changing technique have never been satisfactorily studied. Yet this is essential to understanding the weakness of the American Labor movement. As the twentieth century progressed, skilled craftsmen found themselves on the one hand crushed between the nether mill stone of the unskilled and semi-skilled and the upper millstone of the scientific manager and the engineer; and on the other, left in relatively unmechanized industries in little industrial pockets while the main stream of the growing mass industries swept them aside. In the face of these changes, the policy of sticking to or reverting to the trade unionism of the nineties must be shown to be especially ineffective.

A full understanding of the American trade union movement must also include further analysis of individual trade unions in detail, of industrial trends and possibilities, of the changing character and size of markets, of absentee ownership, and of the development of American and world capitalism. Although partially adequate studies have been made in these fields, they have never been satisfactorily blended with the study of the labor movement.

GEORGE MARSHALL

COUP D'ETAT: *The Technique of Revolution*, by Curzio Malaparte. 1932. E. P. Dutton.

MALAPARTE is an Italian Fascist who has set out to sketch objectively the technique of the capture and defense of the modern state. His thesis is that the modern coup d'etat is essentially a technical problem, and he cites approvingly Trotsky's remark: "Insurrection is an engine, technical experts are needed to start it and they alone can turn it off." The tactics of insurrection constitute a set of autonomous methods which are independent of the particular circumstances obtaining in the given country. "The Russia of Kerenski offers no more of a problem than Holland or Switzerland for the practical application of the October tactics of 1917." Lenin, for example, enumerated four factors that were peculiar to the Russian revolutionary situation: the conjunction of revolution with the end of an imperialist war, the war which occupied those who otherwise would have united to suppress the Bolsheviks, the immensity of Russia and its lack of adequate means for communication, and the revolutionary movement which aroused the peasant masses. But, argues Malaparte, if revolutionary tactics depended upon such favorable circumstances, "there would not

be a Communist peril just now in all the states of Europe." "Not the masses make a revolution, but a mere handful of men, prepared for any emergency, well-drilled in the tactics of insurrection, trained to strike hard and quickly at the vital organs of the State's technical services. These shock troops should be recruited from among specialized workmen: mechanics, electricians, telegraph and radio operators acting under the orders of technical engineers who understand the technical working of the State."

Lenin's four factors I should interpret rather as an explanation of why the Russian revolution was able to stand its ground. An insurrection is not a revolution; the latter implies a more permanent domination of the country's mechanisms and activities, evidenced in its entire structure. Any displacement of one clique by another could, however, qualify as an insurrection. Communism confronts Europe not because the art of insurrection has been recently modified, but because the working classes are conscious of their conditions and aspirations. Malaparte insists that police methods are useless against the technique of revolution, and that Liberal governments can avail themselves no longer of ordinary police measures against Communist or Fascist outbreaks. None the less, it still remains true that a government can fall back on its army, and by defending its centers of power and communication with soldiers, possibly crush the insurrection. A state which has the support of the working classes possesses the most powerful weapon of all against insurrection. The defeat of the Kapp Putsch by the workers' general strike stands out vividly in this connection. And Malaparte calls upon his own experience to describe how for three years Mussolini waged a desperate battle against the labor unions who confronted him with a determined and bloody opposition. Lack of effective leadership prevented the achievement then and there of proletarian revolution.

Malaparte's book is uneven, and more gossip than analytical. His chapter on Hitler is especially bad, and once again he ignores the basic class alignments together with the technique of propaganda so essential to successful revolution. He thinks of insurrections as one would think of moves on a chess-board, and fails to correlate the arousing of the people to a revolutionary consciousness as an element in the historical process. Finally, the book does contain the serious warning that revolutionary tactics demand training and manoeuvres. Current strikes provide as good a school as any for such activity, and those who would arouse the populace more dramatically could organize them-

selves into a technical squad and greet ambassadors like General Balbo with streamers down Broadway condemning a murderer and an enemy of labor.

LEWIS S. FEUER

Whad'ye Mean—Class Struggle?

By ROBERT DELSON

The following entry in the "Whad'ye Mean—Class Struggle?" contest was awarded the prize of Trotsky's three-volume History of the Russian Revolution.

The term "the class struggle" designates at least four distinct concepts and is a misnomer, if literally interpreted, for two of these. It is therefore not surprising that confusion exists as to the meaning of the term—a confusion which has occasioned great injury to the socialist movement because of the failure of many of its adherents to act in accordance with these concepts of the class struggle. These concepts are:

1. *The antagonism of the immediate interests of the classes—i.e., their interests within the framework of capitalism.* The workers' interests are best served, within capitalism, by high wages, steady employment, short hours, healthful (and expensive) working conditions, peace, and the truth as to the actual facts of their condition. The owners' interests are best served, or at least they so act, by low wages, discharge of "unnecessary" workers, long hours, poor working conditions, war, and concealment of the truth. This antagonism of interests is an objective fact—it would exist even if the workers were not conscious of it, and even if they did not carry on a struggle to realize their interests.

2. *The actual struggle to realize these immediate interests.* The workers are in fact conscious of this antagonism of interests. Accordingly, they carry an actual struggle over them, a struggle well described by the term "the class struggle." Strikes, boycotts, lockouts, injunctions, military suppression—these certainly constitute a struggle. But the struggle exists even when the dispute is in the form of negotiations, by an individual worker or a union, as to wages and conditions. This struggle also has a political aspect, i.e., the activities of workers parties for "immediate demands."

3. *The antagonism of the ultimate interest of the classes—i.e. their interest in the maintenance or abolition of capitalism.* The workers are usually defeated in the struggle over their immediate interests and in any event their condition under capitalism can never be favorable as the existing method of production is capable of providing. Low wages, unemployment, slavery and

(Continued on page 21)

The Literature of Revolt

(Continued from page 10)

from the conservative publishing house of Houghton Mifflin Co. for one dollar. It reveals a most attractive personality, a man filled with love for humanity and belief in the human race, who in this faith would abolish all government, all power of man over man, and in service of this ideal would endure all hardships of poverty, imprisonment, exile risk, all dangers even to death.

Kropotkin's *Memoirs* introduced to the American reader a new type of character and experience, a new order of literary values. Our conception of revolution had been limited to the political revolution of which the Daughters of the American Revolution keep bright the memory. Kropotkin illustrates the value of the approach to social theory through human experience—that is, the literary approach. We have had another striking exemplification of this in Emma Goldman's *Living My Life*, published last year. And in general for readers who wish to follow in literature the theme of revolt, biography may be prescribed for the first steps. The letters of Alexander Herzen, the life of Marx by Ruhle, the life of Marx's great rival, Bakunin, the life of Jaures, the life and letters of Rosa Luxemburg—Red Rose, who with Liebknecht fell victim to reaction at the close of the World War, as Jaures at its beginning. The life of Ferdinand Lassalle has been the basis of a literature of its own. The leader of the International Workingmen's Association in the early sixties he achieved such power in Germany as to bring Bismarck into negotiation with a movement which he hated. He fell in love with Helene von Dönnigers, of an aristocratic family, and was mortally wounded in a duel with a representative of her family. *Lassalle's Leiden* was a book of a popularity not incomparable to that of *Werther's Leiden*, a century before. George Meredith made this famous love story the theme of his novel *The Tragic Comedians*. But the best study of Lassalle as a revolutionist is that by Georg Brandes.

In the department of historical writing the literature of revolt is subject to a handicap. History is chiefly written from the point of view of the victors in the class struggle. The history of the French revolution in English is colored by the nationalistic prejudice which developed during the long war which England waged against that movement. Yet Carlyle, as I have pointed out, was the first to see the importance of the mass movement, the people, the mob, as the groundswell of revolution. Carlyle's *French Revolution* is a high peak in the literature of revolt—literature, I say, because

it is not only a narrative of events but much more a record of the emotional state with which Carlyle reacted to them—it is, in other words, expressionistic history. In French literature the Revolution has naturally been a theme of highest importance. Here again, the reaction blasted the leaders' reputations and presented them as monsters to frighten children. Of the revolutionary triumvirate, Danton was the first to emerge from the shadows as a great personality. Romain Rolland made him the subject of a tragedy. Robespierre has been rescued from obloquy by the labors of M. Mathiez, I suppose it is fair to assume that Anatole France had Robespierre in mind when he created the hero of that intensive study of revolutionary psychology—*The Gods are Athirst*. Marat still awaits his apologist. It will be hard for him to make headway against the romantic interest in Charlotte Corday. The story of the Paris Commune of 1871 has been told only by the conquerors. It remains the most conspicuous example of the injustice of history. What is needed at the present time is a factual and impartial history of the revolutionary movement in Europe since 1848—but those who control material like those who merely guess at it, find it difficult to be impartial.

The theme of revolt has penetrated fiction, drama, and especially the moving picture. In America two outstanding cases of social wrong, that of Sacco and Vanzetti and that of Tom Mooney have been the suggestion for novels and plays—Upton Sinclair's *Boston* is a powerful example of the journalistic novel and in its heroine, Cornelia, Thornwell who leaves her family and station as dowager of a governor of Massachusetts, to earn her bread in the Plymouth Cordage Company, it presents a striking study of the loyalty of the privileged to the submerged class. *Gods of the Lightning* by Maxwell Anderson is a play on the distortion of legal justice which follows the lines of the famous case. On its first night in New York the audience stood at its conclusion and applauded for twenty minutes, but it disappeared from the theatre soon afterwards, not without suspicion of discreet suppression.

The drama has always been a powerful instrument of propaganda. One characteristic of the modern stage is its utilization of mass effects, in such plays as Hauptmann's *Die Weber*; the second part of Björnson's *Beyond Human Power*, Galsworthy's *Strife* and Toller's *Masse Mensch*. Gorky's *Lower Depths* while using selected types is a genuine drama of the Proletariat, as is Elmer Rice's *Street Scene*. One of the keenest satires on the present social order was John Lawson's *Procellanial*. The discovery of new material and realistic

effects to be drawn from the hitherto submerged class, the signs of the emergence of a proletarian culture, and the romantic appeal of militancy are unquestionably motives inspiring the younger writers of poetry, fiction and drama today. The great rally of these men and women with other artists and intellectuals at Boston to protest against the judicial murder of Sacco and Vanzetti—Edna St. Vincent Millay, John Dos Passos, Paxton Hibben, Powers Hapgood, to mention only a few of them—was an event in the history of American literature. It marks the beginning of a change in psychological climate. It was a significant fact that so many of the promising younger writers signed the manifestoes in favor of the radical candidates Norman Thomas and William Z. Foster in the last presidential election.

Should we welcome this new literature of revolt, or deprecate it? Clearly, if we are to expect a radical change in our social order we should welcome it as a preparation of the public mind. That such a change is impending who can doubt? Some years ago, however, Mr. Lyford Patterson Edwards published a volume entitled *The Natural History of Revolution*, in which he subjected contemporary society to a rough application of tests drawn from evolutionary geology and biology, and showed that we were in a catastrophic period, in which various phenomena indicated a revolutionary movement as certainly as the behavior of a stream and the contour of a mountain-side give warning of precipitous falls. Since Mr. Edwards wrote his book the symptoms have multiplied. The word revolution is no longer one to be expurgated from a sane vocabulary. Even official announcements recognize in cautious language the coming change. The report of the President's Committee on Recent Social Trends expresses a pious disclaimer "of assuming an attitude of alarmist irresponsibility" but declares that "it would be highly negligent to gloss over the stark and bitter realities of the social situation." To deal with them it prescribes "willingness and determination to undertake important integral changes in the reorganization of social life, including the economic and political orders"—that is to say in Professor John A. Hobson's phrase, "revolution by consent," but nevertheless, revolution. "The report in itself," says the *New Republic*, "is both a revolutionary protest and a revolutionary act. It constitutes one of the most important of the processes of a great social change. . . . Without this sort of activity by leaders of intelligence no social revolution, whether violent or non-violent, ever occurred."

If great changes are to come—and John Stuart Mill said seventy years ago that if the choice were between

the present social order and Marxian communism all the chances and dangers of the latter were as dust in the balance—it is of the utmost necessity that the minds of men should be prepared for them. Especially is this true if the changes are to take place without violent opposition and to become permanent. The great enemy of social change is that men having put their hands to the plow will turn back, and that there will be a period of ebb and flow, of disorder and violence, of unsettlement in which civilization and humanity itself may be thrown back, losing the gain made under political democracy—and doubtful as we may at times think that gain, it is very real in the right it gives to initiate further advance, more fundamental reformation. If any great and permanent change is to take place in the conduct of human affairs, it is time, as Burke long ago said, that the minds of men must draw that way, that every emotion of hope and fear must forward it. To make opinion tolerant and flexible, to encourage speculation and experiment, to cultivate an aesthetic which will find self-interest vulgar and repulsive, which will purge the mind by pity and terror, pity for the wretched victims of society and terror of the wrath to come upon the oppressors and those who enjoy the fruits of oppression—this is the function of literature in a changing age.

Whad'ye Mean — Class Struggle?

(Continued from page 19)

war are inevitable concomitants of capitalism. They can be abolished only by socialism. Accordingly, it is to the interests of the workers to abolish, as it is to the interests of the owners, to maintain capitalism. This antagonism, as well as the antagonism over immediate interests, exists whether or not the workers are conscious of it.

4. *The actual struggle to realize this ultimate interest.* The workers who are conscious of this ultimate class interest are "class-conscious" and they carry on the struggle to achieve socialism. The worker's political party, backed by the labor union ready to use its strength for political purposes, are the chief instruments of this struggle.

So completely are the interests of the owning class in opposition to the socialist society, that this class will not readily yield to the constitutional victory of the workers. The owning class will in fact do what it can to prevent such a victory, and since it controls the state, it can withdraw democracy when that becomes unserviceable for its purpose. Workers conscious of their interests will use any means needed to win the class struggle. . . .

Umbrella Over City College

(Continued from page 6)

the middle of the school year, following the suspension of nineteen students for an off-campus activity, whether they had anything to do with an underground publication, *The Student*, etc.

Different members of the faculty had differing opinions as to why suspensions were being made. Some said it was because the pacifist students interfered illegally with a regular college function. But the committee itself suspended students for "conduct unbecoming a college student and not in the best interests of the college," and because the Jingo Day demonstration "instances an attitude that is harmful to the college." When asked whether the committee had clearly defined for itself what such an attitude and what such conduct was, Dr. Gottschall, the acting Dean, replied, it couldn't do so "any more than good manners could be defined." On this tenuous basis the committee later suspended one student for introducing Norman Thomas at an off-campus protest meeting.

After the "Umbrella Attack" City College became an armed camp. Police radio cars patrolled it at all times. Stool pigeons were all around. Riot cars came racing down the avenues. Students in groups were in danger of having their names taken down by detectives. Self-appointed vigilantes bestowed bloody noses upon the "Reds."

Classes ended on June seventh. From the day of the first suspensions on June first, to the closing of school a nucleus of one hundred undergraduates worked like trojans to get the truth out to the public on the umbrella incident, for they believed that had the President not lost his head and attacked them, the unauthorized pacifist meeting would have been ignored by the faculty as previous such meetings had been ignored. Several undergraduates had the courage to get up and speak at street meetings knowing full well that the action meant suspension. The faculty was less courageous.

Meanwhile an opposition had been organizing among athletes, R.O.T.C. men and other student patriots. Spurred on by a demand of Major Holton's, a member of the faculty, that loyal students use "controlled force" to stamp out the demonstrations these fellows showered rotten eggs, tomatoes, bags of water and harder objects on the heads of speakers, and have bloodied the noses of protesting students. The "vigilantes," however, were in such a minority that they usually did not dare to come out in the open, but operated from rooftops and under cover of darkness.

On the last day of school the students in desperation

called a strike. Most undergraduates were too fearful to come out. Finally at eleven o'clock some two hundred were mustered around the flagpole. No sooner did Tucker P. Smith start to speak than the riot car came racing down in the hot sun and a cordon of police began breaking up the students. The latter started to chant, "Police off the campus, police off the campus," and finally several went in to Dean Gottschall to ask for protection from the police. Haggard and worn out by the whole affair he told them to come up to the Great Hall. The word spread like fire and soon half the student body had crowded in. Professor Morris R. Cohen and Professor Mead came up to the side of the Dean. He got up on the platform and his remarks explained the attitude of members of the faculty who are known not to be Robinson-men nor redbaiters. Quietly he said: "I have been at this college since I was eleven years old . . . I love this college . . . I am loyal to it more than to anything else . . . Some of you have other loyalties. Loyalty to the college comes very low among them. . . . Obedience to the rules of the college is essential if the college is to continue . . . I ask you to disperse and go about your duties as students." The crowd went out to a street corner where the attitude of the students was revealed. The President of the college was responsible for the whole ugly incident. Why didn't the faculty take some action against the vigilantes? Why didn't some professor have guts enough to say something about Major Holton's advocacy of "controlled force?" Why had the committee hearings turned into star chamber proceedings against all the active liberals and radicals at the college?

The end result of the umbrella incident was the expulsion of twenty students, the suspension of eight until January, 1934, and three others, indefinitely, and the revocation of the charters of the three liberal clubs.

On Commencement night five alumni of the college picketed the academic procession in caps and gowns with placards demanding the ousting of Robinson. A loyal member of the faculty detached himself from the procession and rushed the picketers, giving the police an excuse to intervene. The same night an issue of *The Student* appeared detailing the tyrannical, illiberal record of Robinson at City College.

The administration considers the issue to be one of whether it will allow students to break college rules and then to use punishments for such infractions as foci for political agitation. The students want to know whether the administration intends to enforce just those regulations which will hamstring all effective agitation against R.O.T.C. fees, etc.

FREE FOR ALL

Socialism and War

DEAR SIR:

During the years that preceded the World War, anxious meetings were held by the Labor and Socialist International to consider proposals for action against the impending general European conflict. The French delegates urged a general strike of all labor, but German opposition led to the resolution that socialists should vigorously oppose war; if war, however, should come, they must strive to bring about an early peace. Bebel, in fact, had once declared that German socialists would join in a war against Russian invasion, Russia, "a barbarian who is the greatest enemy of our aspirations." In this background, the ineffectual opposition to the war is understandable; the social Democrats could vote unanimously for the war credits, and Jaurès' threat of a general strike was unfortified by any carefully worked out plans.

The recent decisions of the International are fraught similarly with ambiguities dangerous to socialist policy and the interests of the laboring classes. The Federation of Trade Unions is relied on to call a general strike within the aggressor nation, assisted by the boycott of the workers of neutral nations. That country is the aggressor which refuses to accept arbitration according to an outlined procedure, in which the League of Nations figures. In the first place, a critical situation is to be expected if a dispute should arise involving a non-member nation like Russia. One might well expect Russia's refusal to arbitration by capitalist nations. In that case, the grotesque possibility of the International's declaration of a strike in Russia by Russian labor would arise, and the European working classes would be expected to boycott Russian goods and conceivably, march to war against Russia. Furthermore, war may move far too swiftly than the contemplated judicial action, if we are to judge by the League's speed in the Japanese crisis. Again, the L.S.I. might not be in session at the moment for unified action, or the case might be a genuinely difficult one in which no general consensus as to the aggressor would emerge.

I think it is useless to look forward for a successful general strike, when the strike is confined a priori to the borders of the "aggressor" nation. Such a strike call together with boycotts by French and Polish workers would only provide a Hitlerite Germany with convenient nationalist propaganda. I should insist, further, on the analogy between the potential Franco-German war and the guise which the German-Russian war took in 1914. Those who preach the war against Fascism may be expected to take the same vacation from socialist principles which German patriots took on behalf of the war against autocracy. The so called war of liberation is generally a vicious sort of abstraction, for it is used to conceal the less pleasing aspects of financial and industrial rivalry. Moreover, the International's policy, involves the postulate of isolated wars, the assumption that a war is confined to the areas where it first breaks out. The German-Russian conflict in 1914 was compounded with other aggressions such as the invasion of Belgium, all of which weight

the analysis with diplomatic claims and counterclaims whose elaboration is endless. The use of "aggression" as the criterion for labor's policy would only serve to entangle its proponents in meshes of helplessness.

The L.S.I. multiplies difficulties unnecessarily. As military strategists point out, it is an advantage to go into battle with a clear-cut, simple plan. What is more, this plan can be founded on the unity of the working classes and loyalty to socialism. The International persists in clinging to the notion of defensive and aggressive war, a capitalist myth which leads labor to ludicrous formulations and tragically stupid actions. Almost completely forgotten is the place which the attainment of socialism should occupy in meeting these situations. Lloyd George recently pleaded for more tolerance towards Nazi Germany, because after all, it was actively safeguarding Europe from the Communist menace. But the establishment of socialism is precisely that which must unite socialists against a national government England, a Liberal France, and a Hitlerite Germany. Let us declare that no worker will ever again aim his rifle at another. Let us urge a general strike in all capitalist countries going to war, and urge the workers to recognize that their own offensive war against capitalism annihilates the distinctions of defendant and aggressor. Workers of neutral nations must refuse to send war-materials to belligerents. By these methods could socialist policy assure its expression of working-class aspirations.

LEWIS S. FEUER,
Harvard University

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE

NORMAN THOMAS has just started on another swing around the country.

GEORGE FENNER is the pseudonym of a New York student active in socialist cultural work.

A. FENNER BROCKWAY, leader of the Independent Labour Party of England, has just arrived in this country fresh from a battle with British trade unionists against endorsement of the Roosevelt program.

ROBERT MORSS LOVETT is possibly best known to American students as the co-author of Moody and Lovett's "History of English Literature." To us he has come to be known as one of the most unselfish and conscientious workers despite his age, for the co-operative commonwealth. Professor Lovett is President of the League for Industrial Democracy and one of the editors of "The New Republic."

A professional-looking, hard-working, youthful student, Bob Delson is one of the organizers of the Militant socialist movement.

LEWIS FEUER has just returned to Harvard for his third year of graduate study.

GEORGE MARSHALL was one of the most active people in the socialist movement before he became ill. We are glad to see him back in the midst of things.

*When Arguments Fly Fast on the NRA—
Where Do Socialists Stand?*

Read

NORMAN THOMAS

on

**A Socialist Looks at
The New Deal**

T E N C E N T S

•
All radicals should have handy the
L. I. D. BOOKLIST
of Significant Recent Books on

Social Reconstruction

F I V E C E N T S

•
All Pamphlets Free to Dollar Members of the L.I.D.

•
LEAGUE FOR INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY
112 East 19th Street New York City

WORLD EVENTS

Edited by Devere Allen

Issued on the first and fifteenth of
each month from October to June
inclusive. Correspondents and
sources of information throughout
the world. Published by

Nofrontier News Service
Wilton, Connecticut

Subscription: 25 CENTS A YEAR

A P O C K E T P E R I O D I C A L
F O R S T U D E N T S O F I N T E R N A T I O N A L A F F A I R S

The **STUDENT OUTLOOK**

fights against

**WAR
CAPITALISM
RACE PREJUDICE
INTELLECTUAL SHAM**

YOU CAN KEEP INFORMED OF THIS FIGHT BY—

1. Membership in the League for Industrial Democracy, receiving six (6) issues of **THE STUDENT OUTLOOK**, other notices and regular L. I. D. pamphlets.
2. Subscription for twelve (12) issues at \$1.00.

**THE LEAGUE FOR INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY IS A MEMBERSHIP
SOCIETY ENGAGED IN EDUCATION TOWARDS A SOCIAL ORDER
BASED ON PRODUCTION FOR USE RATHER THAN FOR PROFIT**

(1) I,, hereby apply for membership
in the League for Industrial Democracy and enclose
\$1.00 as annual membership dues, \$.50 of which is for
a year's subscription to **THE STUDENT OUTLOOK**.

Name

Address

College Year.....

(2) I enclose \$1.00 for twelve (12) issues of **THE STUDENT OUTLOOK**.

Name

Address

.....

.....