

The STUDENT OUTLOOK

The Intercollegiate Socialist Review

Storm Over Austria

By JEF RENS

*Secretary of the International Socialist Student Federation
who was in Vienna during the fighting*

A "Slacker's" Apology

By MORRIS RAPHAEL COHEN

Government by Subsidy

By KENNETH MEIKLEJOHN

Vol. II, No. 4 - March, 1934

PRICE TEN CENTS

PUBLISHED BY THE INTERCOLLEGIATE LEAGUE FOR INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY

The Student Outlook

THE INTERCOLLEGIATE SOCIALIST REVIEW

Student Edition

Published Monthly from October to May by

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

VOL. II, No. 4

EDITORS

Joseph P. LashChairman
Robert AsherUniversity of Chicago
Roland BurdickSyracuse
George C. EdwardsHarvard
Richard FeiseJohns Hopkins University
Lewis S. FeuerHarvard
Eleanor GayUniversity of California
Kenneth MeiklejohnColumbia University
Maurice NeufeldUniversity of Wisconsin
Richard N. ScammonUniversity of Minnesota
Aileen McQuownGoucher

Felix S. Cohen Mary Fox Lucy Kramer Harold Levine
Paul Porter Ruth E. Schechter Joel Seidman
Monroe Sweetland

Entered as second class matter, June 9, 1933 at the Post
Office of New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1933.



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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

This is Our Heritage <i>An Editorial</i>	3
April 13th—Strike Against War	4
Fisk Accepts Jim-Crowism	4
Government by Subsidy <i>Kenneth Meiklejohn</i>	5
The Spirit of 314—A Poem <i>M. H. Bastow</i>	7
The C. C. C. Stands Ready <i>Jean Ford</i>	8
War and the Student—Two Conferences <i>Baltimore—Northampton</i>	9
A "Slacker's" Apology <i>Morris Raphael Cohen</i>	10
Storm Over Austria <i>Jef Rens</i>	12
Socialist Errors in Austria <i>Otto Bauer</i>	17
Another View	18
Peace on Earth—A Poem <i>Ben Shangold</i>	18
Literature of Revolt Professional Revolutionist <i>Joseph P. Lash</i>	19
A Student Demonstration	20
<i>Illustrated by Bernard Finestone</i>	
Agitate! Educate! Organize! College Notes	21

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

The STUDENT OUTLOOK

The Intercollegiate Socialist Review

VOL. II

MARCH, 1934

No. 4

This Is Our Heritage

An Editorial

WORLD Socialism has spoken. Amidst a world madly headed for war and barbarism, a handful of Socialists in Austria arose and gave their lives for those sacred symbols for which civilized man has died through the ages. For Peace, for Freedom, and for that new vision, Socialism. Or was it for Socialism alone, since without the latter there can be no peace, without the latter man lives in economic bondage?

They died in a revolutionary uprising against Fascism, which systematizes all the iniquities Socialism is braced against: wage-slavery, the pitting of nation against nation, the pitting of race against race, religious and intellectual intolerance, political tyranny.

Never have the forces of reaction been more clamorous. Never, in recent time, have they been more openly bent on destroying one another. Mussolini moves up two regiments to the Austrian border. Hitler counters with movement of his Nazi legions. Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia increase their frontier detachments. If these troops make a battleground of Austria, in the name of what high purposes will they be fighting? Whose ends will they be serving? Those of labor? Of the farmer or peasant? Of the professional worker or student?

Throughout the world it is the same. Everywhere headlines are blazoning increased armaments as national antagonisms become fiercer. Everywhere a servile press and cinema exacerbate the resentments caused by far flung monetary and trade rivalries.

Who desires war? Not you or I. Not this fellow walking beside us in the street bemused by the spring sunshine. These forces, larger than ourselves, that are engulfing us in destruction—what are their human mainsprings; what can avail against them? Only one movement. Against intolerance, personal ambition, greed as embodied in the profit system, only the strength of the international working class can prevail.

When the Nazis came into power in Germany without a show of fight from either Communists or Socialists, it seemed as if there were no power able to withstand Fascism. On February 12th, world socialism, representing the common peoples of the world, through the Austrian Socialist Party, suddenly bared its fist.

The Socialists of France with their mammoth parade against Fascism on the day Doumergue came into power; of Czechoslovakia who tied up the country in a general strike of sympathy with the Austrian Socialists; of England and the Scandinavian countries—these are the men and women who represent the heroic ideas of our century. They stand stripped for action.

That is the significance of the battle of the Austrian Socialists. It has renewed and strengthened the determination of the working class the world over to fight



for their ideals and rights. It has reanimated the world socialist movement.

In *The New York Times* for February 20th this little story from Vienna appeared: "Among those buried today, almost secretly, in Central Cemetery was George Weissel, a Socialist. Only twenty persons were present at his burial, of whom fifteen were police. He was the captain commanding the fire station in Florisdorf, and obviously the leader of the resistance there, which held off the besieging forces for almost three days. When he was sentenced to death, he said: 'I die with no regrets. I am a worker, and I have fought to save my home. You can kill me, but you cannot kill us. I do not ask for mercy—hang me.' As he was being led to the scaffold, he gave a great shout, 'Long Live the Socialist International.'"

That is our heritage.

April 13th — Strike Against War

*"SURE, I'm opposed to war,
but what can I do about it?"*

Here are a list of recommendations for student activity against war. They were drawn up at a meeting of the Student Section of the American League against War and Fascism while the Student L.I.D., in the hope that the League could be built up into a broad unifying agency of the groups opposed to war, was still actively cooperating in its work.

From April 6th, the date of America's entry into the World War, to April 13th has been declared National Student Anti-War Week. In that period students will organize mass meetings, picket public buildings with peace slogans, and on Friday, April 13th, from eleven to twelve refrain from going to classes in a one hour student anti-war strike.

During that hour, undergraduates and faculty who will strike in order to show how determined is their opposition to war, will gather on the campus in picket lines. The rallying cries will be: "Schools not Battle-ships," "Abolish the R.O.T.C.," "Fight against Imperialist Wars," "Refuse to Cooperate in Any War the United States Government May Undertake."

Organize now, if you are serious about making that week an important effort for peace on your campus. Call together a committee of faculty members and students to take charge of preparations for the strike. Now is the time to prove whether all the people who have said they were opposed to war really meant it.

No one has to be persuaded that war is imminent. If that is so, then we must act in a way that will convince our government that we will not participate in any war it will undertake.

Such a move is not futile. Public officials are sensitive to the overwhelming demand of the producing classes of this country for peace. Especially are they aware of the peace movement that is sweeping the campuses. As Monroe Sweetland points out in *Agitate! Educate! Organize!*, nothing caused Speaker Rainey more anguish than the statement that the students would refuse to fight in the next war.

If the anti-war movement is to be confined to polite intra-mural mutters, and undergraduate editorials all hedged about with qualifications, then of course there

will be war. And how grotesque it will seem to the survivors of that conflict, standing amid the shambles, to remember that on April 13th, 1934, students refused to strike because they considered the move too sensational, or out of proportion to the peril that prompted the call for the strike. . . .

Fisk Accepts Jim-Crowism

SHALL a Negro university accept Jim - Crowism? That is the issue raised by the forced withdrawal of Ishmael P. Flory, fellow at Fisk University. When the President, Thomas E. Jones, contracted to have the Fisk Jubilee Singers, an undergraduate chorus, appear at Loew's Theatre in Nashville, several students protested since the theatre is known for its Jim-Crow policy. Flory published an account of the protest in the *Afro-American* and was then asked to withdraw from the University.

This is not an isolated instance at Fisk. The Administration has not protested the policy of segregation at the University Social Center in Nashville at which many university functions are held. The President and other faculty members do not scruple to attend Jim-Crow functions. Flory concludes in his signed statement: "that so long as the Negro accepts the inferior status as is implied in such practices as 'Jim Crow' without fighting against them, just so long will he be oppressed. Some of the facts of 'Jim-Crow' like riding trains in the South are per force accepted by the Negro, but things like theatres and other amusement, can be avoided. Sacrifice, of course, is demanded. Isn't it the only road to freedom? It is alleged around Nashville that Mrs. J. C. Napier, past seventy, and a few other old timers have not ridden 'Jim-Crow' street cars since their inauguration in 1905. If these people can take such a stand against 'Jim-Crow,' certainly college Negroes ought to be able to do likewise."

Norman Thomas, the national office of the Student L.I.D. and the colleges affiliated with the League around Baltimore have already wired their protests to President Jones. The telegram of the Baltimore chapters read: "White and colored students here are carrying on a fight against racial discrimination. They call on you to drop action against other students and reinstate Flory."

We urge all chapters of the Student L.I.D. to do likewise.

Government by Subsidy

By KENNETH MEIKLEJOHN

GOVERNMENTS are the political expressions in the modern world, as in the ancient and feudal days, of the interests of the dominant economic groups. They are the instruments whereby order is maintained, disputes are settled, and the relations between groups and individuals are set. Lenin has termed those who control the government and shape its policy "the executive committee" of the capitalist class. In every way possible the needs and desires of the latter are satisfied. Tariffs are enacted to operate as bounties to industry, by way of high prices; franchises are granted to utilities on easy terms; corporation laws are drafted with a view to furnishing as wide a scope for business activities as possible. In many ways, too numerous to catalogue here, the government can, and does, serve the capitalist class.

But government, like this class, must now and then experience stress and strain, corresponding roughly to the swing of the business cycle. The fact that unrest is directed against the government in times of depression is one of the most significant grounds for asserting the identity of the dominant economic and political groups. The efforts made by the latter to compel subjection by dissident classes, as in the use of the courts and police in strikes, and in dispersing hunger marchers and farmers with machine guns and tear gas, likewise indicate that officials regard themselves as in duty bound to protect the interests of business men, landlords and bankers. In times of crisis, indeed, the struggle develops into a matter of in whose hands governmental power shall rest. The instinct of farmers and workers in directing their agitational activity against officials is correct; so too is the willingness at such times, on the part of the latter, to repel attacks upon the existing power of relations by force, if necessary. Each responds to a situation rendered acute by depression, and responds in a manner that brings to light the underlying nature of government and of the functions which it performs in a capitalist world.

Not always do governments need to resort to force. Mussolini's Italy and Hitler's Germany represent one way in which the problems raised by economic crisis can be resolved, and the rising power of the working class repelled. A subtler method is, however, open. In March, 1933, America's social order was definitely imperiled. Our banking system had completely collapsed. Millions of men were on the streets. Industry was at a standstill. Farmers were in an ugly mood, openly defiant in the face of falling prices for their products

and an increasing debt burden. All this is familiar history now. The manner in which the Roosevelt government met this situation furnishes an example of a means whereby a ruling class can resist threats to its existence, in sharp contrast to the fascist "solutions" that are now sweeping over Europe.

The N.R.A. embodies, it seems to me, much more than an economic policy. It has definite political significance as well. From the time of his election President Roosevelt has been bidding for the support of labor, the farmers, and the discontented middle class. Billions of dollars have been poured out by the federal administration in an attempt to silence, at least temporarily, the most vicioferous sufferers from the depression.

Various appeals have been made, differing in form but relying upon the same motivation. The prospect of high prices is held out to the farmers, and they are induced by its lure to plow under cotton, to burn wheat, to slaughter hogs, to remove from cultivation a certain proportion of marginal land. Indeed, these were among the first groups that received governmental attention. And this is not surprising in view of the fact that strikes among dairy and other farmers last spring and summer had created a situation that could no longer be ignored. Revolt had been threatened. Relying upon pecuniary motives the government was able, by promising higher prices, and by direct loans and subsidies, to allay for a time the unrest that was becoming vocal and that was sweeping the western sections into chaos.

The process has been more open in the case of the unemployed, partly because America has not yet reached the attitude of scorn for those who are in distress which has been achieved in European countries—one must never forget the vicarious pleasure which the Puritans have always had in giving to charity—and partly because the need was more obvious. Outright dole has been resorted to. The public works program, the F.E. R.A., and the C.W.A. have, however, served another purpose—that of stifling protest from the groups from which most was to be feared. The C. C. C. camps removed 300,000 youths from localities in which they could make trouble and isolated them in spots where appropriate discipline and faith in the government could be instilled. Teachers and unemployed professional people are being paid out of C. W. S. funds. And recently provision was made for the payment of expenses up to \$20 to \$30 a month in the case of college students

unable to remain in or to enter institutions of higher education because of financial distress. In all this an eye has been kept constantly on points at which trouble might be expected.

Middle class groups have been pacified, not perhaps with too significant success, by means of the codes, which attempt to eradicate the competitive abuses from which they suffered at the hands of the larger business units. The patriotic appeal has been used in this sphere with considerable effect. Labor has been bought off with promises in the form of Section 7(a) of the Recovery Act. Minimum wages and maximum hours, even though more often than not counter-balanced by the rise in the cost of living, have served as effective rallying cries whereby the support of trade unions, and of the rank and file, as well as of the leadership, might be secured.

The intellectuals have, however, received the most interesting treatment of all. From the time of his election Roosevelt has been bidding for support from them. Their analysis of the defects of the Hoover do-nothing policy has proved extremely valuable in breaking down support for the latter's administration. Roosevelt has taken them into his administration. Where Hoover, and other "practical politicians" have scorned them, Roosevelt has given them positions of importance, and has incorporated them into the inner circle of his advisers. Men like Tugwell, Berle, Ezekiel, Hillman, and others, both well known and those not so famous, because they are still young, would have been dangerous enemies had they been allowed to remain on the outside. Stories that emanate from Washington indicating that all is not serene there, and that many of those working in the administration have grave questions as to efficacy of the program that is being followed give some indication of what might have happened were these men allowed the freedom of criticism which lack of responsibility for the governmental policy would have accorded them. Now, when economists complain that the gold policy is all wrong, or that the price program is bound to fail, they can always be answered that apparently some economists disagree with them.

There is, of course, no way of knowing whether or not President Roosevelt intended to silence the most hearkened-to critics of the capitalist system. But whether or not he did so desire, certainly his actions have accomplished that result. Once within the governmental premises, critics may be made to keep quiet. And very few have attempted to break out. Professor Ogburn and Miss Van Kleeck are notable exceptions. The great majority, which includes not a few socialists and Communists, have been taken in and have stayed.

Once in, economics plays its part. A job is a job, whether the employer be the state or a private person. It is a thing that has value, and hence must be kept. Other things must be sacrificed to it. Loyalties gather around it. Thus "the policy may have its faults, but Roosevelt is really interested in labor, the unemployed and the farmers"; "the government is at least trying to do something to alleviate the prevailing distress"; "the New Deal is far preferable to the policy of sitting still that was followed by Hoover"; and "things are moving in Washington these days." From this point it is but a small jump to the situation in which vested interests in the job and in the program arise. Not only is the silencing a temporary relief to an harrassed government, but it may become permanent, and may, moreover, result, in aligning quite definitely these groups alongside those whom they had formerly sought to expose for their waste and inefficiency, the capitalist class, whose primary concern is, after all, maintenance of power, regardless of how it is achieved. One wonders how many of the so-called radicals who have obtained jobs in Washington will come out, if they do emerge, as confirmed critics of the social and economic order as they were when they went in. One fears that, having "seen the game from the inside," they will tend to forgive inadequacies. Nothing will have changed, but it will seem to be a new world.

The policy has been remarkably effective. The unemployed have caused comparatively slight disturbances, considering their numbers and the inadequacy of the relief supplied to them before the New Deal became operative. The farmers have growled occasionally, but have in general been lulled into a state of willingness to give the program a chance. The intellectuals, outside the left-wing ranks, have argued about details, but "having friends in the administration," and "knowing what is *really* going on," have few questions about fundamentals. Even within the Socialist and Communist Party there has been an attitude of expectancy, not necessarily reflected in the publications, since to admit that minds have not been made up would be to deny the very foundations of their philosophies. We still do not know whether to call Roosevelt "fascist" or merely a "democratic dictator."

Since it has been effective, there would appear to be no basis for arguing against the wisdom of the policy. It has been subtle. It has its dangers, to be sure. While causing persons to become dependent directly upon the government for their livelihood, and in this, and other ways, creating for them an attitude of loyalty toward and an interest in the maintenance of the government,

the method can also turn these same people into antagonists as soon as the material support has been withdrawn. Some indication of this may be seen in the resentment aroused by the curtailment of C. W. A. projects, resulting in the elimination of many thousands from even temporary employment. This is levelled inevitably, under the present set-up, against the government, upon whom responsibility can be squarely placed. But so far the policy has worked, and pragmatic judgment would appear to require acceptance of this criterion as adequate defense for it.

That nothing has been really changed, or is likely to be altered may be thought, therefore, to be beside the point. Yet it is only because fundamental economic relationships have not been touched in any way, because property rights are still regarded in the same light, because nothing has been done to develop a program that will prevent recurrences of the type of catastrophe that we have been experiencing, that a policy of temporarily pacifying discontented groups can be seen in the light of its true function—that of giving time to the governing class, the capitalist class, to draw its lines together again and to reconstruct its defenses preparatory to launching a new offensive. So it is important to compare the temporary benefits that have accrued to labor, the unemployed, the middle class and the farmers with the actual results of the New Deal.

If the latter are studied, it can be seen that things are not much different than they were before Roosevelt came into office. Business improvement can be noted in some lines. But economic relationships are the same. Possibly an awareness that economic prosperity must be spread a little more widely and evenly, if profits are to be made, has been made manifest. Possibly a few abuses have been eradicated. Some measures of control in hitherto untouched fields may have been instituted. But power rests where it did before. Property rights are still supreme. Even where the latter seem to be temporarily suspended, as in the various state mortgage statutes, this has been justified as essential to the maintenance of the property system. Labor is still labor, and works for capital under the capitalist form of production and distribution, with all its contradictions and inefficiencies.

A word of explanation in conclusion. A point of view such as that advanced here is open to misunderstanding. Many are apt to think that it is induced by failure to appreciate the fact that the recovery program has wrought benefits for many millions of persons. In terms of immediate economic advantage this is undoubtedly true. Nevertheless, the fact remains that the admin-

istration has resorted to a policy of "government by subsidy," and that this must be judged in the light of the real accomplishments of the regime. It is because no modifications of fundamental relationships are evident that doles, and loans become mere subsidies with the sole purpose of pacifying temporarily the most vociferous and protestant elements. So long as the problem of power is not faced, nor that of in whose interest men are to be governed or to work, significant change is impossible. Only when the recovery program, if it ever does, proceeds to tackle these issues will the policy of "government by subsidy" justify itself as anything more than a device to gain time—for what?

THE SPIRIT OF 314

What the place is gone; what no more
Youth kneels to kindle fire upon the fane,
Worshipping gods who wait beyond the door
Tho pilgrim feet will not be heard again
Nor voices echo now within those walls
Uttering faith in yet unfashioned creeds,
Never believe that what was there is dead.

The temple was not all.

What we found there, now in our utmost need
We find again, wherever we have fled.

There was no ritual of word and word—
We made a poetry of living stuff;
The cadence of the universe we heard
Bar after bar, unstudied, in a rough
Tempestuous utterance of varied thot—
Men came and went, leaving behind a measure
Of deepening meaning, and we learned to weave
Patterns of what they brot.
How could such poetry, made of such treasure
World gathered, vanish now beyond retrieve?

Yet let it die, as music that once sounded
Within that garden, faded and was gone;
Let our last word be said and the unbounded
Never claim our dreams. Let what was done
Be long forgotten. Still will gods await
Beyond the door. And still on bended knees
To stranger gods, new youth will kindle fires
For life insatiate.

Others will come and others after these
Forever going, and following new desires.

M. H. BASTOW, '33

"*The Spirit of 314*" first appeared in the Syracuse University *Daily Orange* of January 18. Readers of THE STUDENT OUTLOOK will remember "314" as the women's living center at Syracuse which was ordered closed by the reactionary administration of the University because of its open sponsorship of radical programs and activities.



LAW STUDENTS

MARCHING OFF TO

A MILITARY WORK

CAMP IN GERMANY

IT WON'T BE

LONG NOW!

The C. C. C. Stands Ready

By JEAN FORD

IT WAS Assistant Secretary of War Harry Woodring who let the cat out of the bag. Perhaps few people would have realized just what was happening if it had not been for his ill-considered article which came out in the Jan. 6 issue of *Liberty Magazine* and which with colossal lack of discretion, proclaimed in hearty self-satisfaction that "the organization of over 300,000 men in more than 1500 Civilian Conservation Corps camps was the first real test of the Army's plans for war mobilization under the National Defense Act." Washington blushed furiously. They had said that the C.C.C. camps existed purely for the purpose of providing a livelihood for unemployed young men. Woodring had certainly spoken out of turn.

But those who speak out of turn are usually those with something important to say. Woodring said plenty. The following are a few of his statements: "... to those who fancy that we still have essentially the same old army which we had before the war, I can only point out that in two months last Spring, the Army recruited, conditioned, equipped and mobilized more men than we re-enlisted in the Spanish-American war, and did it so quietly and efficiently that few people in the country realized what was happening ... the C.C.C. mobilization demonstrated that the Army is ready to defend the nation ... Let me speak frankly! If this country should be threatened with foreign war, economic chaos, or social revolution, the Army has the training, the experience, the organization, and the men

to support the government and direct the country in the national interest. The C.C.C. mobilization is thus more than a great military achievement; it is a dress rehearsal of the Army's ability to intervene, under constitutional authority, in combating the depression. ... Sooner or later, in my opinion, we shall have to clear away many of the emergency organizations and simplify the government picture at Washington. ... Many (government bureaus) simply duplicate or extend the services which the Army is already organized to supply. It would not be too much to say that with proper constitutional authority, the Army could take over and run them in the interests of the New Deal. ... In my opinion, next year the individual C.C.C. set-up should be eliminated in the interest of economy and efficiency and the whole program taken over by the Army as part of its regular duties. ... If the Army were so directed, it could organize the veterans of the World War, the C.C.C. men, and through them the administration of the emergency relief, into a system of economic storm troops that could support the governments efforts to smash the depression."

A Hitler or a Mussolini could scarcely have struck a more genuinely Fascist note and in the symphony of National Recovery Administration we find this note beginning to grow into a persistent theme of muffled pragmatism. Looking back over the brief history of the C.C.C. camps, perhaps the Assistant Secretary of War's revelation's are not so surprising after all. Estab-

lished on the plan of the German youth camps, the C.C.C. has been taught to look toward these camps as a pattern. We find in the treatise of Osgood Nichols and Comstock Glaser titled *Work Camps for America* the following statement: "Germany is years ahead of us in the handling of this (youth camp) problem, and we cannot hope to omit the essential initial steps. They have developed there above all a vital national consciousness which is almost totally lacking in this country. However, that national consciousness is a goal for which we must strive and which we must reach before we can build that social order toward which we are working. . . . The present depression has given us the opportunity for the evolution of that ideal. The work camp can give us the means for spreading it among those who, in the future will be responsible for carrying it out."

Again there is the statement of Kenneth Holland, educational director of the C.C.C. camps in this corps area made in the NSFA publication, the *National Student Mirror* that: "30,000 of these people (American unemployed youth) are concentrated in camps where they can be taught the rudiments of government and

impressed with their duties as citizens. We must take advantage of this opportunity."

And again in an issue of *American Forests*, Arthur C. Ringland makes the statement: "Collectively the Army and forestry agencies are making their most valuable contribution. They are imbuing these young men with ideals of social responsibility to themselves to others, to their community and their country. We must give these young men of the C.C.C. a touch of glamour and color in their work—some equivalent of the martial spirit to take them out of themselves."

These are a few of the basic ideas on which the C.C.C. camps were originally founded. Small wonder that Harry Woodring, looking over the prospect of national defense finds that "the U. S. now has a higher degree of preparedness for war than ever before." Small wonder that he happily prophesies that "by next summer a million young men will be enrolled in the C.C.C." And, when the inevitable time comes, there should be small wonder to find that "the American Army stands ready" to hoist its banners and plunge into the bloody deluge of the next war.

War and the Student

Baltimore, March 3

FEATURING an unexpected but most inspiring talk by Emma Goldman, who happened to be in Baltimore at the time, in addition to scheduled addresses by Norman Thomas, J. B. Matthews, Edwin Johnson, and others, the Sixth Annual Intercollegiate Conference on "War and the Student" was held on March 2 and 3 at the Johns Hopkins University under the sponsorship of the Hopkins Liberal Club and the Goucher College L.I.D. Chapter.

Miss Goldman, pinch-hitting for a commander of the American Legion who failed to turn up, declared that few things are more encouraging than the fact that students today, understanding the position they are in, are beginning to brush aside "the cobwebs of intellectual superiority and realize that they are as much proletarians as the laboring class. The only difference is that the worker gets up at six in the morning to look for a job while the intellectual waits until nine o'clock." Miss Goldman made a stirring plea for strong cooperation between students and workers against the imminent danger of war.

Following Miss Goldman's talk, came Norman Thomas to denounce the illusion that preparedness is a means to peace as never more fantastic than today

—Two Conferences

when armaments can neither avoid war nor insure victory. "We get what we prepare for," he said, "and we can't prepare materially without preparing psychologically. Thus we arm because we are afraid, and we are afraid because we arm."

The climax of the conference came when some fifty student delegates from seven Maryland colleges signed a pledge that under no circumstances would they support any war entered into by the Government of the United States. The signers intend the declaration to be circulated widely among labor groups, unemployed organizations and churches as well as colleges.

The pledge was immediately denounced by militaristic groups in Maryland. Brigadier-General Richard called the action absurd. The State commander of the V. F. W. called it "subversive to the fundamental principles upon which this country was founded."

Northampton, February 25

ON SATURDAY and Sunday, February 24-25, more than 150 delegates, representing 14 New England colleges and universities, attended the Connecticut Valley Student Anti-War Conference held at Smith College. The colleges represented were American International, Amherst, Connecticut College for Women,

(Continued on page 23)

A "SLACKER'S" APOLOGY*

By MORRIS RAPHAEL COHEN

DEAR FRIEND: Your letter gently but unmistakably intimates that I am a slacker, a slacker in peace as well as in war; that when the world war was raging bitterly I dawdled my time with subjects like symbolic logic, and that now when the issues of reconstructing a bleeding world demand the efforts of all who care for the future of the human race, I am shirking my responsibility and wasting my time with Plato and Cicero. Your gently veiled charge is true, but I do not feel ashamed of it. On the contrary, when I look upon my professional colleagues who enlisted their philosophies in the war, who added their shrill voices to the roar of the cannons, and their little drops of venom to the torrents of national hatreds, I feel that it is they who should write apologies for their course. For philosophers, I take it, are ordained as priests to keep alive the sacred fires on the altar of impartial truth; and I have but faithfully endeavored to keep my oath of office as well as the circumstances would permit. It is doubtless the height of the unheroic to worship truth in the bomb proof of harmless mathematics when men are giving their lives for democracy and for the public order which is the basis of civilization. But it would be sad if all the priests deserted their altars and became soldiers, if the sermon on the mount were utterly erased to give place to the manuals of bayonet practice or instructions on the use of poison gas. What avails it to beat the enemy if the sacred fires which we are sworn to defend meanwhile languish and die for want of attendance?

Impartial Truth is a goddess whose worship is not without its difficulties even in a bomb proof behind the lines. She is hated by the great multitude of the impatient and despised by those superior persons who disdain her as old-fashioned. But as her sworn votary I cannot deny her. When the Germans burned Louvain I could not forget what the Allies had done in 1900 to the Imperial Library at Pekin, and when they sank the Lusitania I could not deny the women and children starved by the blockade. I did not ignore the difference of degree in moral turpitude, and as a citizen I should have been glad, if conditions permitted to volunteer for military service. But though I could conscript my body I could not conscript my mind. As a philosopher I could never assert that the war was a clear issue between the powers of light and the powers of dark-

ness, or as Bergson put it, between the mind or spirit on one side and brute matter on the other. I could never get myself to say that Japan had a better right to Shantung than Germany or that it was better that Poles should oppress Russians and Germans than that the latter should be the oppressors. I could never believe that the world's iniquity would end the moment the Kaiser (or any other "boss") were overthrown. Some there were who insisted that it was my duty to shout these doubts of mine from the roof tops. But I could not do this any more than I could shout them to the Germans across the barbed-wire entanglements. I believe in the division of labor. I am a priest or philosopher, not a soldier or propagandist. I yield to none in my admiration for the brave fellows who gave their all on the bloody fields of Flanders, but I have no respect for the bigots who cannot realize that "there are many mansions in my Father's house," and that it would be a poor world if there were no diversity of function to suit the diversity of natural aptitudes. And when people begin to admonish me that if everyone did as I did, etc., I answer that humanity would probably perish from cold if everyone produced food, and would certainly starve if everyone made clothes or built houses. I admit the desperate need of men to defend the existence of our country, but I cannot ignore the need of men to maintain even in war the things which make the country worth defending. Purely theoretic studies seem to me to be of those fine flowers which relieve the drabness of our existence and help to make the human scene worth while.

I am aware, dear friend, that in my high valuation of purely theoretic pursuits I have the weight of contemporary authority against me. My fellow philosophers for the most part are too ready to assert that theoretic philosophy can justify itself only by its practical applications. But why the fundamental human desire to know the world is any less entitled to satisfaction than the desire for kodaks, automobiles, india-paper or upholstered furniture, they do not tell us. Indeed, just exactly what is practical, and what is the good of being practical at all, are just the kind of theoretic studies that they frantically refuse to undertake. I strongly suspect that in this they are influenced not only by the Puritanic aversion for the arts of free play, but also by the unenlightened prejudice that the bare necessities of life are more important than the "luxuries" which by giving life beauty and dignity make the struggle for it worth while to free men.

*This article, which originally appeared in *The New Republic* at the close of the World War, was sent to us with the suggestion that we reprint it in answer to Lewis Feuer's "Philosophy Follows the Flag." (*Student Outlook*, February). The Editors believe that the arguments of the article are as valid and interesting today as they were in 1919. We hope that the two articles together will provoke further comments on whether any intellectual disciplines are exempted from contemporary social struggles.

Our excessive specialization tends to make us blind to that which is outside our interests, and, hence, fiercely intolerant. I have seen lumberjacks laugh to scorn an artist who was trying to fix on canvas some of the haunting beauty in the gloaming of the woods! and we have on public record the contempt of the aluminum manufacturers for those sentimentalists who want to preserve the scenic sublimity of Niagara Falls. It is just as natural for statesmen and journalists, absorbed in the problems of the war and the League of Nations, to scorn those who have other interests. But there are plenty of historic precedents to justify some scepticism as to the infallibility of the prevailing judgment as to what is fundamentally important. Don't you now think the discovery of certain mathematical propositions by Archimedes to be more important than the siege and capture of Syracuse? They used to scorn Hegel for being concerned with his *Phenomenology* while the fate of Germany was being sealed at Jena almost at his very door. Yet history has shown the appearance of Hegel's unearthly book to have been of greater importance than the battle of Jena. The results of the latter were wiped out within seven years, while the results of Hegel's thought will for good or evil last for many years to come. When Darwin published his *Descent of Man* at the end of the Franco-Prussian War, the authoritative London *Times*, I think, took him severely to task! When the foundations of property and the established order are threatened by the fires of the Paris Commune, how can a patriotic gentleman concern himself with inquiries that are in no wise calculated to help or comfort those who have a stake in the country? Would anyone today defend that attitude?

If I had your persuasive talent, dear friend, and cared to exalt one human interest above others, I would contend that the really important issue before the American people today is not economic or political but moral and vital—the issue of Puritanism. It is the Puritanic feeling of responsibility which has blighted our art and philosophy and has made us as a people unskilled in the art of enjoying life. (No one who witnessed our victory celebrations will here ask for proof.) By making daily existence dreary and depressed it drove people to strong drink, and now it deprives people of their drink without inquiring into its cause or function. But I have no desire to brand as slackers those who will not enlist in the fight against Puritanism. What I wish to suggest is some modicum of doubt as to the complacent assumption that only by absorption in some contemporary social problem can the philosopher justify his existence. The great philosophers, like the great artists, scientists

and religious teachers have all, in large measure, ignored their contemporary social problems. Aristotle, Leonardo da Vinci, Shakespeare, Newton, Buddha, Jesus of Nazareth and others who have done so much to heighten the quality of human life, have very little to say about the actual international, economic and political readjustments which were as pressing in their day as in ours. The great service of Socrates to humanity was surely not in his somewhat superficial criticism of the Athenian electoral machinery of his day, but rather in developing certain intellectual methods, and suggesting to Plato certain doctrines as to the nature of the soul and ideas,—doctrines which in spite of all their impracticality have served for over two thousand years to raise men above the grovelling, clawing existence in which so much of our life is sunk. I know that Plato's otherworldliness is decidedly out of fashion. We believe nowadays that by progressive mechanical inventions and by some happy economico-political device we can bring about the reign of complete justice and happiness. Far be it from me to disparage this modern faith. As a great hope sanctified by the supposed evidence of "scientific" evolution, it is to many a real sustaining force in the presence of otherwise intolerable evil. But to fix all our hope on some temporal affair like the League of Nations is to leave us helpless when we come to the inevitable harvest of disappointment. We hold the benefits of civilization not in fee simple, to our heirs forever, but by knight's service. Much as we may leave to our successors we can never manage it so that they shall be entirely free from toil, pain and the agonies of death. Let us not, therefore, wilfully impoverish their life by throwing away any of the things which have served as consolations to so many since the ancient days—among which are the writings of the divine Plato and even of the altogether unheroic Cicero, who so tragically illustrates the failure of scholars in politics.

Yours, etc.,

IMPRISONED

As we go to press, a cable has come to us to have Americans everywhere protest the imprisonment of Emmy Freundlich, Socialist member of the Austrian Parliament: *Latest News Freundlich initial treatment as common criminal now improved but all cells seriously overcrowded danger transference to concentration camps foreign pressure against sending women to camps urgently needed, all Socialist women members of Parliament Vienna municipality, Vienna provincial council imprisoned.*

STORM OVER AUSTRIA



JULIUS DEUTSCH
Leader of the *Schutzbund*

holds power by virtue of a military law dating from 1917.

Opposed to this minority government are found the National Socialists whose party was declared illegal several months ago and the Social Democrats upon whom Dollfuss has just bestowed the same treatment after a bloody battle.

The National Socialists who continue to exist underground and who conduct extremely vigorous propaganda, can reckon at the least on twenty-five percent of the populace. The Social Democrats represented up to the day of their defeat over a third of the population. The Christian Social Party holds a central position in Austrian politics. Without them no government was possible. On the other hand, they have never been sufficiently strong to constitute a government by themselves. That is why they were in all the coalitions. If they have allowed themselves to be led from the terrain of the sage politics of coalition, in part that is due to the influence of the two very powerful fascists.

In Europe we follow with curiosity the vicissitudes of the *Struggle between Mussolini and Hitler for Austria*.

Because the National Socialists wanted Anschluss, the Christian Socials have never been able to consider a coalition with them. For Dollfuss well knew that Anschluss meant intervention by Italy and perhaps by France and the Little Entente as well. Even if Anschluss failed to come off, Austria would then have lost her independence on another side. Further, as a

Brussels, February 23

THE DOLLFUSS government, is, as everyone knows, a coalition of members of the Christian Social Party representing about twenty-five to thirty per cent of the electorate, and of the Heimwehr who are numerically insignificant and certainly do not number more than five per cent of the population. It is, therefore, a minority government, which, after having freed itself from control by Parliament,

Catholic, Dollfuss had no illusions as to what fate his Nazi partners would reserve for him if he were sufficiently imprudent to make them his allies. The plight of his co-religionist in the Third Reich was example enough.

As to a coalition between the Christian Socials and the Socialists negotiations in this direction went on daily for several months prior to the Vienna outbreak in the democratic wing of the Christian Socials in which there were many workers.

The world crisis, which aggravated the situation of the Austrian working class, created among Christian workers a desire to cooperate with the proletarian socialists in order to defend working class interests. In the Socialist movement, in particular among the leaders, this tendency among the Christian workers was viewed with pleasure. They were well aware that, if some such coalition did not occur, the chances of civil war would be greatly augmented.

The Complicity of Major Fey

Some such coalition might have been achieved if Major Fey, Prince Starhemberg's man, and influential leader of the Heimwehr, had not been represented in the Dollfuss government. I said above that, numerically, the Heimwehr were of little importance. It was composed of small farmers, agricultural workers and *lumpen proletariat*, excluding all the better, more responsible elements of the population, and commanded by some young nobles and officers. The latter knew better than anyone else, the internal weakness of their organization. To compensate for this numerical and qualitative weakness, they sought out and secured the support of Mussolini. Youthful, impetuous and animated by a true freebooter's spirit, Starhemberg, Fey and Cie, had only one end: to provoke civil war so that they could destroy the forces of socialism and democracy and take possession of the apparatus of the state.

Thanks to their brutal language, their clear awareness of what they wanted, and their audacious freebooting activity, the Heimwehr succeeded in attaining a privileged position in the state. Their minister, Major Fey, faithfully gave them protection, and always knew how to impose his will on his bourgeois and bureaucratic colleagues.

The role played by Fey, is, if it were possible, more iniquitous than that of Dollfuss. Fey brought about

By JEF RENS

When a raid on the headquarters of the International Socialist Student Federation in Vienna seemed imminent, Rens was sent down to remove the files to Brussels

the rapprochement between Dollfuss and Mussolini. Fey started the offensive against the Socialist movement and the trade unions. Through his influence the government suppressed a number of collective agreements. Fey vowed to ruin Vienna, and to prevent her municipal assembly from continuing a Socialist policy. Fey caused the censorship of the press, abolished freedom of assemblage, and ordered the dissolution of the Chambers of Labor with their Socialist majorities.

You Americans will easily understand the rebellious feelings that this policy provoked among the fiery Austrian workers. Becoming even still more brazen, Fey more and more used the Heimwehr as the official auxiliary police.

The numerous attempts by the Socialists to open up negotiations with Dollfuss with a view to establishing a solid democratic and anti-fascist front, were disdainfully ignored. The pessimism which already ruled in our ranks as to the possibility of such a coalition was soon replaced by complete incredulity. And from that moment, only one issue remained for our people, who were thoroughly aware of Fey's machinations: to prepare for the civil war that was being forced upon them. This is what had happened elsewhere. After the shameful breakdown of the workers' parties in Germany, the Austrian proletariat had made a solemn vow: never to submit without resisting with arms. They have shown that they have held that vow sacred . . .

The Last Fascist Offensive

At the beginning of this year, the political freebooters, Starhemberg and Fey, prepared their last coup which was to culminate in the complete destruction of the working class movement. During the first days of January, they caused the rumor to spread, by means of a servile press, that, on January 30, the day of the anniversary of Hitler's coming into power, the Austrian Nazis would attempt a "Putsch." Profiting by the uneasiness that they themselves had sown among the people, they mobilized and armed the Heimwehr. This so-called "Putsch" was their pretext for concentrating in Vienna the numerous mercenaries that they planned to use against the workers.

Meanwhile, Dollfuss and Fey con-

tinued their systematic provocation of the Austrian workers. A few days before the battle, the government had excluded all the Socialist trade-unionists from employment on state public works and had brought pressure to bear on private industry to follow a similar course. Clearly they wished to break up the Socialist unions. The decree certainly was not made in order to calm tempers.

Finally, the government more and more used the Heimwehr, along with the regular police, to search the headquarters of the Party locals and unions as well as the homes of the Socialist leaders. Tension among the workers was increased to a breaking point by these raids. On their side, the Heimwehr became more brutal and aggressive. Mobilized under the false pretext of wishing to protect the country against a Hitler coup, they vowed not to disband until all their demands were granted. Chief among these were: dissolution of municipal governments and assemblies with Socialist majorities and their replacement by fascist, government commissioners, prohibition of the Socialist Party, etc. . .

During the few weeks preceding February 12th, one had the impression that the decisive moment was imminent in Austria. The leaders of the working class, conscious of their very heavy responsibility, exerted every effort to restrain the workers, who wanted to reply to the Heimwehr attacks. They did not wish to resort to a general strike and to violence except as a last extremity. The latter had been defined at the Party Congress in four points: proclamation by the Government of a fascist constitution; an attack on the city government; prohibition of the Party; coordination of

HEIMWEHR ON THE RUN AT STEYR



the trade unions. But many of the workers who do not think politically and who felt themselves more and more weakened by the fascist attacks, did not want to hold themselves to these four points and urged battle.

A few days before February 12th, Fey had conducted an all-day search of the central headquarters of the Party and of the Socialist printing establishment. In addition he had caused the arrest of a number of the leaders of the Schutzbund, notably the Chief-of-Staff, Major Eifler, Commanders Low and Schuebauer. The arrest of the last was learned with astonishment by our leaders. In truth, Schuebauer, although one of the most important leaders of the Schutzbund, worked secretly, and was known only to a few of the initiated. Treason or espionage? It is too soon to say. In any case, it proved that the Government was well aware of what was going on in the workers' organizations.

Sunday, February 11th, in the course of a military review, Minister Fey said to the soldiers: "The decisive hour is here. Have faith in us; one of these days we shall make the great cleansing."

Popular Anger Breaks

On Monday morning, when a group of gendarmes and Heimwehrmen tried to enter the headquarters of the Socialist Party at Linz to search for arms and to arrest the more militant, the workers present blocked them with arms. The decisive battle had begun.

At Vienna indignation was widespread because of the arrest the evening before of Comrade Stockhammer, President of an industrial council, and extremely popular in the workers' quarter of Florisdorf. Monday morning the workers had called a protest strike against his arrest. At the moment when the trade union delegates were discussing the conditions of a protest demonstration, they heard the news of the battle at Linz. It was the sign for the Party of the Viennese proletariat to cease work.

Among the first to strike, were the workers in the central electric plant. Between 11:30 and 11:45 the city of Vienna was deprived of electric current.

The workers, politically the best educated and the most active, understood immediately the gravity of the situation and stopped work, while a great number of proletarians, less instructed, less active and less courageous, continued to work while awaiting a more imperative and clearer command. Among these were the railroad workers and the printers.

A grave error had been committed by the leadership of the Party and the unions in allowing themselves to be taken off guard by this spontaneous movement and

not to have assumed immediately direction of the strike.*

The leaders should have known that once the strike broke, they would be compelled to go the limit. It was their duty, therefore, to make every effort to make the strike as general as possible, and to have the Schutzbund occupy rapidly and systematically, the Ministry, the State Offices and the strategic centers. Instead of placing themselves directly, after the stoppage of electricity, at the head of the strike movement, instead of issuing precise commands, they left the masses, incapable of acting by themselves, in doubt and uncertainty.

The best proof of the confusion of the leaders is that neither the central trade unions nor the national secretariat of the Trade Union Federation were able to give clear and categorical answers to the numerous questions from the union members who wished to know if the general strike had been called. Therefore, the workers remained in a state of uncertainty during the early hours of the afternoon. Instead of openly proclaiming the general strike and of preparing, since there was no other outcome possible now, for the capture of power, the political leaders and unionists met, according to the assurance I received at Vienna, . . . *au Parlement!*

During these hours of indecision in the Socialist camp, the Government was not wasting any time. Socialist leaders were arrested *en masse*, and the printing presses of the Party seized. It is to be noticed that from the moment when the strike movement had begun no further Socialist literature was distributed at Vienna. The Government on the other hand showed a great deal more cleverness and had the public buildings, the ap-

*For another view see statement at end of this article.—Ed.



POLICE CLUBBING STUDENTS AND WORKERS ON STEPS OF 42ND STREET LIBRARY DURING AUSTRIAN PROTEST

proaches to the bridges, and all the strategic points seized.

As a matter of fact, the nature of the movement had already been decided at two or three o'clock on Monday when no general strike had been established. The strike which was not general at that time, could not be so because the masses had not received brief and understandable directions from their leaders. History will have to determine who is to bear the blame for this confusion.

A second serious error resulting from the lack of direction was committed when the workers who had stopped work remained in their factories instead of joining their Schutzbund battalions. When in the evening after having waited in vain throughout the day in their places of work for directions, the workers returned home, the city was already in a state of siege. As soon as they had reached home, the workers, who had already got wind of the governmental arrangements, prepared their arms.

As is well known, the workers' districts are all in the suburbs, on the outskirts of the city. Therefore, when the workers obtained their arms in their homes, they found themselves hemmed in by the governmental troops, the police, and the Heimwehr.

A third consequence of the lack of direction was that the workers, instead of attacking the governmental forces in the center of the city, which would have been possible for them if they had all set out at once for the attack, permitted themselves to be surrounded by the soldiers. The battle of the proletariat of Vienna, as heroic as it was, never at any moment assumed the general character of an offensive. The different districts which fought were quickly separated from each other by the governmental troops.

It must be confessed that in these extremely unfavorable conditions the workers of Vienna fought with admirable courage and heroism. In the Karl Marx Hof at Heiligenstadt, at Florisdorf, at the Goethe Hof, at Simmering, at Meidling, at Ottakring, at Sandeleiten, everywhere, the governmental troops ran up against the strong, determined resistance of our valiant comrades who defended themselves with the aid of revolvers, shotguns and hand grenades. The soldiers and the police were beaten back innumerable times. On both sides there were numerous deaths. During the battles the wives and children of the proletarian fighters remained at the side of their fathers and brothers. Sometimes stretched out their full length on the soil, sometimes crouching in the makeshift dugouts, they awaited anxiously the outcome of the struggle.

On Monday evening, the chiefs of the federal troops, despairing of being able to take by attack the workers' houses, sent for cannons. And without the least hesitation the professional soldiers obeyed the order to direct their cannon upon the women and children of their own people. As a matter of curiosity it is worth mentioning here that one of the indispensable conditions for being recruited in the Austrian army is to show a recommendation from a priest. What these mercenaries, —and the proteges of the clergy are not to be overlooked here—committed on the 12th to the 15th of February was assuredly one of the most monstrous deeds in modern history. The inhuman statement of the King of Prussia that a good soldier ought to be able at the command of his chief to fire without blinking an eyelid on his own father and mother was given material confirmation today, in the third decade of the 20th century.

I have visited the different workers' quarters which were seized under artillery fire. The walls of these houses are riddled with gun-fire and hand grenades, while in a great many places shells have opened up great gaps.

It is impossible to get an idea of the indescribable scenes which took place on the stage of the workers' homes. Certain blocks, especially Florisdorf, Goethe Hof, Ottakring and Sandeleiten were not given up until Thursday morning when the workers were assured that all had been lost and when they could put up no longer with the sufferings of their wives and children.

The New Situation

On Thursday, the 15th of February, the last comrades gave themselves up at Vienna. The Dollfuss government was the victor in the struggle. Making very skillful use of all the means of influencing opinion through speeches, press, radio, airplanes, etc., the reactionaries attempted to take advantage of the despair and dejection of the masses of workers to make out that their defeat was due to their betrayal on the part of the leaders, Otto Bauer, Deutsch and others who, according to the government, had fled to foreign lands with the money of the Party. At the same time, the hangmen, Dollfuss and Fey, who had just assassinated hundreds of proletarians, didn't hesitate to set in action a concentrated propaganda among the Socialist masses deprived as they were of their leaders, with the intention of leading them to join up with the Patriotic Front and Heimat Bund. One proof that the government did not succeed in having Bauer and Deutsch indicted as traitors is that at Vienna, several workers swore to me that

both of them fought until Wednesday side by side with the comrades of the Schutzbund in the trenches behind Florisdorf. It is still too early to tell if in the future Dollfuss and Fey will succeed in shattering the confidence of the Austrian workers in their former leaders.

The Dollfuss Government which intends to undertake a fight without mercy against the rule of political parties celebrated its "victory" by hoisting at the City Hall and at the headquarters which had been seized from the Party and from the Socialist unions, flags of the Heimatbund and of the Patriotic Front. The latter has, on a red and white background, the papal emblem.

Some Tentative Considerations

It is still too early to establish a definite judgment as to the final results of the struggle. As to the responsibility for this battle no others ought to be considered besides Dollfuss, the bloodthirsty Catholic Chancellor, Fey, the murderer of women and children, and Mussolini, consumed with ambition and filled with a deep hatred for Socialism. This trio has systematically pushed the Austrian working class to this desperate struggle. This trio holds the entire responsibility for that slaughter of masses.

There is still undoubtedly much to be said about the attitude of the political and trade union leaders. I have already indicated above the confusion of the chiefs in the matter of directing the strike and of the operations of the Schutzbund. I am not in any sense reproaching them with cowardice. On the contrary, some of them have given tokens of great courage, but they have shown themselves to be incapable of managing a civil war, and this can be explained by the fact that they are men who throughout their lives have worked upon the parliamentary plan. Incapable of adapting themselves to new methods of struggle which were imposed upon them by fascism, they were unable to save the Austrian proletariat from a tragic end. Always imbued with the hope of reestablishing a normal parliamentary activity, they have put off the struggle from month to month and when the proletariat could hold out no longer, and resorted at length to arms, they were not ready to lead them in the battle*

Perspectives

Nevertheless, it is not to be understood that in doing away with Social Democracy, Dollfuss has succeeded in

strengthening his own position. On the contrary, in "wiping out" the working class, he has alienated a solid force which he might have made use of in his struggle against the Nazis. The events of the 12th of February have proved that the differences among the various inclinations of the bourgeoisie disappear in the face of their hatred for the proletariat. By the manner in which Dollfuss fought the Socialist workers, he has still further strengthened the feelings of hatred that they harbored towards him. He can use as much propaganda as he chooses,—never, absolutely never—will he be able to count on the proletariat. On the contrary, there is a very great possibility that large groups of the workers will pass over to National Socialism since the Nazis are generally held to be the most determined and vigorous opponents of the Chancellor. Besides the National Socialists have already undertaken a very active propaganda among the Socialist workers, exploiting the hatred that the workers feel against Dollfuss. The Government appears to be very uneasy in the presence of such a possibility. In fighting the Socialist Party Dollfuss has not yet obtained peace of mind.

In case the National Socialists did manage to gather up great masses of Socialist workers now without anchor, the dangers of serious international complication and of a new European war will be great.

The admirably obstinate resistance of our Austrian comrades has exerted a great influence on the Socialist parties of those European countries which have remained democratic. I am not exaggerating when I say that that resistance has strengthened the position of those parties. As a matter of fact, after the inglorious end of German Social Democracy, would-be dictators were everywhere beginning preparations for their imitation of Hitler. At the same time the sudden breakdown of the German proletarian parties had discouraged the workers of the other countries. As an offset to this, the example that our friends in Austria have yielded us is a lesson in heroism for the workers of all countries, who can draw therefrom faith and courage. While, on the other hand, the reactionaries are now aware that the Socialist workers have made up their minds to undertake all sacrifices in defense of their liberty and rights and for the salvation of their honor. That lesson will not go unheeded.

As to the future of Socialism in Austria, I should not like to have to regard it with despair. Undoubtedly the reorganization and the reestablishment of our movement will take a great many years and require a great number of sacrifices. It is entirely probable that the Austrian people will first have to endure many burdens imposed on them by the Heimwehr or the Nazis. Bu

*In this connection, see Otto Bauer's statement at the end of this article. The general question this paragraph raises of socialist tactics for coping with Fascist Parties will be discussed in a subsequent issue of THE STUDENT OUTLOOK by Otto Bauer, Leon Blum, Sir Stafford Cripps, Jennie Lee, Norman Thomas and others.

neither dictatorship is able to offer sufficient and immediate solutions to the great economic, social and ethical problems at hand.

Because in the days immediately following the bloody and heroic battles we have already in Vienna a number of young men, courageous and unknown, who still have the smell of gunpowder and blood in their nostrils, and whose faith in Socialism was far from being weakened by this defeat, was as a matter of fact, transformed

from faith into passion. I have for my part a great and happy confidence in the future of Austrian Socialism.

And among these men of tomorrow the Socialist students will occupy a place of the highest rank. During these tragic days our Socialist students fought as members of the Schutzbund side by side with the proletarians on the barricades. Scarcely a few hours later I already found them in the act of discussing together the way in which they would to reconstruct Socialism. . .

Socialist Errors in Austria

By OTTO BAUER

"WE WERE defeated and we all ask ourselves if we are to blame for the terrible catastrophe because of the mistakes in policy we certainly made.*

"We made mistakes. Of that there is no doubt. I can admit it more frankly since I am responsible. In April, 1932, the Pan-Germans and Nazis demanded a general election; the clericals were in a state of panic, fearing such elections would put the Nazis in power. If we had at this time offered in Parliament a vote against the elections, and promised 'tolerance', to the clerical government as the German Socialists tolerated Chancellor Bruening, we might have prevented the union of the Heimwehr and the clericals.

"We did not do so because we hoped the election of Nazis would force them to show up themselves by their own demagogy in Parliament and because we feared we would share the fate of our German comrades who also had tolerated a clerical government. We made the mistake of not realizing how dangerous it was to have Fascists in the Austrian Government at a moment when Germany was being swept by a Fascist wave.

"We made another mistake like this, remaining too true to strict Socialist principles. It was on my advice that Chancellor Renner resigned the presidency of the chamber on March 4, 1933, so his vote would be available to defeat the government on the issue of making victims of the railwaymen who had engaged in a two-hour protest strike. The following day Hitler swept Germany with his electoral triumph and Dollfuss used Renner's resignation as an excuse to destroy Parliament. At that moment the dictatorship was already established. Eleven days later Dollfuss used force to prevent Parliament from reassembling. This was the moment when we should have called a general strike. The workers expected it and were disappointed.

"At that time everything was in our favor. The railwaymen had not had their strike broken by eleven months of inaction, as was the case last month. The

government had not consolidated its military power and strengthened the Heimwehr Fascists against us. But we shrank from the bloodshed of civil war.

"We were foolish enough to rely on the promise of Dollfuss to negotiate with us early in April to effect constitutional reforms. Our reluctance to see civil war drench the country in blood had no valuable result, for eleven months later this war broke out despite us at an unfavorable moment.

"It is a question whether our mistakes in policy really altered the final result very much. Had we agreed to tolerate the clerical government we would probably have landed where the German Social Democrats landed. A general strike when Parliament was suppressed might well have got the clericals and Nazis together and made Hitler instead of Dollfuss the dictator of Austria.

"We have always tried to steer a middle course between the extreme Left socialism of the Italian and Hungarian Socialists and the almost reactionary bourgeois socialism of Germany. But our form was also defeated.

"When the Nazi danger arose in 1933 it would have been natural for all the opponents of Hitlerism in Austria to combine. But the reactionaries refused to join us. The aristocracy and the army were waiting only for a chance for a Hapsburg restoration, the capitalists for a chance to crush the trade unions and destroy the privileges acquired by the workers under the republic, the princes of the Catholic Church to suppress the free-thinkers.

"So things drifted on until the workers had to face the alternative of shameful capitulation or desperate resistance. Our enemies for a moment won a partial victory and thus can afford to say that the class war has ended. They think they have put the workers forever beneath the iron heel of dictatorship. They are greatly mistaken. Before very long they are going to realize they have won a battle in the class war, but not the war itself."

*Extracts from a pamphlet soon to be published in this country.

Another View

(By an Austrian Socialist now in this country)

THE time in which a general strike in Austria was possible had passed in 1934. The discipline of the railroad workers had been broken through months of terror. Army and police were "safe." Responsible leaders of the workers had been arrested and many local commanders of the Schutzbund were in jail. Nevertheless the strike might have become general if the first day had brought some outstanding success; but the mere hopelessness of the wrong start must have kept many from participating. As said below, I think that the strike started as a "wild" one; immediate police action prevented communication of the trade unions with the workers councils and the spreading of the strike.

The *Parteivorstand* was expecting a fight. But I don't think it expected it at that time. On the 8th the police occupied the central party headquarters in Vienna—certainly a much stronger reason for armed resistance than the raid on a workers club in the provinces. Nothing happened. On the 9th Kunschak, the leader of the Christian-Socials in Vienna offered his cooperation to the Socialists in the Vienna Diet. It certainly was an inappropriate time for a conflict. Nevertheless it started—on the 12th in Linz. It seems that the workers of the Vienna Municipal Power Plant struck when the news reached Vienna. I am almost sure they did that without the consent of the party or the trade unions. They had done so before. When in 1927 a jury acquitted some fascists who had murdered socialists, the party was in an awkward situation. The party had upheld the jury system against fascist attacks; it could not protest against a jury judgment. It was then that the workers of the power plant struck and caused a demonstration. Not being called by the party, the demonstration was not supervised by the Schutzbund. It grew out of control and resulted in a bad riot, which caused 100 deaths.

The question if the *Parteivorstand* could have done more to make the strike and the resistance general is hard to solve. I want to point out that the police knew every party officer and watched him well. The police knew that trouble was ahead. Immediate arrests, cutting of telephone wires, scattered attacks in the outskirts made a central direction of the fighting impossible. The individual leaders could fight in the group in which they happened to be—or they could wait in their offices to be arrested; but they could not function as a general staff. Armed revolt in a city which is ruled by a well organized armed force (which undoubtedly had the plans for the attack on the workers homes all

PEACE ON EARTH

On Christmas Eve
A gaunt, lonely Oak
Raised its wretchedly knurled limbs
To quiver with the faint murmuring breaths
Of the Christmas Spirit
Coming from the smoke smudged village
Huddled in the cold of the valley below.

Murmurs came . . .
Gentle . . . gentle murmurs . . .
Peace On Earth . . .
Good Will to Man . . .
Murmuring . . . gently murmuring.

The bare limbs of the Oak
Quietly trembled.
Then . . . The murmuring
Rose to a husky roar . . .
Peace On Earth . . . *Peace?*
There is no Peace!
IT'S ALL A LIE!

Lynch . . . **Lynch.**
Governor Rolph proclaims Good . . .
Good . . . **Good** . . . **GOOD** . . .
And two grim, white, lifeless bodies
Sway with the gentle murmurs . . .
Peace on Earth.

Geneva . . . **war** . . .
WAR . . . **WAR** . . .
Talk . . . **Talk** . . . **TALK** . . .
And grim, gray, death-dealing turrets
Sway with the gentle murmurs . . .
Peace on Earth.

Illinois . . . **Strike**
As sheriffs shoot to Kill . . .
Kill . . . **Kill** . . . **KILL** . . .
And the grim, black figures of many women
By newly dug graves . . .
In the cold of a Christmas Eve . . .
Sway with the gentle murmurs . . .
Peace on Earth.

BEN SHANGOLD

worked out in detail) supported by an efficient espionage system can be successful only if the armed force can be overrun at once. In Vienna there has not been a chance to do that for years.

LITERATURE OF REVOLT

Professional Revolutionist

LENIN. By Ralph Fox. Harcourt, Brace and Company. 1934. \$2.50.

American radicalism is illiterate. When it has heard of the history and tradition of revolution in Europe, it has not known how to graft that tradition to the trunk of American dissidence. Or, as is more customary, when it has not heard of the heroisms, problems and development of the various working-class parties in Europe, it arrogantly assumes it has nothing to learn from them.

Since we are among those who have suffered from the general lack of knowledge of world socialism that there is in our movement, we are not the most competent to pass on the historical accuracy of this life of Lenin. Nevertheless, this book is absorbing, because this is what Lenin should have been like, even if he wasn't. Further this book is valuable to American socialists, because Lenin's conception of how a revolutionary party should be organized is relevant to our own problems of party structure and responsibility and because Lenin's attitude toward the good things of life—philosophy, science, adventure, literature and the arts is a refreshing challenge, by its sensibleness, to the "party line" in these matters.

In Lenin's youth, the opposition to Romanov reaction came chiefly from the Populists—who were the university and urban intellectuals. If enough Romanovs were assassinated, the Populists reasoned, some measure of democracy would be granted, and then further reforms could be carried out through a newly summoned Constituent Assembly. It was about this time that Lenin entered the University of Kazan, from which six months later he was expelled following a student protest against the government watchdog over student activities, the Inspector.

Lenin was exiled to the country, where he undertook the study of Marx and Engels which convinced him that only a party founded on the growing industrial proletariat, not on a few emancipated intellectuals, could liberate Russia. He soon came in touch with the exiled Plekhanov, leader of the Russian Marxists, and established himself as a leader of the latter.

He set out to build a party of professional revolutionists, men who devoted their whole lives to the organization of the working class in their struggles against capitalism. The professional revolutionary was an intellectual worker who devoted his whole life to the party. The function of this person was, "to create dozens of fresh contacts in every place, in person give over all the work into their hands, teach them and draw them in, not by lecturing, but by the example of actual work. Then he should go to another place, and in a

month or two return to check up his young successors." As to party organization, the most important task was to start a paper centered on the party leadership, and to get that paper out to the working class. These were the principles on which the successful Bolshevik Party was built.

There are many interesting things in this book, much too many to mention in this review, but one thing stands out sharply, that the Russian radicals maintained their revolutionary integrity in the face of difficulties much greater than any that we have in America, that greater dissensions and squabbles rent the pre-revolution ranks than those that are embittering American revolutionists, and that, in spite of this, these people kept on, confident that their analysis was correct, confident that the future was with them.

JOSEPH P. LASH

A Pipe Dream

A MODERN TRAGEDY. By Phyllis Bentley. Macmillan Co. 1934.

Not a single psychosis or situation comprises *A Modern Tragedy*—it has its significance in the fact that the scheming manipulating manufacturer; the idealistic hunger marchers' leader; the misled, weak manager of the Heights mill; the impetuous spoiled beauty of the family of tradition—all these "jostled each other in self-defensive roughness, each fearing the other and his own knowledge of that fear, each struggling to assert himself, to gain power, to impose his will; and the economic ill-health of our times intensified, exacerbated these feelings, which in their turn helped to create economic disease."

And Miss Bentley foresees that only when men have learned the mutual love which casts out fear can the economic problem be solved, and that as long as it remains unsolved fears will multiply. But Miss Bentley has her cause and effect mixed in her picture where all is for the worst in the best possible of all worlds. In her novel she indicates by the interaction of her characters the economic shadows for human distrust but in her conclusion she overlooks them. The actions of Milner Schofield, shop steward and a workman for Messrs. Lumb, dyers and finishers, who later became the leader of the march of the unemployed to London; of Arnold Lumb whose business failed when the profit system became as unprofitable for the small manufacturer as for the worker, of Walter Haigh whose management of Height's Mill through price and wage cutting drew the business from the Lumb's—all these point to an inalienable break of interests which causes the modern tragedy and which negates Miss Bentley's special doctrine of brotherly love.

An interesting study of the role of the profit motive

as a demoralizing force in man is made in the portrayal of Tasker. Leonard Tasker, brilliant and unscrupulous promoter and industrialist, who played about with balance sheets, who floated a new company when the old one threatened to sink in the rising tide of depression, was undisturbed by the suicide of Crosland, an old stalwart in the spinning trade. Like Jay Gould, an

American product, who rose to fortune leaving behind him Pratt, duped, and Leupp a suicide, he sacrificed the human for the gold.

This is the modern tragedy—the gold that is the soul acid of the rich and the body acid of the poor; the clash of interests which makes Miss Bentley's plea for brotherly love a pipe-dream. F. Y.

A Student Demonstration

ONE of the most spectacular and effective demonstrations ever staged in New York City was organized by the Student L.I.D. outside of the Austrian Consulate at 42nd Street and Fifth Avenue.

When on Monday, February 12th, news of the revolt of the Socialists in Austria first became known in this country, every Socialist pulse beat faster. Down at the L.I.D. office people kept running in with successive issues of the papers. Cheers, when it was rumored that the army was deserting to the Socialists. Despair, when the howitzers were turned on the apartment houses of the Viennese workers. "Could they possibly win?" everyone asked. "What heroes!" everyone cried. This was the sign we had all been waiting for—that world Socialism *could* and *would* fight.

But what could we do to help the Austrian Socialists? The members of the Executive Committee Columbia Socialist Club put their heads together and drew up a memorandum to the New York Student L.I.D. requesting it to take some immediate action to show our solidarity with the embattled workers of Austria. Members were called on the phone to come down immediately to the Students and Workers House to plan a demonstration outside of the Austrian Consulate.

Columbia was assigned to getting out a release to the newspapers and preparing copy for a printed circular. Hunter College, in the meantime, set to work to mimeograph a demonstration circular. N. Y. U. painted placards for the demonstration. Others were sent over to the Socialist Party offices where a meeting of organizers pledged support to the demonstration. The Young Peoples Socialist League ordered all its members to come down.

We had called our demonstration for Wednesday at five o'clock. The next morning, Tuesday, we were all out on our various campuses distributing mimeographed circulars. As the printed ones came off the press, they were rushed up to the colleges and to the garment districts.

Tuesday evening, we learned from the early Wednesday edition of *The Daily Worker* that the Communist Party had called a demonstration at the same

spot for four o'clock. Although we were flattered at having the Communist Party take its cue from the Student L.I.D. we were flabbergasted at so childish a ruse to get the leadership in the demonstration. A telegram was sent late Tuesday night to the Communist offices inviting them to join our picket line.

Early Wednesday afternoon groups began congregating outside of the Salmon Towers at 42nd Street and Fifth Avenue in which the Austrian Consul has his offices. Groups of Yipsels marched up Fifth Avenue with red flags unfurled and placards denouncing Dollfuss and proclaiming the solidarity of world Socialism. By five o'clock there was one huge line running all around the block from Fifth Avenue to Sixth, from 42nd Street to 43rd. Ten thousand people were in the picket line. Never had so many students come out for a demonstration. Socialists and Communists and liberals all were marching in honor of Austrian Socialism. The line moved slowly. Red songs were chanted. Mass imprecations were hurled at Austrian brutality.

The busiest corner in the world had never seen anything of this character before. The police were bewildered. How long should they permit the line to march? It was steadily growing. It would soon snarl up traffic. The leaders were ordered to march away. Someone shoved. Police began using their clubs. All over the plaza of the Public Library the marchers were harried with clubs and billies. Mounted officers, ten



HOW THE CLUBBING IMPRESSED ONE YOUTHFUL MEMBER OF THE YOUNG PEOPLES SOCIALIST LEAGUE

AGITATE!

EDUCATE!

ORGANIZE!



WITH Monroe Sweetland working steadily among Southern colleges and Bill Chamberlain concentrating in the Midwest, the center of gravity of Student L.I.D. activities has definitely shifted from New York.

On Lincoln's Birthday members of the Student League for Industrial Democracy from seven Virginia colleges appeared before a committee of the Virginia General Assembly to protest retrenchment in education. Their clearcut recommendations were as follows:

"We are opposed to all educational retrenchment either of secondary or higher education. Therefore we oppose (a) any decrease of the regular total appropriation; (b) any cutting of teachers' salaries; (c) the proposed subsidization of secondary education at the expense of higher education.

"We likewise oppose all discrimination in educational opportunity and reward for service, and therefore urge: (a) an equal minimum salary of \$720 for all teachers, regardless of race; (b) equality of equipment and capital outlay between white and Negro schools; (c) inasmuch as the state does not admit Negroes to state-supported graduate and professional colleges, we petition the general assembly to make provision for their tuition in institutions outside the state."

Members of the delegation included Eleanor Alcott of Sweet Briar, Galen Ewing of William and Mary, Hilliard Bernstein of the Richmond Worker's School, James Jackson, Jr. and William Paxton, Jr., of Virginia Union University, Roderick Corprew of Vir-

ginia State College, J. M. Powell of the University of Richmond and Palmer Weber of the University of Virginia. They appeared before the Governor, answered the antagonistic queries of the Assembly Committee effectively, and altogether did a handsome job.

Knoxville, Tennessee, wouldn't be the first place one would expect to take first prize for student activity this month, but it goes there. Says the unfriendly *Knoxville Journal* in beginning a two-column story: "Disdaining the usual racial prejudice in the South, a group of white University of Tennessee and Negro Knoxville College students and faculty members attended a joint supper meeting last night . . ." Fifty-five students and faculty members attended the first of a series of five such meetings, at which the guest speaker was the visiting lecturer in the L.I.D. Lecture Circuit.

All has not gone smoothly for the student activists at the U. of Tennessee: their telegram requesting President Rightmire of Ohio State to reinstate the expelled conscientious objectors brought strong administrative criticism; permission granted by the manager of the U. of Tennessee cafeteria for the joint meeting with the Knoxville College students to be held there was withdrawn when superior officials of the University got wind of the meeting. Unperturbed, the students persuaded a tea room in "neutral" territory downtown to serve the group.

This Chapter has also, according to a communication from Howard Frazier to Miss Torchinsky of Hunter L.I.D. become involved in the Harriman hosiery strike: "... about fifty miles from Knoxville. The mill officials have consistently ignored the decisions of the National Labor Board, not being willing to recognize unions—saying they have run the mills for twenty-five years and don't need any interference now. About seventy-five men were put in jail for picketing and a few of us went over—made speeches to those in jail and helped picket for a while. We already had papers drawn up to get us out of jail, but as the jail was already overcrowded, there was not much use in putting others in, so we got back to Knoxville O. K."

Fred Bettelheim in his monthly report from Penn State: "We have written letters to Ohio State protest-

abreast, galloped down the street. If you couldn't run fast enough you got it over the skull. In desperation the protestants gathered in knots on the steps of the Library and for a while fought off the police. They were scattered by flying wedges. The line reformed. The police ordered us to march off. Instead we circled the block again.

That night the evening papers carried stream headlines: "Thousands Riot in Austrian Protests." We had accomplished our purpose. It wasn't much. But it was the first demonstration of the solidarity of world socialism, after we heard of the uprising in Vienna.

ing outrage and are vainly attempting to get R.O.T.C. officers here to defend stand in debate. They consider debate immoral! . . . No fascist evidences here, though conservatism is widespread."

Henry Haskell writes from Pomona College that the Student L.I.D. there is sponsor to a forum series during the second semester which includes Jerry Voorhees, Upton Sinclair, and other prominent Californians.

Noah Walter, member of the National Executive Committee of the Young Peoples' Socialist League spoke before meetings arranged by Student L.I.D. representatives at Amherst, Smith, Springfield and Wellesley colleges.

All in one letter came seventeen new members from Skidmore College, New York.

The Vanguard Club at the U. of Michigan has been primarily responsible for the success of the L.I.D. Lecture Circuit in Ann Arbor. All over the country speakers on the Lecture Circuits have been meeting with small groups of students on the campus, counselling

them on their problems, telling them of the student movement on other campuses.

Recently added to the staff of the Carolina School for Workers is Ruth Hammond, who was active in the Syracuse Socialist Club until her graduation last June. The latter club has been cooperating with Local Syracuse of the Socialist Party in establishing numerous branches of the Party throughout the city and its suburbs.

Stanton L. Catlin from Middlebury College writes that he and his friends have been systematically listening in to the weekly L.I.D. broadcasts.

The Liberal Discussion Club at the U. of Virginia has set up a Marxist study group under a friendly professor.

At Hampton-Sydney College, buried in the red clay district of Virginia, the lone campus radical reports that two speakers from off-campus have been allowed on during the past year, Gypsy Smith and a Reverend Anderson from Texas. As at Hunter College, Student L.I.D. speakers are decidedly not allowed.

Betty Muther, new N. E. C. member from Wellesley, writes of the meeting put on in New Bedford, Mass., by her Peace Committee. It was attended by 1200 people and was the opening shot in a campaign to get the R. O. T. C. out of New Bedford's High Schools.

After telling the delegation of the American League against War and Fascism that he "thought there'd be a war in the Spring," and that "the United States will have to do some of the things Soviet Russia is doing if we are to remain a capitalistic nation," Speaker Rainey of the House of Representatives told Monroe Sweetland that he knew the students would respond "wholeheartedly" to the war-call of the Government, and that they would prove to be just as "red-blooded" as they were in 1918!

Romayne Cribbit of Kansas State College writes of the formation of an active Student League for Peace on the campus, after several years of student indifference to social and political issues.

The Harvard Liberal Club is in the process of reorganization and a new constitution for the group has just been prepared. The issue is whether the club should continue to be a "liberal" club, taking no stand on any issues, or whether it should become a militant organization taking definite stands on questions of social justice and dedicating itself to a vital change of our society. Student L.I.D. members are in the leadership of this fight. If it is won, militant action will no longer be the prerogative solely of a few students in the Harvard graduate school of Philosophy. This latter group of philosophers, taking their meals together, spending

L.I.D. PICKETS OUTSIDE OF THE WALDORF. THE PERSON IN THE CENTER IS JENNIE LEE, ARM IN ARM WITH MARY HILLYER



most of their time arguing and plotting revolution, have shown their mettle in the leaflets they have issued, the demonstrations they have organized, and the seeds of *malaise* they have sown in the consciences of the milder undergraduates.

From North Dakota State College, James Long writes that things have gotten under way auspiciously, and that soon they will have enough members to become a recognized chapter of the national organization.

Donald Donohue from the chapter at the University of Idaho writes: "Our group is steadily earning the respect and discussion of the campus. We intend to follow a policy of constructive thought. The capitalist system is rotting enough from within to destroy itself."

When "Green Pastures" was playing in Madison, recently, hotels refused to put up the Negroes in the east. The U. of Wisconsin Chapter united campus and town organizations in protest against this action on the part of hotel managers.

At the University of California, a grand battle has been raging against the R. O. T. C. *The Trojan*, campus paper, is opposed to continuance of the course unless there is universal conscription of all youths between 18 and 20! The Student L.I.D. Chapter there, however, is fighting the course because it spreads the military mind, and because preparedness is only to the advantage of the nation's imperialists.

Tom Page of the University of Kansas L.I.D. reports on the R.O.T.C. out there: "In a recent lecture on the 'international situation' the professor of Military Science and Tactics discussed conscientious objection to military service in time of war. He placed it in the category of and as a close parallel of sexual perversion. . . . During the course of another lecture he made the statement that he had been sent here (U. of Kansas) to 'throw out' these opinions. 'The cause of war is lust (James 4:1) and the way to stop war is to remove the cause.' . . . The bright nickel-plated sabres issued to the senior cadet officers of the University of Kansas R.O.T.C. unit were made in Germany. . . ."

A Social Problems Club affiliated with the Student L.I.D. has been started at the University of West Virginia with Owen Hamilton as Student Representative. It is one of the most promising chapters in our national movement.

Students in the New York Colleges have helped in two important strikes recently. Some City College freshmen, especially Morris Milgram, did devoted work with the laundry workers, who finally won their strike when Mayor LaGuardia cut off the water supply of the oppressive laundries.

When the Amalgamated Hotel and Restaurant Workers Union initiated their general strike by mass picketing of the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel some fifty students from L.I.D. chapters in the New York colleges joined the huge line that snugly wrapped itself around the hotel. Experienced picketers, the students swiftly animated the line with songs and the mass chant that since then has become the slogan for all strikes, "Strike and Fight!" Some of the girls from Hunter and a few fellows from Columbia have been helping at Union Headquarters.

War and the Student

(Continued from page 9)

Connecticut State, Dartmouth, Harvard, Massachusetts State, Mount Holyoke, New Hampshire State, Smith, Springfield, Trinity, Wesleyan, and Yale.

The resolutions adopted presented indubitable proof of the attitude of the students against war. The delegates pledged themselves to support the government of the U. S. in no war it undertakes. They also voiced support of the peace policies of the Soviet Union and any nation which will pledge itself to institute or co-operate with such policies. A demand was made for complete abolition of the R.O.T.C. Resolutions were passed condemning fascist tendencies in the U. S. and abroad, the brutal suppression of Austrian workers in their fight against fascism, the Vinson bill and the U. S. military program, and American imperialism in the East and Latin and South America.

Specific action for students was also agreed upon. The week of April 6-13 was set as a week of special campus activity against war to culminate in simultaneous demonstrations from 11-12 A.M. on April 13. Miriam Oikemus of Massachusetts State College and Makepeace of Springfield College were chosen to appear at General Johnson's open hearing on the N.R.A. in Washington on February 27 and voice the protest of the convention against the militaristic tendencies in the N.R.A.

Two issues were hotly contested, the first, affiliation with the American League against War and Fascism was voted down as not providing that linkage with labor that the Convention desired, and the second, an amendment by the Student L.I.D. to place the word "Socialist" before the phrase "Workers of Austria" was beaten under the leadership of the N. S. L.

Finally, the delegates put themselves on record as favoring the formation of a national student anti-war committee composed of representatives of the various college and university anti-war committees.

Students Listen in to the Radio Broadcasts of "The Economics of the New Deal"

*Arranged by the League for Industrial Democracy at the suggestion
of the National Advisory Council on Radio in Education
every Saturday afternoon from March through May—
5:30 to 6:00 P. M. Eastern Standard Time over
the Red Network of the N. B. C.*

THE PROGRAMS FOLLOW:

March 17 The New Deal and the National Debt

JOHN BAUER, Director American Public Utilities
Bureau
COLSTON WARNE, Department of Economics, Am-
herst College

March 24 The New Deal and Taxation

JOHN DEWEY, Professor of Philosophy, Columbia
University; President, People's Lobby
CLAIR WILCOX, Department of Economics, Swarth-
more College

March 31 The New Deal and Social Insurance

FRANCIS J. MCCONNELL, President of the American
Association for Social Security; former President,
Federal Council of Churches; Bishop, M. E.
Church
LOUIS WALDMAN, New York attorney; former As-
semblyman, New York State

April 7 The New Deal and Transportation

JULES BOGEN, Professor of Finance, New York Uni-
versity; Editor, New York Journal of Commerce
AMOS PINCHOT, New York attorney; writer

April 14 The New Deal and Stabilized Currency

O. M. W. SPRAGUE, Professor of Banking and Fi-
nance, Harvard University
WARREN M. PERSONS, Economic Consultant

April 21 The New Deal and Power

JAMES C. BONBRIGHT, Professor of Finance, Columbia
University; trustee, Power Authority of New
York State
CHARLES SOLOMON, New York attorney; former As-
semblyman, New York State

April 28 The New Deal and Tariffs

EDWARD P. COSTIGAN, U. S. Senator from Colorado;
former member U. S. Tariff Commission
OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD, Contributing Editor and
Owner, *The Nation*

May 5 The New Deal and International Relations

RAYMOND MOLEY, Professor of Public Law, Colum-
bia University; Editor of *To-Day*
NORMAN THOMAS, Executive Director, League for
Industrial Democracy; twice Socialist candidate,
President United States

May 12 The New Deal and Technological Unemployment

STUART CHASE, author of *The New Deal, Your
Money's Worth*, etc.; Director of the Labor Bu-
reau, Inc.
FREDERICK C. MILLS, Professor of Economics, Col-
umbia University

May 19 The New Deal and Industrial Profits

HENRY PRATT FAIRCHILD, Professor of Sociology,
New York University; author of *Profits or Pros-
perity?*
ORDWAY TEAD, Editor Economics Books, Harpers;
co-author, *Business Under the Recovery Act*

May 26 The New Deal: A Summary

LEVERING TYSON, Director, National Advisory Coun-
cil on Radio in Education
HARRY W. LAIDLER, Executive Director, League for
Industrial Democracy

STATION LIST—WEAF, New York City

KGHL Billings, Mont.	KFI Los Angeles, Calif.	WCSH Portland, Me.
WAPI Birmingham, Ala.	WAVE Louisville, Ky.	KEX Portland, Oregon
WEEL Boston, Mass.	WIBA Madison, Wis.	WJAR Providence, R. I.
WBEN Buffalo, N. Y.	WMC Memphis, Tenn.	KSD St. Louis, Mo.
KGIR Butte, Mont.	WSM Nashville, Tenn.	KDYL Salt Lake City, Utah
WMAQ Chicago, Ill.	WSMB New Orleans, La.	WOAI San Antonio, Texas
WSAI Cincinnati, Ohio	WKY Oklahoma City, Okla.	KFSD San Diego, Calif.
WFAA Dallas, Texas		KGO San Francisco, Calif.
KOA Denver, Colo.		KOMO Seattle, Wash.
WWJ Detroit, Mich.	WOW Omaha, Neb.	KTBS Shreveport, La.
WEBC Duluth, Minn.	KTAR Phoenix, Ariz.	KGA Spokane, Wash.
WJDX Jackson, Miss.	WCAE Pittsburgh, Pa.	WRC Washington, D.C.