

S T U D E N T R E V I E W

DECEMBER, 1932

10 CENTS

THE STUDENTS BEAR ARMS

DONALD HENDERSON

ON

**BUILDING A STUDENT MOVEMENT
REVOLUTION VERSUS PACIFISM
OXFORD ESCAPES ITS CLOISTER**

ANTI-WAR ISSUE

PUBLISHED BY THE NATIONAL STUDENT LEAGUE

DANCE AND ENTERTAINMENT

TO CELEBRATE
THE FIRST ANNIVERSARY
OF

STUDENT REVIEW

AT CENTRAL OPERA HOUSE
210 EAST 67TH STREET
NEW YORK CITY

RED HATTERS BAND

FRIDAY, DEC. 23, 8 P.M. Admission 50 Cents

THE ROYALTON RESTAURANT
Rendezvous of Students
BEST FOOD — LOWEST PRICES
118 FIFTH AVENUE AT 17TH STREET

TYPEWRITERS
Sold Rented Repaired
J. E. ALBRIGHT CO.
825 BROADWAY NEW YORK CITY

A DIFFERENT BOOK ON RUSSIA!
"ONE-SIXTH OF THE WORLD'S SURFACE"
by RUSSELL WRIGHT

Answers all the Common Questions

Illustrated, \$1.25

at your Bookstore or from the Author

6234 FOREST AVENUE
HAMMOND, INDIANA

DAUBER & PINE BOOKSHOPS, INC.

Sixty-Six Fifth Avenue New York
Open Until 10 P. M.

OLD, RARE, AND USED BOOKS, REASONABLY PRICED.
NEW BOOKS (Except Text Books, etc.) AT
20% DISCOUNT.

HEALTH CENTER
CAFETERIA & RESTAURANT

At Workers Center
50 EAST 13TH STREET NEW YORK CITY
Reasonable Prices

A novel by H. T. TSIANG

CHINA RED

3rd printing 50c Box 66, Station D, N. Y. C.

*"Nothing like it, nothing quite so deep and reverberant has
ever been achieved on the screen."*—DELEHANTY, Even. Post

The First Socialistic Picture from Germany

COMRADESHIP
Kameradschaft

EUROPA
154 West 55th Street
East of 7th Avenue

Continuous from 10:30 A.M.
Circle 7-0129
25c Until Noon

RED GREETING CARDS

Handmade blockprints — Black on Brilliant Red Paper
Revolutionary designs — Reasonable Prices

Write — Visit — or Telephone:—

WILLMOTT— 310 East 15th Street, New York City
Algonquin 4-3476

For the CHICAGO CONVENTION use

GREYHOUND LINES

LOW RATES — FREQUENT SERVICE

*Call your Local Greyhound Terminal for information
on our low Holiday Excursion rates, or write*

CAPITOL GREYHOUND BUS TERMINAL
51ST STREET AT EIGHTH AVENUE
New York City—Phone: Columbus 5-3000

GREYHOUND BUS DEPOT
EAST 9TH & SUPERIOR AVENUE
Cleveland, Ohio—Phone: Cherry 3360

When answering advertisements, please mention the STUDENT REVIEW

STUDENT REVIEW

PUBLISHED BY THE NATIONAL STUDENT LEAGUE

Editor: HARRY MAGDOFF
Managing Editor: HERSCHEL PRAVDAN
Assistant Managing Editor: NATHAN SCHNEIDER
Literary Editor: MURIEL RUKEYSER
Business and Circulation Managers
THADDEUS ANDRUS
MIRIAM WHITER

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS:—Sherwood Anderson, Joseph Budish (City College), Gabriel Carritt (Oxford U.), Elliot Cohen, Leonard Dal Negro (New York U.), H. W. L. Dana, John Dos Passos, Theodore Draper (Brooklyn College), Waldo Frank, Joseph Freeman, Leonard Gans (Wisconsin U.), Carl Geiser (Fenn and Nash Junior Colleges), A. Girschick (U.S.S.R. correspondent), Michael Gold, Donald Henderson, Rema Lappousse (Boston U.), Felix Morrow, Scott Nearing, Herbert Solow, Herbert Spence (Harvard U.), Edmund Stevens (Columbia U.), George Perazick (U. of California), Walter Quinn (Chicago U.), James Rorty.

THE STUDENT REVIEW is published monthly, October to July 1, by the NATIONAL STUDENT LEAGUE, 13 W. 17th St., New York City. The students are asked to contribute articles on student life and activity on the campus, in the classroom, in the industries and professions. Manuscripts should be addressed care of the Student Review and must be accompanied by a stamped return envelope. Subscription: 75 cents per year (10 issues). Foreign: add \$1 for postage.

VOL. 2 DECEMBER, 1932 NUMBER 3

Editorials

THE courts of the United States received a severe reprimand from the Supreme Court in its Scottsboro decision. The Supreme Court has made it plain that the lower courts can no longer commit legal courtroom murders indiscriminately—at least, not without observing all the “rules of the game.” Judges and prosecutors, all the machinery of such obviously bungling perjurers as took the stand in the it that defendants from the ranks of the rebellious oppressed are guaranteed every constitutional safeguard before being convicted. The courts have been warned to conduct trials so as to leave no room for criticism of their procedure. The use of such obviously bungling perjurers as took the stand in the Mooney trial, and the denial of the right of counsel, as in the case of the nine Scottsboro Negro lads, must not be allowed to recur.

We must not lose sight of the fact that the Supreme Court's reversal of the Scottsboro decision, and the temporary respite of the boys have been brought about only by the unceasing work of the International Labor Defense in carrying the case before that court, and in arousing international demonstrations and protests against the would-be murders. Above all, we must realize that the boys are yet to be retried, and that we must fight every effort to convict these innocent youths at a “proper” trial.

FOR many weeks Bolivia, backed by American imperialism, has been fighting a bloody war with Paraguay, backed by British imperialism, for possession of the Gran Chaco, a region rich in oil and quebracho (a shrub used in the tanning of leather). Bolivia is also being backed by a bloc of powers dominated by American imperialism: Mexico, Cuba, Colombia. Paraguay is being backed by a bloc dominated by British imperialism, the so-called A B C group: Argentina, Brazil, Chile, and also Peru. Thus we see the whole of South America being split into two rival groups. The Pan-American Union, the instrument of American imperialism, and the League of Nations, which plays the same role for British imperialism, are also maneuvering to obtain advantages for their respective groups.

How are the revolutionary workers, peasants and students of these countries struggling against these wars? In Bogota, Colombia, the office of “Tierra,” the organ of the revolutionary masses, was wrecked by a chauvinist mob because it dared to protest against the preparations of Colombia for war. In La Paz, Bolivia, a demonstration of workers and students against the war was brutally attacked and broken up by the police. In Paraguay 500 soldiers were arrested

and disarmed for refusing to fight against their brothers in Bolivia.

It is the duty of all revolutionary students in the United States to protest vigorously against these wars, and especially against the acts of American imperialism which is chiefly instrumental in fomenting them. It is the duty of the students to expose the role of American imperialism, and to join hands with their brothers in Bolivia, Paraguay, Colombia, and Peru, who are now actively carrying on a struggle against the native bourgeoisie and foreign imperialism.

THE genuine internationalism of the National Student League, in contradistinction to the professed “goodwill” of Pan-American organizations, is definitely recognized and approved by the students of Cuba, Mexico, Panama, and other Latin American countries who have formerly accepted invitations to the League's second National Conference this Christmas.

Previous attempts on the part of American students to confer and unite with their Southern neighbors have met with lukewarm reception or flat failure. The letter in this page from a Mexican student explains their distrust.

But the National Student League is confident that the National Conference at Chicago will mark the beginning of a permanent *rapprochement*, and to be the basis of a real union of the students of all the Americas in the fight against the imperialism of the United States.

In This Issue

OUR PROGRAM ON WAR	(Editorial)	4
BUILDING A STUDENT MOVEMENT		
	Donald Henderson	5
OXFORD ESCAPES ITS CLOISTER		
	October Club of Oxford	7
IN THE MIDST OF REVOLUTIONS . . .	S. Small	7
THE STUDENTS BEAR ARMS . . .	Joshua Winters	9
TOWARD A REAL COLLEGE THEATRE		
	Bernard Reines	11
AN OPEN LETTER		
	The National Committee for the Student Congress	
	Against War	12
AN ANTI-WAR CONFERENCE . . .	Arthur J. Bartlett	13
STUDENT ACTION SPEAKS		14
SOME CANADIAN EXPERIENCES . .	Neil Gardner	15
REVOLUTION vs. PACIFISM . . .	Edmund Stevens	16
COMMUNICATIONS		18
WE REVIEW		20

Our Program on War

An Outline for Discussion

FOR some time there has been need for a more adequate statement of the program and the position of the National Student League than appears in the Program which was adopted at the First National Convention in March. The greater seriousness of the war dangers and consequently the greater importance of correct activities against war, the increased attention which students are paying to this problem, and the holding of the National Student Congress Against War to formulate a basis for common action among all students this Christmas vacation, have raised many questions in the minds of students concerning our program. N.S.L. members themselves have shown an inadequate understanding of this program and, in some cases, an inability to carry it into practice in their campus activities.

Part of the General N. S. L. Program

The National Student League program in the struggle against war is part of its general program as a revolutionary student organization. Our attitude towards war rests upon our general analysis of modern society. The development of capitalistic society today has produced conditions which have placed the students, as a class, in a situation where their interests lie more completely with those of the revolutionary working class; the solutions of the problems facing them as students and as prospective workers must be sought in the achievement of Socialism, in the overthrow of bourgeois society. The causes of war are rooted in the economic and class structure of this society; *the struggle against war is a part of this general struggle against present-day capitalistic class society.*

Three Important Considerations

In line with this general program, but expressed more concretely, our anti-war program is based on three specific considerations; these distinguish our program from all other student programs on the war question.

We recognize first that, in their basic causes and conditions, wars today are unlike the wars of past periods. We must know the conditions and causes of the disease we are trying to eradicate before we can formulate a program of effective action against it. Its roots lie in the capitalistic system when that system has developed to a stage where it is imperialistic. The major capitalistic countries must exploit the resources, the people, the markets, and the investment possibilities of colonial regions in order to keep going; the uneven rate of development in their economic strength and exploiting potentialities leads to a constant necessity for a re-division of the exploitable regions (Germany versus England in the Great War, England versus the U. S. today).

However, these conflicts between the major imperialist countries, these simon-pure *imperialist* wars, are not the only kind of war today. The peoples of the exploited regions all over the world strive for liberation from imperialist control and for national independence. In India, in Latin-America, in China, in Persia, wars for national liberation constantly go on. The present depression has stiffened the resistance to exploitation in these regions and strengthened these movements; it has also compelled the imperialist countries frequently to resort to more forcible means of staying in power. These wars, on the part of the exploited peoples, are *progressive wars*, similar to our own American Revolution against England; they are wars of national liberation and wars directed toward the overthrow and weakening of the imperial-

ist system. As such they must be supported in every way possible.

A third type of war of major importance faces us; the danger of war and intervention against the Soviet Union. This rests upon three important conditions. The achievements (especially those related to their national minorities) and continued existence of the Soviet Union are having a tremendous influence in the awakening of the colonial and exploited peoples throughout the world. This is causing the imperialist nations as a whole increasing difficulty both in the colonial regions and at home. These same achievements, the peace policies of the Soviet Union, and the building of a workers' fatherland, are stimulating the development of revolutionary movements among the workers within each imperialist country, making another imperialist war a certain signal for civil war at home. The vast possibilities of investment, markets, and exploitable labor within a war-torn, defeated Soviet Union make an attack all the more attractive to the imperialist governments. Taken together with the effects of the depression these conditions create a powerful bond of common interest between the major imperialist countries against the Soviet Union. It requires no argument to establish the conclusion that active defense of the Soviet Union is thus part of the struggle against imperialism and war.

A fourth type of war presents itself: class war. A constructive program of struggle against war must distinguish between these four types of war, and in the light of their historical and class nature must take a positive position with reference to each. A necessary part of the struggle against imperialist war, in the light of this analysis, is support of the national revolutionary liberation movements in the colonial regions, active defense of the Soviet Union, and support of the revolutionary working class in the class war.

A second major consideration in the N. S. L. program on war is a recognition of the basic role which the working class must play in any effective and successful action against war. This class alone can take those necessary actions which will prevent wars, and this class alone can achieve the overthrow of capitalism, the root condition and cause of modern wars. They are the class which suffers most by these wars, which does the fighting and dying, which supplies the basic sinews of war in the form of munitions, food, clothing, transport services, and the like. Their strategic position in the factories, in the munitions plants, in transport, makes their organized action and support necessary to carry on or to prevent war. All other social groups, whether they be students, professionals, youth, can only play an assisting role in this struggle. Consequently, while it is important that all minor social groups sincerely opposed to war develop programs of their own based on their own immediate conditions, these programs must be in line with and contribute to the organized actions and programs of the working class. It is on this basis that the N.S.L. supports and urges all groups and individuals to support the program of the World Congress Against War.

This third consideration deals specifically with the role of the *students*. A revolutionary student program must recognize that the struggles against war to be carried on by students must center around the war situation and the war preparations as they show themselves on the campus and in the educational system. In this connection the reader is referred to another article in this issue, *Building a Student*

Movement, in which the meaning of *revolutionary student action* is dealt with more exhaustively.

The educational system and the student body are part of imperialist society and reveal the war forces at work in countless ways. They are being utilized now and will be utilized during war for imperialist war purposes. It is these immediate conditions facing the students around which action must be organized: against R.O.T.C. and other direct military training devices; against R.O.T.C. and teachings in the class rooms which paint the League of Nations, Kellogg Peace Pact, and other products of liberals and pacifists (See Edmund Stevens' article in this issue on pacifism) as positive aids to peace; against the use of the class room for nationalistic and jingoistic interpretations of history and current events; against the use of the chemical and engineering laboratories, for preparing new war materials. In this way only can the students be educated to the reality and meaning of the war situation at the present time; in this way only can the mass of students be organized for

effective struggles with the workers in stopping war.

The Question of Unity

What about the question of unity with other students in carrying on the struggle against war? The National Student League recognizes and wishes to point out to certain other student organizations that the vast majority of students as yet remain indifferent to the war danger and accept no anti-war program. The small minority organized in the various student organizations subscribe to widely different programs. The above analysis and program of the National Student League, we realize, is at present unacceptable to the vast majority of the student body. It is this question which makes the Student Congress Against War to be held in Chicago during the Christmas vacations so important. At this Congress and at other places, the N.S.L. will strive to seek a common basis of unity with all students organized and unorganized, on a program of minimum demands for immediate action.

Building a Student Movement

On the Second National Student League Convention

ON the 30th and 31st of this month the National Student League will meet at Chicago for its Second National Convention. In reality, this Convention will be the first truly national convention of the League. Here will be gathered representatives from high schools, colleges, art schools, music schools, etc., from every section of the country and from Canada and the Latin-American countries to discuss the problems and tasks of an organization national and even international in scope. The First National Convention of the League which took place last March during the Easter vacations, though it laid the basis for the building of a national movement, was the deliberations of an organization at that time largely confined to New York City.

Exactly one year ago, there crystallized in New York City a vigorous and militant student organization known as the New York Student League; a program, differing little from the present N.S.L. program, was adopted and published by this group during the Christmas vacation. During January and February, this Student League established contacts and cooperating groups in about twenty colleges outside of New York; in this connection the publication of the *Student Review* and its widespread welcome among students was of major importance. During March a call was sent out for the convening of a national convention to adopt a program and to lay the basis for a national revolutionary student movement. In brief outline, this is the origin of the present National Student League.

During the succeeding nine months, the League has grown to an organization with members and groups in approximately 200 colleges, universities, high schools, etc., located in every section of the country. From an organization limited to college students, it has established a rapidly growing High School Section of the League. It has branched out into music, art, and normal schools. And during the last month steps have been taken to organize the large numbers of unemployed students who have recently graduated or who have been forced out of college by economic conditions.

On the international field, the National Student League has established working connections with the revolutionary student movements and organizations in all the major countries of the world. It assisted in the holding of the International Student Congress at Amsterdam, Holland this summer and is the United States Section of the Revolutionary International of Students established there. In particular,

the National Student League has concentrated successfully on the task of establishing connections with the revolutionary student movements in the Latin-Americas; several of these representatives will be present at the Second Convention. Its program and activities have been of direct and material assistance in the formation of similar student organizations in Canada and in England.

The phenomenal growth of the N.S.L. since March, 1932 (less than nine months ago) is one of the factors which lends such importance and interest to the coming Second Convention in December. A truly national and international reflection of this movement will be possible at this Convention. A more adequate discussion of the problems and activities facing us should be held, and a more truly national crystallization, both organizationally and ideologically, of the policies and activities which we must pursue needs to be accomplished. There exists, partly as a result of this rapid growth, a serious discrepancy between our ideological influence and our organizational strength. Thousands of students accept the program and follow the policies and leadership of the N.S.L. and yet remain outside organizationally. On the other hand, and equally important, within the N.S.L. there are a great many groups who, while part of the League, continue to act on their campuses as isolated groups; these groups follow much the same sort of policies and activities as they did before affiliation with us. The desirability and necessity of direct personal contact and guidance with these groups to establish closer bonds of loyalty and action and to reach a clearer understanding of the meaning of the revolutionary student movement is one of the main objectives of the Convention.

The danger of war has increased and actual warfare is going on in many places; the more open militarization of the campuses and the training of the student body for war have made a more adequate statement and program of activities for the struggle against war necessary. In this connection, the holding of the National Student Congress Against War in Chicago during the Christmas vacations, called to formulate a common basis for action by all student groups, puts new problems and new opportunities up to the League. We must realize that the program adopted there will not necessarily be a 100% N.S.L. program. At best it will be one which we can and will support on the basis of a minimum program of demands for immediate action by all students.

Connected with the economic changes, both on and off

the campus, there has developed among graduate and professional students, as well as among undergraduates, a much wider recognition of the hopelessness of their condition. This has resulted in an increased "radicalization" of the student body and a pronounced leftward swing in their ideologies and actions. The student press on the campuses reflects this in the much greater amount of space devoted to student problems and difficulties. As yet, however, the vast majority of these students see little or no connection between the work of the N.S.L., its program, and its activities and the solution of their problems. They still look to the college administrations, the Boards of Higher Education, and the ingenuity of the individual to solve their difficulties. This condition makes imperative and pertinent a much wider use of the tactics of the "united front" in getting these students into action. The N.S.L. membership has shown during the last year a totally inadequate understanding of these methods. The discussions at the Convention must make a start in clearing this up and the revised program should state clearly the methods of dealing with this problem.

Related to this condition among the students, there are two very important developments facing us. Recognizing this leftward swing among the students, the Socialist Party and the L.I.D. in particular have intensified their work on the campuses during the last year in order to establish their leadership. Using the popularity of Norman Thomas among the students, Thomas-for-President Clubs were established throughout the country; the middle-class reformistic aspects of the Socialist program were played up; and widespread support was gained during the campaign. At present, energetic work is being carried on to transform this support into L.I.D. and Socialist Clubs. A second development, no less important, centers around the increased activities of the administrations themselves to retain the position of official leaders and spokesmen for the student bodies of their respective colleges. Speeches and conferences by administration heads and by faculties adopting fine resolutions regarding the necessity of educational reform, regarding opposition to 'economy programs', superficial activities for the relief of suffering students, have become extremely common. Active cooperation in energizing official faculty-student governments, which remain thoroughly under respectable control, is played up. A clear understanding of both of these developments and the methods by which they are to be handled and clarified to the student body must be achieved by the Convention.

There is another important condition which must be taken into account at our Convention in dealing with the tasks of the N.S.L. We have had nine months of active experience in building a revolutionary student movement. Essentially, the growth of our movement has been the result of our success in carrying on *activities*. Substantial achievements have been accomplished and many weaknesses have been revealed as a result. We must turn to this *activity*, this nine months of experience, to discover the causes of our weaknesses, and in the light of this critical evaluation we must revise our program and policies, ideologically and organizationally.

Ours is not a static approach or program. Changes in the objective situation with which we have dealt and in the relative strength of our movement must be constantly reflected in our policies. And on the basis of our past history, we must attain a clearer understanding of how to grapple with the immediate phases of development ahead of us.

Finally there is a basic necessity for achieving among N.S.L. members a better understanding of the meaning and tactics of *revolutionary student* action. This problem cannot be solved by merely setting up Marx-Lenin study circles. We have many students of Marx and Lenin, but we have few actual working revolutionists. This weakness is at the root of many of our mistakes and many of our difficulties.

Most N.S.L. members still regard the activities conducted off the campus in direct support of working class issues as the *revolutionary* side of their work while they look at those activities conducted on the campus around student issues as the *student* side. The result of this is that the so-called revolutionary activities of the N.S.L. lead to sectarianism and isolation from the student body, the production of a small group of "professional" radicals with no mass support or understanding. At the same time it leads to the carrying on of the so-called student activities along the old reformistic and liberal lines. Opportunism, academism, and reformism on the student issues; sectarianism and leftism on the working class issues. The greatest danger to our movement is the first; our greatest obstacle, the second.

In reality the relationship is dialectical and the issues are one. The student issues in school are the reflections on the campus and in the educational system of the class struggles and forces at present in society. In the war preparations on the campus, in the jingoism in the class room, in the worsening economic conditions facing the student, in the increased restrictive role played by administrations, in the progressive decay in educational content and method, and in many other ways, the world of class and social forces reveals itself on the campus. The problem facing the revolutionary student is the carrying out of activities on these concrete immediate conditions facing the student in the light of our revolutionary class analysis.

Students are not factory workers and the attempt to educate, arouse and organize students on the basis of factory issues and conditions as the immediate starting points of activity can only result at best in "taking a few slumming" and leaving the mass, which is ready material under present conditions for the reformers and liberals untouched. This does not mean that the students cannot and should not assist the revolutionary working class. On the contrary, it is precisely because these immediate conditions now facing wider numbers of the students, and more fully facing them after they graduate, are integrally connected with the conditions facing the worker, that their interests lie with the revolutionary working class. The problem is to make this clear to the student. Activities conducted on these issues lead the student up against the same basic forces and conditions facing the worker in his struggles and, in action, reveal the true nature of these forces and class alignments. And on this basis, a wider and truly revolutionary support for the revolutionary working class solution of these problems by students can be achieved.

Basically, the needed clarification on the theory and tactic of revolutionary student action can only be achieved through the actual carrying on of these concrete struggles. The Convention must, however, provide a basis for creating this understanding in its treatment of our problems and our policies; and it must take steps to provide organizational channels for constant guidance in our future activities.

In the light of these conditions, the Second Convention of the National Student League will approach its problems. The calling of the Convention during the Christmas vacations should make it possible for maximum student representation. The holding of the Convention in Chicago, Ill. in addition should facilitate the removal of a past New York City orientation in program and in organization. The basis of representation to the Convention is sufficiently broad to prevent "leadership from above." Every N.S.L. group on each campus or in each school is entitled to one delegate for each ten members or fraction thereof. In addition, the National Executive Committee of the League extends an invitation to all other student organizations and clubs to send fraternal delegates to the Convention. These credentials for the Convention may be obtained from the National Office of the League at 13 West 17th St., New York City.

DONALD HENDERSON

Oxford Escapes Its Cloister

FOR the press of Great Britain the London Hunger March has been the creation of "paid agitators from Moscow," who have used the widespread and chronic suffering of our 3,000,000 unemployed to further their own nefarious and anti-British schemes. "Anti-British" is the word, for "British interests" have never been more blatantly put forward in their true light, as the interests of a handful of politicians, war-mongers, and capitalists, interests to which the working masses of this country are expected to conform.

One incident in the Hunger March, however, has attracted almost equal attention, and has proved as good copy for our press. This was the reception of the marchers in the university city of Oxford. And naturally, our newspapers have garbled the whole affair as gleefully as they relegate the whole unemployed workers' movement, and its organizer, Wal Hannington, to the status of Russian conspirators and exploiters of misery for the purpose of rousing disaffection. For days our press has told us of the cheerful sympathy shown by the undergraduates of Oxford to the unfortunate, though misguided, demonstrators from among the lower orders. Oxford has provided, by its treatment of the Hunger Marchers, "a thorough refutation of the Marxist theory of class struggle," and has shown that the first care of the middle classes, and of their student offspring, is the interest of the workers, especially of the unemployed.

Now let us consider the actual facts. Why was it that Oxford was able to startle the press by the welcome it afforded the Hunger Marchers?

Six weeks ago it is more than doubtful if the average citizen, don, or student in Oxford had heard of the Means Test, except possibly as a vague object for the attack of unscrupulous agitators. Certainly no one considered it as a legitimate grievance. Again, the typical attitude towards the Hunger March was one of annoyance at the disturbance created, distrust of agitation, and a general resentment that the unemployed should presume to organize in their own defense. The organization of the Marchers' reception here fell in the first place to the local committee of the unemployed workers movement, whose work, not being good copy ex-

cept as a focus for press attacks upon Communism, has not been mentioned at all. But the fact is that the task of feeding and accommodating the contingent of 260 which came through Oxford was not undertaken by sympathetic representatives of culture, but by these class-conscious unemployed workers, and by a handful of militant undergraduates, who persuaded, shamed and bullied the non-political, that is to say anti-working class, sanctuaries of Oxford learning, into salving their consciences by sharing in this provision for the destitute.

Some gave generously of their money; a few gave generously of their active work. One London paper remarked that "it was quite the done thing for undergraduates of every political complexion to look in at the Corn Exchange" (where the marchers were housed) "during the week-end." Quite so, and when their interest in the new amusement had evaporated, they left the Corn Exchange, and read about their own generous labours in the next day's papers. Meanwhile the effective work was done, with a few exceptions, by the unemployed workers of Oxford and their student comrades, working not from that "sympathy" which the unemployed have learnt to estimate at its true value, but from a desire to share in the active struggle of the working class. Certainly there were exceptions. Priests and Christians in droves contented themselves with comforting declarations of grave concern. But the important moral to be drawn from this Oxford episode lies in the ease with which the "sympathetic" distinguished themselves from the active supporters of the marchers. On the morning the marchers left Oxford; a band of Oxford workers and students marched out of the city at their head. Mr. Duff Cooper, well-known as the husband of that celebrated fashion-plate Lady Diana Duff-Cooper, wrote to a newspaper hoping the "university authorities would know how to deal with stupidity of this kind." "Sympathy" is admirable, one gathers; active support begins by being stupid and will no doubt end by being criminal. Capitalist praise of "sympathy" and "charity" wears very thin when it is applied to a militant solidarity.

OCTOBER CLUB OF OXFORD

In the Midst of Revolutions

THE average American student, who cannot recognize the economic forces behind our own politics, can hardly be expected to recognize the extremely involved, imperialist maneuvers in Central and South America. A general ignorance about these countries exists even among our more internationally minded students. Even they, who should understand the vital importance of our imperialist possessions, the connection between conditions of workers and students in the United States and their condition in the colonies, very often fail to realize the significance of this relationship.

The active participation of the students in Latin American revolutionary movements has led to the erroneous conception that all students who take part in these "revolutions" are revolutionary students. They are no more "revolutionary" than the revolutions themselves. Most of the official student organizations are simply sets of puppets going through their parts in a marionette show staged by American or British Imperialism and engineered by native showmen.

In Mexico, the biggest student organization is called *Confederacion Nacional De Estudiantes*, a numerically large

and very powerful group. It is assisted and recognized by the government, and its leaders are all reformists, using radical phrases to gain their ends. Since the general sentiment of Latin American students is genuinely anti-imperialistic, these valuable assistants to the government are very loud in their anti-imperialist talk, but their propaganda is not directed against the source of their imperialist oppression, American capitalism. Instead they howl against the individual tyrants and dictators, like Serra of Colombia, Machado of Cuba, or Gomez of Venezuela. Instead of calling upon the students to support the real struggle of the workers and poor peasants against American Imperialism, they turn the fight into a campaign for replacing the men in power with national reformists.

As for their role as student leaders of student fights: when the Mexican government cut the University budget by 500 pesos a year, the student leaders immediately organized a campaign for raising money from individuals. This aid to the government was dressed up to look like an attempt to free the University from government control. If the schools received no support from the government they would really be autonomous.

Another example of the misleading character of these student leaders in their so-called anti-imperialist program is their behavior during the fearful slaughter that followed the attempted insurrection in Salvador. When the revolutionary workers and peasants organized an armed rebellion against their rulers, open servants of American imperialism, these Mexican students did not even organize a demonstration to protest the terror exercised against the rebels, supposedly fellow fighters against the common enemy, Wall Street domination.

The Mexican student organization, along with student movements in all Central America, belongs to a higher body called the *Ibero-American Student Conference*. This central body was the organization which refused to participate in the Pan-American Conference called by the American Intercollegiate Association to protest the presence of American marines in Nicaragua and Yankee Imperialism in general. The demagogical character of this step was later clearly exposed by the fact that they permitted representatives of the American student body to come and speak before student groups in their own countries.

The *Ibero-American Student Conference* has recently issued a statement supporting the war of Colombia against Peru. These revolutionary student leaders issued no call of any kind protesting against the war, to say nothing about calling for a struggle by the workers, peasants and students against the war, an imperialist war resulting from British and American rivalry in South America.

In Cuba, the official student organization is called *Directorio Estudiantil*. This is the organization in which Julio Mella was a leader. After he was expelled, for being too revolutionary, the organization split into two factions, calling themselves *Ala Derecha* (right wing) and *Ala Izquierda* (left wing). The *Ala Derecha*, like its Mexican counterpart, supports the nationalist reformist opposition in Cuba against Machado. It also takes no part at all in combatting the repressions to which students must submit. Two years ago the Cuban University was closed by Machado after the students organized systematic protests against him. The *Ala Derecha* carries on no fight for the re-opening of the University. Their line is to get rid of Machado, since they cannot have any culture while he exists anyway. And so the University stays closed while these student leaders help the national reformists in their attempt to get the contract from the United States to run Cuba.

Many members of *Ala Derecha* support the terrorist ABC organization, the organization responsible for the assassination of many government officials. Consciously or unconsciously, these students are once more aiding the government in its anti-working class campaign. The removal of a few corrupt and hated officials and their subsequent replacement by men of the same ilk tend to dissipate the energy of the revolutionary movement. As a result of these useless acts of terror, the government has reacted with three-fold terror against the revolutionary peasants, workers and really revolutionary students.

In Panama and Costa Rica, the student movement is completely reactionary. There are, however, some real revolutionary student groups which have definitely allied themselves with the revolutionary workers and peasants of Latin America. In Mexico this group is known as the *Federacion De Estudiantes Proletarios*. It is comparatively new and composed almost entirely of revolutionary elements. There is another Mexican group known as the U.E.P.O.C., (the Union of Workers and Peasants). This was organized by the Mexican government in its days of genuine anti-imperialist struggle. It was to conduct an educational campaign among the Mexican people, to arouse in them a sort of cultural nationalism. It employed well known artists as well as students to carry out this work. Now that the Mexican

government has once more become a puppet of American Imperialism, the revolutionary students have continued to utilize the apparatus set up in the old days for the purposes of revolutionary and anti-imperialist propaganda. One part of this apparatus is the system of factory evening schools. The entire organization of these two groups is genuinely anti-imperialist and left wing in composition. For this reason they are continually being thrown out of their headquarters, persecuted, arrested and terrorized in every way.

There are also regional revolutionary groups as in Jalapa and Vera Cruz, where all the students of the Normal School took part in an anti-imperialist, anti-clerical strike on Nov. 7, 1931. These groups have newspapers which state their program and serve as agitational mediums. One of the best known of these papers is the *Grito* (the Call) issued by the U.E.P.O.C.

In Cuba, the left wing of the former *Directorio Estudiantil*, the *Ala Izquierda*, is the group which organizes the students to struggle against Machado as a tool of colonial exploitation and not merely as a personal tyrant. It raises specific student demands and fights for student rights. It also mobilizes the students to fight with the working class in the anti-imperialist, anti-feudal revolution. These students are facing the greatest terror at the hands of Machado. Great numbers of them are constantly being imprisoned and many have lost their lives in this struggle against tyranny.

In Chile, Argentina and Uruguay the student movements are definitely left-wing. In Venezuela, all student organizations are banned. In Peru, there is the APRA, a Nationalist organization whose leader, Haya de la Torre, is one of the greatest of Latin American demagogues. This organization has come out openly supporting the Peruvian government in its war against Colombia.

With this bare outline of the alignment of forces, the tasks of the N.S.L. in regard to the Latin American student movement become very clear. The broadest united front among students must be started on the basis of unconditional struggle against foreign domination, by American students here and Latin American students in their own countries. It is important to remember that it is only the leaders of the official student movements who are open to attacks as hypocrites and reformists. The rank and file is ardently anti-imperialist and can be won over to any program which will help them in their fight against Yankee imperialism.

There is no revolutionary student center in South and Central America. There are only scattered left wing groups. The National Student League Conference in December can take the first steps toward creating such a center. Every effort is being made to see that student representatives from Panama, Honduras, Cuba, and Mexico arrive at the conference. The student groups in these countries have expressed their eagerness to send delegates but they are very poor and must have financial assistance to get there.

This is not the only task of the National Student League in this connection. We must educate our own student body to the realization that the struggle against Yankee imperialism here at home is one of our most important tasks. Only in that way can we help our fellow students in Latin America in their fight against terror and economic exploitation. We are trying to win over the Latin-American students in this country to an anti-imperialist program.

Only by taking such action will we prove to the revolutionary student bodies of Latin America and the rank and file of the official student organizations that we are not merely another trick out of Wall Street's bag to keep them in subjection and terror, that their fight is also our fight. Only by uniting with the students and exposing their false leaders will we be able to show our solidarity with revolutionary students in Central and South America and build a real All-America revolutionary central student organization.

S. SMALL

The Students Bear Arms

IN the United States war preparations, the R.O.T.C. is a vital link, which must be strengthened at any cost; and consequently, no method or means of blandishment or compulsion is overlooked in the effort to secure and maintain footholds in educational institutions. Public displays, reviews at which pretty girl sponsors inspect the cadets, natty uniforms, sham battles, military balls, are all part and parcel of the popularization policy. And in this unprecedented campaign, college administrations, as before, and during the last World War, are using all their endeavors to promote and further the object of the War Department. Again, as in 1917, academic credit is being offered for military training courses which are widely publicized and highly praised in college catalogues, courses of a jingoistic nature, which demonstrate the "need of national organization for the military defense of the country." Again, as before the World War, college campuses are witness to intense suppression drives directed against militant struggles which are made to prevent the mobilization of students for imperialist war. The "intellectual and physical equipment of the college" is in the hands of the military hirelings of imperialism.

Colleges and universities have always figured prominently in the plans for mobilization. In 1916, at the suggestion of the War Department, the National Defense Act was passed for the express purpose of providing "systematic military training at civil educational institutions for the purpose of qualifying selected students of such institutions for appointment as reserve officers in the military forces of the United States." These reserve officers were to serve as a nucleus for the training of recruits in case of war. This purpose was clearly brought out by subsequent events. Mr. Kahn, speaking for the War Department on the floor of Congress on April 4, 1917, when the Military Academy appropriation bill was under consideration, said of the student training corps: "They have from 20,000 to 30,000 men in the various colleges of the country under military training . . . who are probably not the best material for training recruits, but they will do in an emergency."

In the early spring of 1917, when each succeeding day found America drifting nearer to war, the faculties and trustees of many universities sent resolutions of loyalty and support to the President. President Butler of Columbia, previously and subsequently a pacifist, underwent a rapid change of front by adopting early in March "strenuous measures for the mobilization of all of the forces at Columbia in the event of war." At the same time the trustees of the University ably seconded his efforts by appointing a committee to inquire "whether any of the faculty were propounding to students doctrines which were subversive to the constitution of the United States or otherwise unpatriotic." (*New York Times*). A few days later a group of pacifists were forcibly ejected from a patriotic meeting held in the university gymnasium, and advised to "go out and play with the Barnard girls." Plans were then made for the formation of a training corps for military officers, as called for in President Butler's proposals. The chairman announced that the meeting had been called to "send out to the world the message that Columbia, as a whole, is a patriotic, red-blooded institution and has no pacifist yellow streak."

As campuses were more and more converted into training camps, normal academic activities were completely suspended. The *Times* of April 2 comments: "The spontaneous unhesitating verdict of American colleges is that if war comes . . . athletic competitions must be foregone, to the end that all muscular expenditure shall be dedicated solely to the country's need." Immediately after the declaration of war

the following headlines appeared: "Harvard Crew Disbanded-Rowing Goes By the Board as Call to War is Heard," "Cornell Athletics Cease, Games Scheduled Cancelled Because of War," "U. of Penn. Discontinuance of Sports May Be Discussed Here Tomorrow."

Besides directly supplying cannon fodder, universities devised other means for serving the forces of destruction. Columbia University established a summer "War Session" with courses "that will make for preparedness" (*Times*, April 8). Dean Woodbridge of the Philosophy Department gave special lectures on German atrocities. Students in the advertising display classes at New York University were set to work planning war posters for use in recruiting.

Sundry means were devised to stimulate recruiting among students. Resolutions were passed to give diplomas to all New York City high school students who enlisted. Credit toward an academic degree was likewise granted to college students, and Columbia University sent forth her undergraduates with a rifle clasped firmly in one hand, and in the other the "Bachelor of Arts Certificate for National Service." In their ears resounded the ringing words of G. Stanley Hall: "Oh, the splendor and glory of 'the day' that has come to us Americans! We have our 'place in the sun' for it is ours to save Europe and the world for democracy." (Addresses and Proceedings of the National Education Association, 1918).

The efforts of the schools and colleges were no less at home than on the battlefield. Drastic changes were instituted in curricula "to make for the teaching of democracy and country's need." Immediately after the declaration of war the following headlines appeared: "Harvard Crew Disbanded-patriotism;" textbooks were "carefully scrutinized so that everything might be excluded that was misleading as to fact and erroneous in principle." And with the first blast of trumpets, the first roll of drums and sound of marching feet, our teachers, our professors, and our traditional leaders in pacifist activities became practical and ideological recruiting stations. Under the auspices of the National Security League, the best qualified professors from the leading universities of the country were released on full pay and sent forth "to push propaganda for interpreting the meaning of the war in every possible way, in cooperation with public officials, educators, newspapers, churches, universities, granges, labor organizations, and other available agencies." The National Education Association and the American Council on Education had particularly important functions in the imperialist war machine. They gave active response to the call of the War Department for a large college enrollment, "in order that it may have as a military asset, an adequate supply of material for officers, technicians, and business administrators." They aided the government in making a more "economical, wise, and efficient" coordination of its activities in the schools. They favored and recommended the adoption of "universal and compulsory military training in the schools . . . by the national government and at its expense." Indeed, these educational organizations, representing at the time 600,000 public school teachers and the interests of approximately 20,000,000 children, did their bit during the World War.

This campaign of provocative propaganda was redoubled in energy by wholesale dismissals, expulsions, and acts of terrorism launched against students and teachers. "Put your heels on the vipers," blustered E. K. Hubbard, President of the Manufacturers' Association of Connecticut, in a patriotic address made in February, 1918. The American Association of University Teachers did. In its monthly bulletin, the Association urged the dismissal of all disloyal college teach-

ers. (*Times*, March 2, 1918). Nicholas Murray Butler announced that "traitors would not be tolerated at Columbia University in the Faculty or the student body." Prof. J. M. Cattell and H. W. L. Dana were dismissed at a meeting of the Board of Trustees on the charge of disseminating doctrines tending to encourage disloyalty. The same fate befell many others, professors and students. Numerous teachers were driven out of the New York City educational system and some actually imprisoned by court-martial for similar reasons.

The end of the war did not mean the obliteration of imperialist rivalry; open military struggle subsided while underlying economic conflicts continued to rage. Colonial empires had been temporarily redistributed but the fundamental antagonisms of capitalism remained the same.

Today, the struggle in the Orient threatens to be the center of a new world war, more inclusive than the last. Unable to solve the economic crisis through further exploitation of its industrial workers and peasants, and its colonial possessions, Korea and Formosa, Japanese imperialism started the invasion of Manchuria, attaining simultaneously a foothold for a war against the Soviet Union. Dispatches published daily reveal that the Japanese army is still fighting Chinese soldiers who apparently are not aware that, in the words of Count Uchida, "of their own free will," the Chinese people had set up the "independent state" of Manchukuo. Much as American capitalists feared this move as an attempt at Japanese control of the Yangtse valley, "Wall Street remained definitely sympathetic towards the Japanese adventure in China, regarding it as basically a bit of international policing which would benefit business all over the world." (*New York World-Telegram*, February 2, 1932.) The incident at Shanghai differed little from the battles against the Chinese people waged by American, French, and British gunboats in the Yangtse River. Though America and the industrial nations of Europe differ as to who shall dominate the immense market of China, all are agreed that it shall not be the Chinese people.

But more significant than any of these inter-capitalist antagonisms is the common imperialist hatred of the Soviet Union. The rulers of America, Europe, and Japan admit the imminence of an united attack on the Russian workers' and peasants' government.

The so-called "Great Powers" of the world realize as clearly as anyone, the tremendous influence which the Soviet Union is having on the masses of people in the colonial regions of the world. In China, in India, in South America, increasing resistance and revolutionary movements for national liberation are greatly stimulated by the continued existence of the Soviet Union. This means greater difficulties in exploiting these regions for the imperialist countries, compels them to resort to forceful means of maintaining their power, and increases their economic difficulties at home. The same effect is evident internally; increased resistance to the burdens of the economic crisis by workers and farmers, and the growth of revolutionary sentiment among these masses against their own governments. The example of the Soviet Union with its continued achievements during the last fifteen years is reaching the millions of workers in each capitalist country. As Professor Oscar Yazsi of Oberlin College has pointed out, the main check to imperialist war in Europe today is the fear of civil war and the Bolshevization of the whole of Europe. Under these conditions the imperialist nations of the world are seeking a common basis for handling a common enemy: the Soviet Union.

The Japanese plans have been revealed in the recently uncovered Tanaka memorandum, presented to the Emperor of Japan on July 25, 1927, by the Prime Minister, which in unequivocal terms admits "the inevitability of war with Russia on the fields of North Manchuria." Among Americans, Representative Hamilton Fish, speaking before the

American Coalition of Patriotic Societies, called for war against the Soviets in these words: "A house divided against itself cannot stand, nor can the economic structure of the world long endure, half communist and half capitalist." The strategy of the imperialist nations is to build an "iron ring" of hostile countries around the frontiers of the Soviet Union. The leading role in this maneuver in the west is played by France, which openly supports the Japanese advance to the Soviet border and plans to use the dependent states of Poland and Rumania as bases of operation. *Current History* of October 1932 quotes from the Franco-Polish military pact signed on Sept. 15, 1932:

"The French Government undertakes to give its support to the Polish Government in case of an armed conflict with Soviet Russia. . . ." From the Polish-Rumanian military convention, it quotes: "For an offensive against Russia, the armed forces of the two parties will be concentrated each in their own territory; the point of contact between them will be established at Hotin on the Dniester."

That England has a share in these preparations can be seen in the recent abrogation of the trade pact with Russia and the results of the recent Ottawa Conference. America's share in the plotting is evident from the following significant comment on the visit to Czechoslovakia of the American Chief of Staff, General MacArthur:

"The Commander-in-Chief of the U. S. Army can learn all there is to know on the Dniester front (Rumania-Soviet boundary), thus fulfilling the orders he got from Washington to study the conditions in the border states around Russia in order to provide the basis for the establishment of an Anti-Soviet Front in Europe by America. For it is no longer a secret that this is why MacArthur was sent to the continent." (*Bohemia*, a Prague, Czechoslovakia, newspaper).

All these facts point to one inescapable conclusion. The capitalist world is ready to plunge into another war, especially directed against the workers' government of Russia.

On the basis of experience gained during the World War, preparations for the impending conflict have been enlarged and integrated on a mass scale. Secretary of War Hurley clarifies the position of the United States in this respect. He is quoted in the *Times* of May 30, 1931, as follows: "The army is better organized, better trained, better equipped, better housed and better officered than ever before in peace. In the post-war period of intensive study and effort, we have secured factors for proper defense that we did not possess in 1917. We now have a carefully detailed plan of mobilization." The colleges and universities have an important function in these war plans. "A more highly educated and more numerous personnel to employ as commanders and instructors" is now available as a result of the R. O. T. C. machine devised by the War Department.

Since 1921, the growth of military education in our schools has been rapidly accelerated. In 313 institutions, military training was given in 1931 to 147,009 students. Of this total, it was compulsory in 159 institutions affecting 95,344 students. In 1912 military education was given in 94 schools involving 29,979 students. In the Annual Report of the Secretary of War for 1926, we find the following boast: "During the course of a year, the War Department guides, for varying periods, the lives of over 400,000 young Americans . . ."

In the decade from 1921 to 1931, the federal government spent \$106,965,041 for the R. O. T. C. This does not include the expenses of student militarization under Section 55c of the National Defense Act providing for industrial training, and Section 113 providing for rifle corps. In 1932, \$6,000,000 was appropriated for the R. O. T. C. and C. M. T. C., excluding the pay of commissioned officers and

enlisted men in charge of these activities and the interest and depreciation on material equipment used.

In camouflaging the true purpose for these vast expenditures and rapid developments, military strategists often stress the healthful physical effects of military training and its value for teaching citizenship. The former claim is, indeed, untenable; it has been effectively denied by numerous hygienists and physicians. As regards the second "benefit", citizenship training under the supervision of any governmental agency has as its sole purpose the eradication of any contrary-minded sentiment and the perpetuation of the system of national capitalism with all its attendant evils. Consider the type of material that is presented in military training manuals; it needs no comment. Training manual number 2000-25 prepared under the direction of the Chief of Staff defines internationalism: "An impractical, destructive idealism called internationalism is being propagated by certain foreign agitators, and is being echoed and re-echoed by many of the nation's 'intellectuals'. Its efforts are to combat the spirit of patriotism, to destroy that spirit of nationalism without which no people can long endure."

The superficial reasons for establishing military training in the schools can no longer beguile the student. The War Department organizes it for a very definite purpose, as part of its plans for the impending conflict. William T. Stone, Washington Representative of the Foreign Policy Association makes an unequivocal statement in the *Times* of September 4, 1932: "Efficient mobilization of man-power depends upon the existence of a large and trained reserve . . . The War Department has been forced to sacrifice the regular army, which is expected to furnish a force ready to take the field, in order to carry out the military training program in high schools and colleges." In the *Herald-Tribune* of Feb. 16, 1930, is outlined the "New Mobilization Plan" which "enables the United States to muster an army of 4,000,000 men within ten months." Under this plan, the "time necessary to train a force will require nine months less than under the 1917 effort." However, a full realization of their program necessitates intensive activity among the students who will supply "the bulk of the reserve officers." It is unmistakably stated that "there is still a shortage of reserve

officers to complete the full requirements of the mobilization plan. More than 80,000 more officers are needed. The reserve officers of the future will come from the R.O.T.C. and the C.M.T.C." Nor will women be excluded from the war drive. According to Major General Ely, "women will play a greater part in future wars. Governments, including our own, have been studying the use of women in war."

Students can no longer ignore these vital facts; there is no other explanation when our National Guard is doubled, when 110,000 men are added to the Reserve Officers' Corps, when the scope and efficiency of military training in colleges and summer camps are increased, when billions of dollars are spent for armaments, when industrial mobilization is being feverishly prepared. The *Armaments Year-Book* (1928-29) reveals the staggering sum spent by the U. S. on armaments alone, \$772,984,000,—more than any of its imperialist rivals. Manufacturing establishments, to the number of 17,000, surveyed by government technicians, are ready at a moment's notice to fill orders for 4,000 items on the War Department's list. The War Policies Commission has already undertaken study of the task of industrial reorganization in any "future emergency." And simultaneously with this predominantly important industrial mobilization is the mobilization of the student body—men and women—in the functioning of the war machine. The Annual Report of the Secretary of War for 1929 strikes this very keynote: "This important element of our national defense continues to supply the life-blood for the Organized Reserves, furnishing as it does, approximately 5,000 young officers each year. Its contribution of trained specialists to the Organized Reserves is of inestimable value."

But, indeed, not as in 1917 will the student body of America permit itself to be betrayed and driven into slaughter. Today, we are preparing to mobilize our forces against imperialist war. "We propose to struggle resolutely against preparations for such wars, and against the attempt to utilize the schools and colleges for war whether this takes the form of outright military training or the more subtle forms of jingoistic propaganda." (Program of the National Student League).

JOSHUA WINTERS

Toward a Real College Theatre

DESPITE the fact that the college student has become very much aware of his economic instability, in the field of culture the student generally continues to accept an outworn, hollow, unrealistic creed, summarized in the slogan, "Art for art's sake." This slogan ostensibly separates art from life, making of art a gentle hot-house flower too delicate to thrive in the strong sun and wind of reality. As such, art becomes an "escape" from life, a pleasant opium-dream, and equally insignificant and unimportant.

The theatre in the American college and university today is by and large not a social theatre and not a students' theatre (except that students take part in its work). It is not a social theatre, for its plays ignore the most important social phenomena of our time. It is a theatre doing only "classics" of mainly historical interest, Broadway hits, and superficial folk-plays. Those plays dealing with important current matters are generally by writers who fail to get at the basic social roots.

The most important of all modern phenomena, the rise of the working class on the social horizon, is almost entirely ignored by the theatre. Strikes, unemployment, hunger marches, lynching, deportations, police brutality, civil wars, the new world in the Soviet Union, the hollow mockery of

League of Nations' pacifism, bloody fascism, all these vital and dramatic matters do not exist, so far as the college theatre is concerned.

Nor is this theatre a students' theatre. When treated at all, the most blatant phases of student life, sex, liquor, and sports, are discussed. Such matters as the right of academic freedom, the question of "overproduction" in the professions, the closing down of schools, increased charges for education, R.O.T.C., these are some of the basic questions before the working class and middle class student today. But you will never find a trace of them in the college theatre. God, and the Trustees, forbid!

This is not to say that the college theatre is entirely blind to life. It couldn't be, and continue to maintain enough interest to keep it going. While by far the greater number of college theatres ignore social themes, last year witnessed an increasing interest in this direction among some of the leading theatres. In fact, Carl Carmer, writing in the *Theatre Arts Monthly* (July 1932) declared that "the whole current trend encourages the production of propagandist plays."

A brief analysis of some of the social plays presented by college theatres last season might prove interesting. Take a play with a war theme, *Journey's End*, by R. C. Sheriff,

produced at the University of Missouri. It portrays the experiences of a group of officers—gentlemen all—who kill and are killed without questioning, without dreaming that anything should or can be done about it. *When the Red Army Marches* was produced by the Civic Theatre of Denver University. It describes the wild dream of a "parlor bolshevik" (and of the enlightened author). Its moral: "His dream has proved to him that the principle of *Red Russia* if established here will mean . . . destruction of all a true American holds dear." There is no question as to who is meant by "a true American."

Of course there are a number of "labor colleges" (e.g., Commonwealth College, Brookwood Labor College) doing "labor" plays of varying degrees of clarity and militancy. It is not always the labor college, though, that does the best work along the line of clear-headed dramatization of the problems of the working and farming classes. There are varying degrees of "lefts" and "rights," and pseudo-revolutionists, in the theatre no less than in economics and politics.

One college theatre deserves special mention as a social theatre. It is, strangely enough, the Experimental Theatre of Vassar College. In May of 1931, it produced *Can You Hear Their Voices?*, a play dealing with the Arkansas farmers who, refusing to starve, marched with guns and took food for their families. The play, based on a short story by Whittaker Chambers, was written by Hallie Flanagan, director of the Theatre, in collaboration with her assistant.

The Vassar Theatre has been greatly influenced by the new revolutionary workers' theatre movement that has been rising rapidly in the last two years, centering around the magazine, *Workers Theatre*, and the League of Workers Theatres of the U. S. A. Last May, Vassar actually presented two short plays of the workers' theatre before its startled school audiences, a play on the question of unemployment insurance and a recitation on the Kentucky miners strike. Plays of similar import have been produced at the University of North Carolina, and the University of Texas.

This activity has developed spontaneously. But now the time has come for all socially-conscious students interested in the theatre to work systematically for the building of a real students' theatre movement as an integral part of the student movement. This should be the work particularly of members of the National Student League. A real students' theatre will also do plays dealing with immediate student problems, as summarized in the program of the National Student League.

What are the practical steps to be taken in order to develop such a students' theatre movement? For one thing, students should seek to have their school dramatics organizations include social plays among their productions this year. The question of producing *Can You Hear Their Voices?* should be raised in every student dramatics organization. This play has already been done in many languages in many lands. *Scottsboro, Limited*, Langston Hughes' one-act play on the Scottsboro case (published in *New Masses*, N. Y.), should also be proposed.

There will naturally be a great deal of resistance to the idea of the social theatre. Where headway is slow or, in some cases, impossible, efforts should be continued, but the social problems club should then become the center for producing at least the one-act plays. Such a students' theatre should work in closest co-operation with the revolutionary workers' theatre. Exchange of plays, performances, directors, audiences, and criticism will help both. Organizational contact should be established by the National Student League with the League of Workers Theatres (L.O.W.T.), locally, as well as nationally. A revolutionary students' theatre in alliance with the revolutionary workers' theatre can be a highly effective weapon in bringing before the students the fighting program of the student movement in its alliance with the militant working class.

BERNARD REINES

An Open Letter

To All Friends and Supporters of the National Student Congress Against War:

The following paragraph appears in the League for Industrial Democracy's News Bulletin of November 16th:

"Some of you have perhaps been invited to a congress in Chicago during late December under the sponsorship of a committee created by the Communist-dominated National Student League. We make no recommendations concerning your attendance, but we feel that we are responsible for reporting to you our experience in offering the cooperation of the L. I. D. We have always heartily supported any genuinely representative attack upon the war system, and in line with this policy the aid of the L. I. D. in making the Chicago conference a "united front" of all anti-war student groups was suggested by Blanshard and Porter to the officers of the Conference and the Secretary of the N.S.L. The N.S.L. leaders rejected the L.I.D. proposals for cooperative control of their anti-war conference and insisted that it should be controlled entirely by a committee of their own choosing which included at the time no leading socialists or pacifists."

The National Committee for the Student Congress Against War feels compelled to bring to the attention of the groups associated with it in the work of the Chicago conference, the misstatements of fact contained in the above paragraph.

The statement begins with an insinuation that the National Committee of the Congress is under communist control. Yet, because the L.I.D. are perfectly aware of the composition of that committee they are careful to refrain from stating this directly.

The L.I.D. says: "We make no recommendations . . ." but the whole tenor of the comments that follow constitutes a recommendation, and we cannot believe that the directors of the L.I.D. have published these misstatements from non-sectarian motives. Why were they afraid to issue any recommendations openly to their members on such an important question as the coming Chicago Congress?

The sentence concerning the L.I.D.'s offer of cooperation, which contains the most serious charge, is a direct distortion of the truth. No proposals were ever received by the National Committee for the Student Congress Against War from either Mr. Blanshard or Mr. Porter or any other member or leader of the L.I.D. The proposals which Mr. Porter and Mr. Blanshard made, were made to National Student League leaders, Jos. Cohen and Donald Henderson, who were also members of the National Committee. Those proposals were to the effect that the National Student League should attempt to secure the scrapping of the present National Committee for the Congress, which had been chosen to include student leaders in the anti-war fight from all over the country, irrespective of organizational connections; that in its place, a joint L.I.D.—N.S.L. committee should be appointed by the leaders of those two organizations alone. Even if acceptable, those proposals were made after a month's work by the National Committee for the Student Congress Against War. Far from being acceptable, these proposals were made to narrow the student congress to the control of two organizations, who represent but a small fraction of the sincere students who should participate in the anti-war movement. There was thus no question of bringing in ". . . all anti-war student groups." The National Committee could not consent to replacing a broad committee of students by a bi-partisan committee of two organizations, especially in view of the fact that both these organiza-

tions, the N.S.L. and the L.I.D. have already clearly formulated a definite program on war, which the majority of students do not at the present time accept.

The L.I.D. further states that the National Committee "... at that time included no leading socialists and pacifists." As a matter of fact, the committee includes such leading pacifists as Henri Barbusse, Sherwood Anderson, Robert Morss Lovett, the National President of the L.I.D., and J. B. Matthews, Secretary of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, leading student socialists such as Gregory Bardacke, head of the Thomas-For-President Club at Syracuse, Nathaniel Weyl, contributing editor to the L.I.D. magazine, *Revolt*, as well as many students unaffiliated with any student organization.

The National Committee for the Student Congress Against War demands that the L.I.D. leaders in New York publish a correction of these misstatements in their next bulletin.

Finally, we are glad to state that so far, the L.I.D. leaders stand alone in taking this narrow, sectarian attitude. Reports which have come to the Committee indicate widespread interest in and support of the Congress by L.I.D. members throughout the country.

NATIONAL COMMITTEE

FOR THE STUDENT CONGRESS AGAINST WAR

(This letter has been sent to all interested student publications.)

An Anti-War Conference

INITIATED by the League for Industrial Democracy, and supported by twenty-two organizations ranging from the National Student Federation to the Young Communist League Opposition, the United Youth Conference Against War was held in New York during the Thanksgiving holidays. A large number of student groups, mainly from the New York state area responded to the call for a united front to meet the war danger. As the Conference progressed, however, it became apparent that the control rested in the hands of the New York Socialist Party leadership, through the operation of a well-organized and tight-voting caucus. Seven Socialists, and no one else, were elected to the Resolutions Committee. The Credentials Committee was not elected by the delegates. An appreciable volume of protest against these tactics was sounded from the floor, including a concerted motion of censure from fourteen college groups; and the atmosphere of distrust that was thus engendered made the formulation of any unified program impossible.

Accordingly, the analysis of the Conference must be an analysis primarily of the attitudes of the scheduled speakers, rather than of the delegates. While the fundamental basis of disagreement was partly clarified at the special discussion sessions, at the meeting scheduled to be devoted to the formulation of a program of action, such a discussion of philosophies and approach was precluded, and the really serious work of the Conference was left to a Continuation Committee consisting mainly of organization appointees of the sponsoring groups. The program will thus be drawn up after the Conference has adjourned, and will be one formulated by a narrow leadership rather than by youth delegates.

The keynote address of the Conference was delivered by A. Fenner Brockway, the Chairman of the British Independent Labour Party, and a prominent member of the Amsterdam Federation of Trade Unions. Brockway spoke of the rapidity with which the crisis is deepening, the disruption of the capitalist world economy which it heralds, and the iron remedies to which capitalism is obliged to resort if it wishes to stave off revolution and civil war. These remedies—fascism,—anti-working class dictatorships of all sorts—and imperialist war force the working class movement into a

race against time to establish a socialist world. Thus, according to Brockway, the old democratic and Fabian tactics are swept into the discard, and an effective socialist party must rely on seizure of power by revolutionary means. The second part of Brockway's speech can be described only as a complete failure to trace correct inferences from his premises. He spoke of the advantage of taking office nationally by the ballot as opposed to the taking of power by force, without recognizing the futility of the former. He recognized the need for educating the army to side with the workers and turn its guns on the government in case of war, yet at the same time could emphasize the value of a group of conscientious objectors who by force of pacifist example serve to help stop war. The position of Brockway is a half way position between revolutionary Marxism and social democracy. It accepts the necessity of using war as the occasion to turn the workers against the capitalist class and seize power by insurrection. Nevertheless it refuses to go about the business of educating the workers and preparing for this action. On fundamental questions of revolutionary policy, Brockway stated that he refused to divulge his plans.

I am dealing with this position at considerable length, not only because it was the dominant opinion at the Conference I am describing, but because some of the best student radicals are in this camp. Like Fenner Brockway they are searching for some novel eclectic philosophy which accepts Marxian premises and refuses to carry their conclusions into practice dialectically. It is exactly the position of the Two-and-a-Half International which shortly after the war condoned the official social democracy and refused to join the rising Third International. In Germany this social reformist offshoot alternately assisted and sabotaged the revolution.

The student discussion at the Conference revolved around the Brockway position. The Marxist-Leninist position represented by about a hundred delegates attacked this attitude as being neither flesh nor fowl, as playing into the hands of the war forces by sending the best workers into social reformist party organizations which the left wing—social democracy—was incapable, intellectually or organizationally, of leading.

Probably the most important discussion session of the Conference was that on "Non-Violent Tactics in the Class War." Significant of the leftward swing among students and youth was the fact that this session developed into a discussion of the necessity of revolutionary preparation against war, and spontaneously expanded to cover the question of working class action in the events of war, dictatorship, fascism.

The Conference lacked not only a unity of opinion but a unity of program. The question of war is a part of the question of the development of capitalism, a part of the question of the socialist road to power. The division of the discussion session subjects: "Putting the War Department out of Education," "Resisting International War," "Non-Violent Tactics in the Class War," "When Congress Convenes—Pacifist Political Issues," seemed to betray a lack of consciousness of this fundamental unity. A vigorous student discussion during these sessions could have done much to obviate this.

This conference might have succeeded in getting liberal and reformist students and young people to begin to think about war in wider terms. Unfortunately, it did not present, or attempt to present, a thorough-going analysis of the nature of war or give the delegates a chance to do this or a chance to formulate a program of action. ARTHUR J. BARTLETT

EDITOR'S NOTE: *While this article shows plainly the impotence of the Conference, it does not analyze adequately the "left wing" Socialist position of A. Fenner Brockway and others. This "left" position will be discussed in a near issue of Student Review*

Student Action Speaks

Commonwealth College, Mena, Arkansas.

When two students, N.S.L. members, were expelled from this labor school, thirty-four of the student body of fifty-five went out on a protest strike. According to telegrams received as we went to press, the expulsions seem to have resulted from a struggle on the part of the students against Negro discrimination policies by the school, and for wider student representation on the administrative bodies.

The National Executive Committee of the N.S.L. has accepted an invitation from the Commonwealth College Association to conduct an investigation. At the same time it has informed the Association that the present conditions cannot exist pending an investigation. As a correlative requisite for this investigation the two students must be reinstated; no punitive action should be taken against the students who went out on strike; if any Negro discriminatory practices exist they must be removed immediately; and students be given wider representation in the governing bodies.

College of the City of New York.

City wide protests resulted in the reinstatement of the ten suspended students who had been arrested as they led a march on the Night Court where four of their fellow students were being arraigned. The four had been arrested for taking part in a Campus meeting protesting the dismissal of Dr. Oakley Johnson. Thirty City College students are now before the Board of Higher Education under belated charges of misconduct growing out of their participation in a student trial of the college president and evening session director, who had been responsible for the arrests and suspensions.

Fisk University, Nashville, Tennessee.

Students at this Negro school protested in a body to the president of the University and forced him to give up his plan of allowing James W. Ford, then Vice Presidential candidate of the Communist Party, only a small room for his pre-election meeting. The University, like most of the Southern Negro colleges, has a very reactionary administration, the controlling board being dominated by white business men and landlords.

University of Texas

The Texas Student Club is fighting tooth and nail the bill to be considered at the next session of the legislature, which would raise fees at the University. The bill affects not only Texan students, but over a thousand students from other states, who attend the University. The Club's objections are based on the grounds that by raising the fees the University officials are discriminating against the poorer students.

University of California, Los Angeles

Realizing the necessity of a national organization to help them in their local struggles, the members of the California Students' League liquidated their organization and re-formed as the Southern California District of the N.S.L. Activity has already begun with the new group initiating a student protest meeting against the action of the Long Beach police in releasing the Ku Klux Klanners who raided an International Labor Defense affair and severely beat the participants.

Reed College, Portland, Oregon

The militantly progressive students at this college are organizing an N. S. L. group as the basis for effective student activity.

Lindbloom High School, Chicago

Ostensibly because he had refused to attend an Armistice Day assembly which he branded a "military show," Milton Galatsky, a second-year student, was expelled from school. Galatsky had been active in expounding his radical views in the class-room and outside of school; but the authorities denied that his views had anything to do with the expulsion.

The new High School Section in this area has been active in demands for his reinstatement. Leaflets have been distributed by the N.S.L. group and mass student resolutions of protest have been drawn up for presentation to the Superintendent of Schools by a delegation of students, teachers, and intellectuals. Both the Civil Liberties Union and the International Labor Defense are investigating the expulsion.

University of Illinois

A radical bookshop with additional facilities for meetings and socials has been established here by an active N.S.L. group. Symposia and forums are being held regularly and attracting many new students. The group has sent a challenge of "Socialistic Competition" to the University of Chicago and the University of Wisconsin to see who will have the largest membership before the National Conference.

University of California, Berkeley, California

A small group of anti-war demonstrators in front of the Stadium at an Armistice Day football game in Berkeley, were attacked by a mob of hoodlums.

The riot squad, as usual, appeared on the scene and took the demonstrators for a ride to the station-house. After being fingerprinted and photographed in true criminal fashion, they were released on their promise to appear for trial. Four members of the group were University of California students. The Social Problems Club there has arranged protest meetings against their treatment.

New Alumni Section

An Alumni Section of the National Student League is being formed. At a preliminary symposium in New York unemployed alumni were elected to participate in the Hunger March to Washington.

All interested alumni, employed and unemployed, should communicate with Madeline Jaffe c/o National Student League, 13 West 17 St., New York City.

Reorganization and enlargement of the Editorial Board of *Student Review* makes it possible to accept stories, sketches, poems, one-act plays, reviews, and the like. All such material must be primarily of student interest and preferably connected with student life on and off the Campus.

Reports of organized activity and student struggles are particularly desired for *Student Action Speaks*. The Editors would appreciate every reader considering himself a correspondent and sending in clippings and factual material concerning student and "administration" activities.

All contributions should be typed double-space and submitted with a stamped, self-addressed envelope to:

Editorial Board, *Student Review*,
13 West 17 Street, New York City.

Woodward High School

The war-mongers at this Toledo school suffered a painful set-back on Armistice Day. Instead of listening to the jingoistic speeches of army men and the D.A.R., the International Club took over the program and students spoke, condemning war, and pointing out its cause and cure. One student, a member of the High School Section of the N.S.L., discussed the class struggle and greatly impressed the rest of the student body.

Demands made by youthful workers in the neighborhood of the high school for the use of the gymnasium are encouraged by the N.S.L. group, and as soon as the Student Council begins to function the group will take steps to present formal demands to the Board of Education.

Cornell University

Practically the entire Ithaca police department and a number of R.O.T.C. officers joined forces to prevent any disturbance of the Armistice Day speech by ex-Senator Wadsworth, well-known militarist. They destroyed posters and leaflets carried by a large student group massed before the hall where he was to speak, and drove the crowd away, using their clubs freely. The meeting was initiated by the Cornell Liberal Club, which is alert to organize and lead vital student activity on and off the Campus.

Trenton State Teachers College

The militant students of Trenton, N. J., have organized a National Student League branch on this campus. An executive committee was recently elected.

DeWitt Clinton High School, New York City

Repeated resolutions in the General Organization Council, executive body of student government in this New York

City high school, student opinion influenced by constant distribution of N.S.L. leaflets for three terms, and powerful articles in an Armistice Day issue of the school newspaper, recently culminated in the revoking of the R.O.T.C.'s charter by the General Organization.

George Washington University, Washington, D. C.

The Liberal Club has protested to the President of the University against the refusal to recognize officially the National Student League group. The N.S.L. members, however, are undaunted, and even though acting in an unofficial capacity, they are remaining true to their principles and fighting side by side with the Liberal Club against student repression of all sorts.

Nation-Wide Anti-War Activity

Using the medium of the radio besides the special anti-war meetings in the colleges and universities throughout the United States, students all over the country are preparing for the coming Chicago Student Congress Against War. Anti-war broadcasts have been given by Ira Lattimer, of the National Committee of the Student Congress Against War through local stations in Memphis, Tennessee. In New York, Oakley Johnson, Chairman for the American Anti-War Committee won the radio listeners' decision in a debate with an American Legionnaire, held during the WOR Forum Hour. WTAM in Cleveland broadcasted part of the Ohio State Anti-War Conference, at which students representing various social science and liberal clubs, "Y" groups, and peace organizations were present.

Joseph Cohen, N. S. L. delegate to the International Congress Against War at Amsterdam, spoke at anti-war meetings during his national tour of colleges and universities on the results of the Amsterdam Congress Against War.

Some Canadian Comparisons

AMERICANS frequently believe that Canadian universities are modelled very closely on the higher educational institutions in England, with their mild traditional freedom of speech and toleration of unorthodoxy. In actuality, such is not the fact, for overt political radicalism among students is not widely tolerated in the universities of the Dominion. And let it be added that there exists little tendency on the part of Canadian students to be conscious or resentful of this state of affairs. Unorthodox activities are confined pretty much to polite debating organizations called "labor clubs," and to a newly-formed association, the League For Social Reconstruction, at which students, graduates and others meet as a sort of Fabian Society to discuss labor matters and promote an educational campaign for public ownership of natural resources in Canada.

To a Canadian student, the activities of such a radical organization as the National Student League at American universities come somewhat as a surprise. Now and then student newspapers do get into trouble in Canada, but nothing so hectic as a strike results. Doubtless the difference in point of view is the result of dissimilar conditions. For example, a larger proportion of American students are obliged to work their way through college (some of them, desperately hard) than in Canadian universities. American students, more in contact with workers, are more aware of the reality of the class struggle and the need for solidarity. Also, the emphasis on social sciences in American universities doubtless helps to account for the interest of students in social movements and newer social philosophies. Then again, professors in small Canadian universities are subject to closer sur-

veillance than in larger institutions across the border.

As an example in contrasts, we will examine conditions in McGill University. Circumstances differ a good deal, of course, between the various institutions of the Dominion, but this will serve at least to give some notion of the present situation. To begin with, the Principal (equivalent to "president" in American universities) is an exception in that he is not a university graduate but owes his position to the fact that he distinguished himself during the war as an army official. He is prominent as a director of several corporations, and so is useful to the university in his capacity as collector of funds and as a congenial go-between of the staff and the corporation, the latter body being made up of affluent business men, and corresponding to an American Board of Trustees. He is a staunch supporter of the local R.O.T.C. and a crusader in the field of stamping out unorthodox beliefs among students. For example, he is known to have privately disciplined undergraduates because they voiced publicly their disrespect for the prevailing economic system or for Canada's place in the British Commonwealth of Nations. Unorthodoxy, he agrees, is permissible in the form of polite discussion in university classrooms, but if in the form of "propaganda," it is not to be tolerated. This rule applies to professors as well.

Under such conditions, what little radicalism exists at McGill University has been fostered by a student Christian organization, but it too is well aware of the Principal's financial influence, and accordingly is somewhat covert in all its activities in this field. To cite an example, several years ago a prominent Y.M.C.A. man, a mild Socialist, was

invited to speak at a meeting of the group. The Principal was known to disapprove of him and his ideas, so postcards were sent out privately to a picked group of people, and no report of the meeting was printed in the undergraduate newspaper. The leaders of the organization, among other things, did not wish to lose the official's sanction, nor his annual contribution during the financial campaign!

Yet the work of stamping out radicalism is not left entirely to the eminent Principal. The students, the majority incorrigibly "respectable," often take the matter into their own hands. One incident in particular will serve to emphasize this point. A student, while representing one of the faculties at a banquet in Toronto University, refused to stand when "God Save the King" was played; it was against his principles. News of this treasonous act reached the ears of a group of reactionary students, with the result that one dark night the offending student was waylaid in a deserted street, pinned down, and his head shaved. The impromptu barbers were going to show him that he could not "get away with that red stuff" around the university. Did the Toronto University student body protest, or attempt to retaliate for this essentially cowardly act? The only protest, an editorial, came from a student literary magazine, which had only a small circulation.

The undergraduate newspaper at this same Canadian university is not permitted to discuss political or religious matters in its editorial columns, which means that comment is confined to dull dissertations on manners and modes of students, or to well-worn platitudes on the more obvious phases of university life. What unorthodoxy there is finds expression in the feature columns, and even here little which is genuinely worthwhile or important ever sees the light.

The student "labor club" at Toronto University is hardly more encouraging. Some indication of its conservative tendencies is shown by the fact that a few years ago it decided not to become affiliated with the Labor Party of Canada (a group which is represented sparsely in the Federal assembly and here and there in provincial and municipal governments). It was felt that such a connection would rob the group of its essentially academic rôle. Communists either are non-existent among the ranks of students, or else too wary to declare themselves, for to do this would certainly wreck their college careers.

Fortunately, conditions in all other universities of the Dominion are not uniformly as dismal as in these two. A few years ago, at another Canadian university, the editor of the student newspaper was expelled because he dared to disagree editorially with the marriage views expressed by a

prominent Canadian cleric, and because he made some pointed remarks about sex and kindred subjects. The other members of the staff promptly resigned and for a few weeks published a rival news bulletin in a local newspaper. True enough, the subject in controversy was hardly a display of full-blooded "radicalism" on the part of the editor, yet it showed the capacity of Canadian students to assert their right to express opinions freely.

The one shining example of student radicalism in Canada was the fight made a few years ago by the undergraduate newspaper at the University of British Columbia against the establishment of a student unit of the R.O.T.C. The Principal had invited the military authorities to set up such an organization, without the previous agreement of the students. The newspaper called for a vote on the question from the student body, and found that the majority were opposed to the Principal's action. For weeks the newspaper conducted a vigorous campaign with cartoons and editorials, but in the end the effect was unsuccessful. The agitation was characteristically western in its vigor and spontaneity and suggests that the greatest hope for radicalism among students lies in this part of the Dominion.

The future is not entirely dismal. More healthy signs of radicalism may be looked for with the rise in power of the workers in the various provinces and the growth in influence of the National Student League upon the universities. Younger professors are beginning to show themselves to be less content with outworn political and economic ideas, and are taking a more active part in student radical organizations.

In the long run, however, it is likely that the Canadian student will continue to trail behind the American student in the whole field of radical thought and action. The tendency to be conservative, coupled with a tendency to accept without reflection the ideas preached by reactionary and biased newspapers and "intellectual leaders," will hold him back. His own difficulties in finding employment, temporary or permanent, in the future may awaken him to the needs of workers and their helplessness without adequate organization, and may help to develop a sense of militant radicalism. In this possibility is to be found the brightest ray of hope.

NEIL GARDNER

EDITOR'S NOTE:—*The Editor doubts many of the generalizations and implications of the author. We feel however that despite the inherent pessimistic tone there is sufficient ground, based on some of the incidents related above, to expect the growth of a welcome brother organization in the Canadian Universities.*

Revolution vs. Pacifism

OPPPOSITION to war comes from two main sources, middle class pacifism and the revolutionary working class movement. Despite the apparent community of interest on the war issue the respective philosophies of the two positions are in complete disagreement. Pacifism is the complete disavowal of all forms of violence. The conclusions of pacifism are based in general on either one of two premises. One is the idea of a benevolent deity whose loving family includes all men who should therefore love each other and regard wars as the result of misguided, greedy, evil-scheming souls. The other form substitutes for the deity the concept of an unchanging, rationally ordered universe governed by harmonious natural laws. This concept was the basis of classical economy as developed from Adam Smith to John Stuart Mill. In the sphere of human society this meant that man was a rational animal whose nature it was to seek his own self-interest. This in turn was

supposed to coincide with the common good. Hence the best way to further the interests of all was to allow free play to individual initiative. On the international field this meant that each nation, by rationally pursuing its own self-interest would *ipso facto* further the collective interest of all the nations.

All economic maladjustments were supposed to be the result of interference, through ignorance, with the free operation of these natural laws. Since war was destructive and anti-social, it was assumed that it could be abolished merely by proving that in the long run it didn't pay.

Faced with the discrepancy between this "rational order" and the world of conflicting interests and struggle surrounding them, the pacifists, like the economic theorists, are forced to draw distinctions between theory and practice. They thus divorce their convictions from any necessity of acting upon them.

Because pacifists repudiate all forms of struggle, they are theoretically opposed to all wars, but since they likewise regard wars as unessential and foreign to the "natural" course of human affairs, they cannot fathom the causes of war. Despite their moral indignation, they are incapable of effectively opposing war. When war is declared, they are, for the most part, induced by "practical" consideration to keep quiet, or on the basis of their misunderstanding of war, act idealistically and ineffectually. The few who have the courage to stand by their convictions, are either persecuted or laughed at. These few save their souls, but sacrifice the masses to the practical war-makers.

The dissemination of the belief that good-will, disarmament conferences, and war resistance can prevent war under capitalism helps to conceal the continual preparations for imperialist war. Pacifism serves as a buffer that diverts the activities of the masses, which only if turned into revolutionary channels can uproot the causes of war. Thus when imperialist conflict comes, as it inevitably does, the people find themselves helpless with neither organization nor program for utilizing this crisis to put an end to war forever.

The tragic futility of pacifism in preventing war is borne out by the experiences of the last conflict. On the tenth of March, 1917, when America was rapidly drifting into war, the members of the American Peace Society announced that they recognized "with deep appreciation the efforts of President Wilson to avoid war and at the same time to protect the honor of the nation and the rights and lives of our citizens. We wish to assure him of our hearty support in his determination to secure recognition of the claims of justice and humanity." By such pious obeisance to the shibboleths of the slaughter, these pacifists prepared to make their exit.

In the face of swift marching events their retreat soon became a rout. The *New York Times* of April 2, 1917 remarks: "Most of the pacifists who came to Washington under the guidance of the Emergency Peace Federation to protest against war had returned to their homes tonight, convinced that their efforts were useless . . . The remaining pacifists tried to see President Wilson but were told he could not receive them. Wherever they were recognized on the street they were jeered and hooted."

Dr. John Haynes Holmes, one of the most honest and courageous of all the pacifists said in a sermon delivered on the eve of American entry into the war: "No order of a president or governor will persuade me or force me to this business of killing. On this issue there is no compromise . . ." When asked to comment on this sermon, Addison F. Andrews, a trustee of Dr. Holmes' church remarked: "Dr. Holmes is an idealist. His sermon yesterday held up his ideal. But it was not practical. This isn't the time to put his idealism into practice . . . No, we are not going to ask Dr. Holmes' resignation. We will just let him hold his ideals. We will need them after the war." Thus do pacifists, even the best of them, become unwitting instruments in the hands of the war makers.

In direct contradiction to pacifism, the revolutionists regard struggle as the dynamic of change in a developing society. In history this struggle has taken the form of a conflict between oppressed and oppressor classes. Today this struggle manifests itself as the struggle between the workers and the capitalists. In this contest, the capitalists, like other exploiting classes in the past, will try to maintain their position by using every means at their disposal; hence violence is inevitable. The revolutionary is therefore not opposed to all wars.

When capitalism was a progressive force in human development, in the days when it was replacing feudalism, wars of national liberation were fought which resulted in the creation of states in which people with a common historic heritage and cultural tradition were brought together

under one government. The American revolution is a case in point. The welding of these strong national unities was the most definite achievement of the nineteenth century. Such wars were regarded by the Marxists as progressive.

With the maturing of capitalism, however, the process of territorial consolidation began to overflow the banks of nationalism and to take the form of the seizure or conquest of territories inhabited by reluctant and unassimilable peoples, peoples of other nationalities. The development of monopoly capitalism and the rise of the rule of banking capital began the era of wars between capitalistic nations for the division of the world, the stage of imperialism. Unlike nationalism, imperialism does not extend to the new territories the political and civil liberties of the mother country. They become subject states, ruled by an alien bureaucracy, as in India, or ruled by puppet governments, as in China, Near Eastern countries and Latin America.

Under the new conditions created by imperialism three types of wars occur. The attempts by the subject peoples to throw off the imperialist yoke constitute one type. Such struggles, like the earlier wars, are aimed at national liberation. Another type of conflict occurs when the imperialist powers, in their scramble for territory, fall out among themselves. Such wars are fought merely for the enrichment of one group of capitalists at the expense of another and the workers lose out in any event.

While the revolutionist realizes that under the present system war forces are constantly threatening the peace of the world, and that war can be removed only by the overthrow of imperialist states, it is his job to oppose imperialist wars before their outbreak and, once they occur, to try to utilize them for a revolutionary overturn, the class war. In both instances, the essential technique is the same. It consists in building among the workers and farmers, a mass opposition to the plans of the imperialists. This is done by organizing the workers in fields and factories into the revolutionary movement, as well as entering the army and establishing a militant corps there. The opposition to imperialist war and the final overthrow of capitalism are thus viewed as phases of the same active process.

Before 1914, the socialist parties of the world accurately foretold that the next war would be an imperialist war. On this basis, international congresses were held, the last in Basle (1912), which outlined in militant terms the tasks of the proletariat in such an event.

Despite these plans, when war arrived, the socialist parties proved unequal to their revolutionary tasks. This failure resulted from the fact that the years of peaceful development which preceded the conflagration had brought into the ranks of the workers' organizations a host of bourgeois petty reformers and politicians of various shades, who came in many instances to dominate the direction of policy; consequently, when war came, instead of mass anti-war activity, the official socialist parties, for the most part lapsed into a position of open support of the war, relegating active opposition to a dissident minority.

Within the framework of the American Socialist Party, which prided itself on being more radical than most of its European sister parties, the same divergent tendencies were manifest. Officially it condemned the defensist position adopted by German and French Social-Democracy and placed itself on record as opposed to the war. But it failed to translate this opposition into practical anti-war activity. Because of this failure it was no less ineffectual than those organizations which opposed the war from purely pacifist motives. Thus, on March 3, 1917 the National Executive Committee of the party "as a result of a strenuous protest from the New York State committee" deleted from its proclamation urging the United States not to enter the war "all recommendations favoring the placing of an embargo

on food and war munitions." (*Times*, March 4). Even this mild legalist tactic (the recommendations were addressed to the government, not to the transport and munitions workers) was too strong for the stomachs of some socialists.

Owing to the pressure of left-wing elements, elements who later in 1919 left the Socialist Party to form the present Communist Party, the Convention of the Socialist Party, held at St. Louis in April, 1917, passed a resolution condemning the war, but the advocates of defensism included many of the most influential leaders. The correspondent of the *Times* commented: "Basically opposed to war, the party has leaders who believe that, with war certain, it is the part of the Socialists to buckle down to the job of helping the country to defeat its enemies." Thus Allan Benson, the party's presidential candidate in 1916 stated for publication: "I am opposed to war up to the time it begins . . . When it comes to a question of whether the United States or some other power is to win in a fight they are already in, I am for the U. S. A. all the way. Any other position is the position of an anarchist. An anarchist is against all sorts of government; I am not. I am for the government of the United States."

One of the few leaders who still remembered the purpose for which the party was founded was Gene Debs. Urging the workers to call a nation-wide strike if war was declared, he said to them, "You have been taught patriotism, brutal patriotism; patriotism to your country, but you never had a country." Needless to say, the Socialist leaders did nothing of the kind.

Everywhere in the warring countries the militant revolutionary minorities were ruthlessly persecuted. Yet in the end they led a revolution, which spreading from Russia, threatened to submerge the capitalists of western Europe. Thus they proved the fundamental correctness of the revolutionary method of opposition to imperialist war. Today, fourteen years after the conflict, with the war clouds gathering around us, American students are coming together at the Student Congress against war to renew the struggle against

war. The lessons and experiences of that war period can save us from many pitfalls and blind alleys.

Successful opposition to war leads directly to the revolutionary transformation of society. And in both instances the primary force is the working class. Any other social groups such as the students may play an important subsidiary role by assisting the working class, but they cannot lead the struggle. Students who are sincere in their opposition to war must therefore coordinate their activities with those of the working class movement against war.

The Student Congress is a response to the summons of millions of militant workers, as represented by their delegates at the World Congress at Amsterdam.

In formulating a program it is well to keep in mind a lesson of the past war; that resolutions which do not carry with them the necessity of activity have no significance. It is easy to predict beforehand or diagnose after the event. But to follow through with activity now and at the crucial time is difficult, as the experiences of the last war proved. Few of us can now remember the pressure of wartime opinion. In wartime all the forces of the press and other agencies are used to popularize the cause. The shibboleths of Truth, Justice, Liberty, Honor, Democracy, etc. are again played up as decoys. The particular cause is depicted as different from those of all other wars in its purity and righteousness.

We must therefore start our anti-war activity now, actively opposing military training in our own sphere, the colleges and universities, actively exposing to the students the meaning of all the preparations for war on the campus, while never losing sight of the relation of our activities to the basic role of the working class. We must base our movement on the realization of the true nature of present wars. Only thus can we build a realistic student fight against war and be in a position to combat continually the lies of the imperialist war-makers.

EDMUND STEVENS

Communications

To the Editor of *Student Review*:

As a representative from the Hunter College Student Council at the United Youth Conference Against War, I want to register a protest against the insincerity of many of the leading Socialist Party and the League for Industrial Democracy members who were in control.

The resolution to support the Chicago Anti-War Congress was endorsed by almost everybody present. This support implies, of course, active cooperation wherever possible. But in my own experience, even when the responsibility to support the Congress was thrust upon the leading L.I.D. members in our school, they rejected their responsibility.

At a Student Council meeting at Hunter College when a motion was made to send a delegate to the Student Congress Against War, not a single Socialist Party or L.I.D. member rose to speak for it. The President of Student Council, an L.I.D. member, delegate to the United Youth Conference, and officially responsible for carrying out the resolution to which she had pledged support, remained absolutely silent on the question. When the motion was put to a vote these members voted against it or abstained from voting. In the light of such an incident, it seems that the resolution was brought up by the Committee, not because they were sincere in their desire to fight against war by sup-

porting the Student Congress Against War, but to stave off the rising tide of resentment against the conduct of those who controlled the United Youth Conference.

New York City

RUTH RUBIN

To the Editor of *Student Review*:

One can best describe the ideology of students at the Juilliard School of Music in New York by likening it to the school's *sound-proof rooms and artificial ventilation*. Recruited from 45 states and 18 foreign countries, they are isolated probably to a greater extent than at any university. Music study is abstract and individual, and lessons are scattered through a few hours during the week. There are no student clubs of any nature and even organization for musical purposes, such as ensembles, orchestra, student concerts, etc., is lax. The social atmosphere is negative and formal. There is no such thing as student news.

And yet, from this background, there has sprung up the Juilliard Student League, initiated by the N.S.L. group, with its program of administrative reforms, economic guarantees, and biting criticism of our present-day "art". The process is significant of the profound change that has taken place in the outlook of the American student body.

The advent of the present depression merely hastened the climax of the chronic crisis of the musical world. The trend

of the post-war period has been to concentrate musical forces in the hands of mammoth entertainment trusts. The symphony orchestras are closed guilds and brazenly commercialized. Music teachers have been superseded by the host of "music appreciation" and "education" courses controlled by the large publishing houses. "Jazz" is the supreme achievement of the long-lamented "American music," based on mass production and high-pressure salesmanship.

These trends have brought the music student face to face with the fundamental disaffection in the musical life of the country and in the structure of the present social order. The extent of unemployment in the musical field is appalling, and the future is dismal. "Art" is out of the question.

Present demands for an employment bureau and an active student organization at the Juilliard are receiving enthusiastic support. More advanced elements are taking part in the broader movement of the National Student League, and the report of our delegates to the Soviet Union has enabled many to see hope in the building of a new culture.

New York City. NORMAN CAZDEN

To the Editor of *Student Review*:

During the last academic year in France, an enactment was passed increasing the term of study by one year for the students of the *Licence d'Enseignement* (this degree is necessary for teaching in the high school). The group of radical students against whom this enactment was especially directed announced a meeting for the preparation of a general strike of students to protest against this new regulation and the increased expense which this extra year would entail for the poorer students working for this degree.

When we arrived at the meeting-hall on the assigned day, we were astonished to find the door shut, the passage full of police spies and a great number of policemen.

Gathered in the Sorbonne courtyard we could only clamor but *les messieurs* of M. Chiappe (he is the chief commissioner of police in Paris) came to establish peace, as it is known, by dealing blows.

So, a very old privilege was violated by our Rector of University who called the policemen, through fear of us. From the beginning, the Sorbonne has been a refuge from policemen, who could not enter even to take a fugitive criminal. But on that day it lost its immunity; it was not a crime that broke the custom, but a legitimate defense of the students' rights.

I remember, too, how the police acted when Paris had its meeting against war, at Bullier, last September. Thousands of people were waiting to go into the hall, when, by the orders of the Chief, the policemen pulled out their cudgels, and, without cause, rushed at the crowd. I was there. I saw the sergeants drive their bicycles against the mob. I saw cafés stormed and shop windows broken.

But all that, in the French language of the police, is called: to maintain order.

A FRENCH STUDENT IN AMERICA

To the Editor of *Student Review*:

A debate between the Oxford and Smith debating teams took place here October 27, ostensibly on the subject of cancellation of war debts and reparations. The Oxford men insisted that the present depression was due to the terrific sum of reparations and war debts which Europe had to pay.

The Smith team said the depression was not due to reparations but to tariffs which crippled world trade, to bankers who lent money foolishly and then crippled credit, and of course to the World War which, in turn, had led to the tariffs. But it seemed that a certain Sir Basil Z., the mystery man of Europe, had precipitated events which led to the war, in order that he might sell armaments to both sides, and so make a lot of money. He also owned most of the

banks in Europe, and so helped cripple trade in the hope of another war, that he might sell his munitions. It's all very complicated, but it seems to indicate that it's all Sir Basil's fault. And therefore, fellow-students, I say "hurrah!" For when the sons and daughters of capitalism have gotten into such straits that they rake up a bogie-man from somewhere in mid-Europe, so that they may blame someone for the depression, we're getting places. Maybe, after years of effort, we'll be able to persuade them that the bogie-man is not Sir Basil, but the capitalistic system!

Smith College RUTH GERSEN

To the Editor of *Student Review*:

I want you to know that I am in deep and sincere sympathy with the aims and ideals of the students represented in the *Student Review*. I believe firmly that only a complete and fraternal understanding and sympathy between the student masses of the country can relieve us of the weight of hypocrisy and prejudices that keeps us at the bottom among civilized peoples. The students of the country are our only hope of salvation, and the ideals of the National Student League are those which I earnestly hope may some day prevail.

New York City

COUNTTEE CULLEN

Editor's Note: *The writer of the following letter is a former editor of Student Review. He writes in answer to a request for an article on the effect of the agricultural crisis on the Western student. We publish his reply because it contains much material of general interest.*

To the Editor of *Student Review*:

I am back on the farm and completely immersed in a kind of work I want to do more than anything else. The problems of the farmer are not in any way connected with the student at present. I have lost the student perspective to a large extent, gone completely bucolic. I haven't worn my suit for over three weeks. I milk cows and husk corn. I am no longer the student and doubt very much if I could write an article acceptable to the editorial board of *Student Review*. It would be difficult to link up my experiences with student problems. The inability of farmers to pay taxes or interest, and the murderous exploitation of farmers by every kind of money-handler and merchant is not at the moment a student problem.

The farmers are desperate, and because they have been braska there is a revolt which may grow to important propor-

GORKI PRIZE AWARD

An annual Maxim Gorky award and honorable mention for the three best proletarian American novels will be instituted by the American Revolutionary Writers Federation.

This award will be one of the novel features of the Gorky Festival celebrating the fortieth anniversary of Maxim Gorky's writings, on Friday evening, December 23 at the Central Opera House, 67th Street at Third Avenue.

Michael Gold, author of *Jews Without Money*; Louise Thompson, just returned from the Soviet Union where she was with the group producing the film of Negro life; Sergei Radamsky, opera and concert singer; and Moissaye J. Olgin, author and editor, will be among the speakers honoring Gorky's anniversary. Theodore Dreiser, John Dos Passos, Sherwood Anderson, Grace Lumpkin and other leading American writers will be among the guests of honor.

tions. Here is organization in the mass, one of the best examples that I have ever seen or read about. We have stopped seven sheriff's sales; taken two repossessed trucks from an International shed (took them while the sheriff and the International man stood by, helpless). We have marched to the county court and read the riot act to the county officers; we made the county treasurer promise not to sell delinquent taxes at 12% interest. We are going to Washington and later we will march on the state legislature here, twenty thousand strong.

The farmers are desperate, and because they have been the most independent class of workers they are ready to fight for what they consider their rights. The right that we are working for now is the right to live. When statutory rights interfere with the the right to reap the full returns of one's labor, then statutory rights must be set aside. Thousands of farmers in this section have subscribed to this principle, and are organizing to fight for it. Meetings are held every night, sometimes several meetings a night. But an agrarian revolt will be hard to control. The danger of its turning into a fascist revolt is great. The real struggle will come then.

My experiences have been very valuable. I've been chased out of two towns already. I have seen a little terror in these one horse towns and it has lead me to believe that it will be stronger after the farmers learn just where they stand and begin to fight along class lines. Such lines are being more clearly drawn now than ever before in the rural sections. I was born and raised on a farm and in the latter part of my teens lived in a small town, and the change is very apparent to me. The small town fascists, American Legion, Masons, business men, and bankers, in cahoots with the county officers and local press are a sinister weapon. I know because I have bucked up against it twice. There are no machine guns, no legal killings by hired thugs, but tarring and feathering, beatings, hangings, and shootings in the dead of night. The Klan has been revived to intimidate the farmer. Farmers all over the country are milling around, just waiting for a program that will solve their demands. For instance, in Iowa the men who fought so hard on the picket lines are still unorganized material and we haven't anyone to send to them. Every rural organizer is working double time. . . .

Newman Grove, Nebraska.

L. D.

To the Editor of *Student Review*:

The Technical Bureau, affiliated with the Friends of the Soviet Union, is an organization of engineers, chemists, and architects whose purpose it is to render voluntary technical assistance to the factories and farms of the U.S.S.R., mainly by solving problems transmitted to us. The Bureau is now organizing a student section. We particularly desire to enroll socially-minded students of engineering, industrial chemistry, and architecture, since in a very few years they will join us in the ranks of intellectual workers, employed and unemployed.

Students can help the Technical Bureau in its work: 1. By assisting experienced fellow-members living in the cities where they reside or study on problems assigned to such members; 2. By doing bibliographical research in connection with problems; 3. By obtaining valuable printed matter and sending it to our office for our use or for transmission to the Soviet Union.

Students of technology are urged to write to us and to persuade fellow-students to communicate with the Secretary, Technical Bureau, Room 330, 80 East 11 Street, New York, N. Y.

With best fraternal greetings, and wishing you best success.

L. COHEN, *Secretary*

We Review:

THE AMERICAN COLLEGE AND ITS RULERS by J. E. Kirkpatrick, Ph. D. New Republic Publishers, New York. \$1.00.

THIS is an interesting book, despite its shortcomings. Beginning with the early colleges founded by the English in America it traces the development of the ruling body of the college into the twentieth century as late as about 1926. The first of the American colleges were, of course styled after the British. The faculty supplied the men who were given the power and responsibilities necessary to administer and direct the institutions. However, Dr. Kirkpatrick, author of the book, points out that the conditions in which the British college system was set in America forced a change in the policy of faculty rule. The resistance to this inevitable change which was sure to usurp the faculty of many of its most important functions gave rise to a conflict between academic rule and the business rule of the college. This conflict resulted in an easy and almost complete victory for the latter.

Against the overwhelming control of the American College by Big Business only two forces exist on the campus which can oppose it. One is the faculty, the other, a powerful student body. The role of these two forces constitute, perhaps, the most important sections of Dr. Kirkpatrick's book. Historically speaking, the role of the faculty in America has been a meek one. Those few individuals who have dared to participate against the encroachments of the business interests have been summarily dismissed without a hearing or diplomatically released from their jobs. Those who are still in the profession are continuously under fire not only by the ruling power of their own college but by organizations off and on the campus whose aims are to keep the colleges safe for the perpetuation of the existing social disorder. "Our traditional system of academic organization has invited the shifting of the directing power from 'Main Street to Wall Street', and from Wall Street to the private office of a director of the 'House of Morgan'." There is little doubt left today that the hand that operates the ticker still holds the college fast in its iron grip.

Even in those colleges where the highest position, that of president or chancellor, is occupied by a recognized authority in the field of education or by a member of the faculty, the instructor or professor is far from certain of defense and cooperation from above. The contrary has been true. The process has been and still is to remove the higher authorities from contact with the teaching staff and to make them responsible to a body of men off the campus who, by virtue of their financial status, political affiliation and responsibilities, have been able to turn this office into an autocratic mouthpiece.

Realizing that at any moment the teacher may have his economic pedestal shot from under his feet, Dr. Kirkpatrick asks "How is the faculty to be secure in the full control of academic policy—while the purse strings rest in the hands of financiers?" To this major problem, Dr. Kirkpatrick gives no immediate answer. Yet, it is irrefutable that unless the faculty submits to the 'House of Morgan' it can expect no security at the hands of the financiers. Should it attempt to struggle against suppressions and domination by Big Business it cannot hope to win a complete victory for itself. As an isolated force it is helpless, not only hopeless. Only by allying itself with a more powerful force, can it achieve its end. This force to-day is the organized revolutionary working-class.

What have the students in the American colleges done? This question Dr. Kirkpatrick considers in detail in his chapters on "Students In Revolt." The first signs of stu-

dent militancy revealed themselves in a struggle against the suppression and censorship by the college authorities of student publications. During and after the World War, in a period of dead reaction, a wave of open student protest rose against military training in many of those colleges where it existed on a compulsory basis. At the College of the City of New York, the students voted by a large majority against compulsory military training.

Previous to this vote these students, like many others, were being criticised for their lack of interest and participation in social problems. However, immediately following this revolt against R.O.T.C., the students "were declared by the dean to be immature to know what was best for them in this matter and were thenceforth directed to cease agitating the question in the student publications." At Ohio State University a campaign against military training resulted in a protest vote of 1,099 for the opposition and 701 for the status quo. A faculty committee, on the other hand, appointed to investigate the problem "voted four to one in favor of compulsory military drill." The Ohio faculty seems to be "safer than the student body," comments Dr. Kirkpatrick. The first remarkable example of student opposition against faculty dictatorship occurred at Fiske University where the students walked out on strike and stayed out until their demands were granted.

Now what have the students accomplished? They revolt against censorship and suppression. They go out on strike. All this is very important. But what major problems have they solved? Have they been instrumental in bringing about any important social changes? No! American students have not brought about any important social changes nor solved any. We need not infer from this that they have not been involved in social changes. In reality they cannot escape them. Whether they remain on the sidelines or on the fences as indifferent spectators makes little difference. The repercussions of every change in society will affect them despite their position. Nevertheless their role in society has not been a functional one, i.e., aggressive.

The reason or cause for it is not difficult to discover. It can be traced through a causal series to the economic structure in which the students live. But more immediately it lies in the teaching process itself. Presumably they are imparting unto the gullible student an impartial thinking habit. Actually their impartiality consists of an aloofness from and a failure to come to grips with the social problem and their thinking consists of a passive adaptation to the environment (meaning of course the *status quo*). Their analysis fails to take into account the very fact of material change which is the essence of society itself. Our teachers have admirably served the ruling class by making the student fatalistic, passive, and contemplative in his attitude toward society.

To this unscientific meaning of thinking, the students must oppose the dynamic principle of change. In practice this principle means that students will have to act on the environment outside of themselves in order to change it. The material conditions which are necessary to impell students to accept such a principle in both theory and practice are present. *We know that thousands of students who are ready to work as engineers, teachers, architects, accountants, researchers, etc., find themselves today in the ranks of the millions of unemployed. Like the proletariat, they are faced with immediate problems of employment and unemployment insurance.*

What can the students do toward this end? One year ago, there was no answer to this question. Today there is. Today there are definite signs of a new social consciousness among the American students. The Kentucky and Ohio student delegations to the mining districts, the Columbia

Strike, the student fight against fees in the City colleges; student participation in strikes and in anti-war activities, etc.—these activities are not like the earlier ones which were carried on by unrelated student bodies. They have been conducted by students nationally organized into a single body in order to carry on revolutionary activity against the oppression imposed on them by the present social order. This new social consciousness has already revealed a phase in the life of American students which Dr. Kirkpatrick could not have foreseen. His remark on academic democracy, though, might have led him to speculate on the role that students will play in its realization in America. Speaking of academic democracy, "the franchise for teachers and pupils, a large measure of self-government for our schools," Dr. Kirkpatrick remarks that "this just now is a new Bolshevism. Tomorrow it may be a common practice in America as it is today in Russia."

Dr. Kirkpatrick does not consider the important thing. Who made it possible? It was not the faculty nor conferences on education which cleared the path for its realization. To be sure it was not a reform. This academic democracy followed as a result of the successful revolutionary struggle for emancipation by the toiling and exploited masses of capitalistic Russia.

Here too in America academic freedom will come in the wake of victorious struggles of workers and farmers led by class conscious leaders. Will the American student find himself in their midst?

J. HARTMANN.



THE SOVIET WORKER by Joseph Freeman. International Publishers, New York. \$1.50

A genuine education of a people goes on in the Soviet Union, Joseph Freeman's book shows us. "The center and symbol of this cultural revolution is the worker, who, in his advance toward new goals, lifts the peasant with him."

In the transformation of the "dark people" the workers themselves play a very important part. Every elementary school is attached to an individual enterprise, the workers of which are influential in shaping the policies of the school. The factory supports the school out of its funds, it organizes workshops in the schools, and provides both tools and instruments. It provides for the care and feeding of poorer school children. The school aids in eliminating illiteracy among factory workers through the school faculty and older students. The places of production are thus the centers of learning.

Furthermore, some form of education is open to all workers and peasants. And there is no such thing as unemployment among the students and workers in the Soviet Union. Workers are trained for specific tasks. Convicts, too, are trained for a place in the scheme. Here, we know from our own experience what unemployment and part-time employment mean. There is no need for a student in the Soviet Union to depend on an underpaid father for his education.

In the Soviet Union the worker is the central factor in all activity. Through his trade unions he directs activity of his entire social and economic life. Of special interest to students is the role which trade unions play in education. Their educational function is to broaden the base of socialism. "Being a school for communism in general, the trade union must become in particular a school for managing socialist industry and gradually also of agriculture," Lenin declared. As Freeman shows in one of the most interesting chapters in the book, the unions are taking this responsibility in spite of much opposition from those who assume that the same methods of work are applicable for the Soviet trade unionists as for like groups in capitalist countries.

Because of the widespread notions regarding forced labor

in the U.S.S.R., the chapter on forced and convict labor is of particular importance. Documentary evidence shows that such books as the Duchess of Atoll's "Conscription of a People" are so inaccurate as to be absurd. Many of the charges, as Freeman notes, come from the unreliable news agencies of Riga, Helsingfors, Bucharest, or Warsaw, which our own United Press discredits. Freeman cites American authorities in good standing to prove charges of "forced labor" are brought by professional "patriots," anti-Soviet propagandists and "white" Russian emigres, and by producers of manganese, anthracite and lumber. The Labor Code of the U.S.S.R.—never altered without the consent of the workers through their trade union representatives—guarantees freedom of labor by protecting the worker against dismissal without valid cause, and by granting him the right to break a labor agreement without notice in case the employer violates the conditions of the agreement or the labor laws. If no suitable work is found, provisions for his care are made by the state.

In contrast to American methods of punishment, the Soviet treatment of prisoners is kindness itself. The Soviet concept of a criminal is that of a mal-adjusted individual who must be separated from his fellows for a time until he can be a useful person to society. "No convict leaves prison illiterate, or without a vocation. Work in prisons is not designed to punish the convict or to humiliate him. (The prisoner himself selects his own vocation.)" "It seeks to divert his energy into useful channels." Convicts work eight hours a day and are entitled to all the safeguards provided by labor legislation. They get regular union wages for their work; this compensation is given them in a lump sum when they leave the prison and can be used as funds to start anew.

This book, the result of a year of study in the U.S.S.R. of the Soviet worker, contains the latest and most accurate account of the Soviet system. Because of its scholarship it deserves the attention of the student who wishes to judge the Soviet system after fifteen years of existence and the status of the most important group in its social scheme,—the workers.

●
BEYOND DESIRE by Sherwood Anderson. Liveright, Inc. New York. \$2.50.

There are people walking through this book with pained faces: mill people, literary lions, strikers, revolutionaries—people among whom Red Oliver and Ethel find themselves and whose problems they adopt, into whose lives they are projected by outside forces. Sherwood Anderson has been steered away from his theme of personal frustration, but his people are still motivated completely by desire for power. He has seen, though, that the desire for existence obliterates this—and has focussed his story on the mill towns of Langdon and Birchfield, Georgia. The looms rise, dancing before the lives of his workers, making life for them. The new South of post-slavery, industrialized bad times, is laid out for the workers to resolve into system; and the influx of revolutionary feeling is shown as an aid.

Ethel Long, the woman whose story is told in one section of the book, is lost in pursuit of completion, never once reaches beyond desire. She is haunted by her own limitations, and lengthens the list of Anderson's characters who are seen whole, but who are dominated by the disturbance of their own desires.

Red Oliver is a student, a mill-hand, the son of a local doctor who had married "beneath him." He faces his life and the mill, puzzled, but driven to participation. His actions are casual: he works in the mill, is hitching toward Birchfield one day with a travelling salesman who brags about his adventures with women, curses the communists who have come into the town to organize the strike. He goes on, cursing and boasting, and finally noticing Red's

hatred for his talk. The salesman begins to be bothered: "Say," he asks, "you ain't one of them fellows, are you?"

"Ain't what?"

"One of them damn communists."

"Yes." Red had said it calmly, quietly enough.

He had said it on impulse. He gets out of the car, heaving a final rock to add to the salesman's panic. The salesman drives on to the next town, reports to the police the wild communist who is out on the road, killing innocent people. Red escapes through the woods, helped by a woman striker who takes him for a leader helping to direct the mill strike. On impulse, he fails to tell her who he is; he is rather pleased with the idea of himself as a hero; in the camp, he begins to wonder if these new principles are not the most valid. After several days, a company of soldiers is sent down to crush the strike. The commander is Ned Sawyer, who had played baseball at college, as had Red. He had wondered about American equality, too; he had drifted into, not the communist camp, but a military-training camp, because he liked the feeling of solidarity; he wasn't leading men against the strikers because he wanted to kill. Ned Sawyer stands, facing the strikers, and heroically proclaims that he will shoot the first who advances. In a dream, half will-lessly, on impulse, Red Oliver steps forward, walks toward the regiment, and is shot dead.

Sherwood Anderson has shown us people attracted by the plans for a new order, whose minds are fascinated by the new scheme that will lead to justice and fulfillment. These are people who are not rich in self-completion, who are driven desperately to revolt; who are devotees of disaster. It is not thinking revolution, on the grand scale, taking the large view. These people grope with no conscious propulsion, towards some sort of protest. They are restless and unorganized. They walk half-blindly to the next logical step of their lives, are steered to protest with the people who work beside them, in mills, in colleges, in factories. These are the people who are given to us in *Beyond Desire*: eager, bewildered, dazzled, seizing at the possibilities of hope that are shown to them in love and in revolution. M. R.

●
KAMERADSCHAFT. Directed by George Pabst. A German language picture, produced by the Nero Company.

There is a virility about Pabst's approach to the lives of his French and German miners that has elicited the opinion from a number of critics that *Kameradschaft* reminds one of Eisenstein's *Potemkin*. While Pabst's visual time-sense never approaches that of the great Soviet director, his almost spontaneous camera viewpoint have certainly contributed towards making several sequences of *Kameradschaft Potemkin*—like in their documentary illusion. But Pabst has by far surpassed Eisenstein in his most sympathetic penetration of his working class characters.

Only one having a profound understanding of proletarian lives could have recreated the scenes around the mine after the disaster. On this plane Pabst has more in common with Pudovkin than any other Soviet director. But at this point all comparisons with the masters of Soviet cinematography must end.

It would be unfair to Pabst, it would be unfair to those who see his film, if we failed to make a careful analysis of *Kameradschaft's* dangerous conclusions and some of the dangerous illusions many aspects of its treatment create. A careful dissection is all the more important as we are dealing with a work so masterfully executed that the momentum it gathers during the unfolding of its story carries the spectator along like a mighty torrent that sweeps everything in its path.

Pabst has done worse than just "blur the class lines" (Vern Smith—*Daily Worker*). He has actually confused and distorted them. The solidarity of the German and

French miners is simply unity against unavoidable "natural" catastrophes. As one of our younger critics has put it: "*Kameradschaft* lacks a villain." Where the treatment begs for clash and friction, Pabst has applied a silk-gloved touch that certainly keeps *Kameradschaft* from being an even greater film than it is: the German operator's ready consent to permit his workers to equip a rescue-crew; the improbable leniency of the French *gendarmerie* in handling the crowds that surround the mine; the French mine boss greeting the German rescuers, and so forth.

All these false-renderings from a social and political standpoint find their climax at the conclusion of the film when so much might have been saved. One sits on edge expecting a grand explosion when both German and French miners meet to celebrate their joint efforts in rescuing a number of survivors. But instead of an explosion we are offered a muted detonation from a blank shell:

"We are all workers. And miners are miners . . . We know but two enemies: Gas and War! *Auf Wiedersehn!* Long live the French! Long live the Germans!"

Workers, be they miners, plumbers, carpenters or bakers, know but one enemy, and that enemy contains in itself gas, war, unemployment (touched upon in *Kameradschaft*). Capitalism is that enemy, and Pabst, by failing to point that out, has created a work which will tend to confuse the issues in the minds of workers. Comradeship (solidarity) against what, Pabst?

Pabst must find the villain for all his films. If he fails, his heroes will remain meaningless symbols wildly tossed in every direction in a sea of abstraction.

Rumors have it that Pabst has sworn never again to make what he calls "a social film." The entertainment-for-entertainment's-sakers in this country have seized upon this statement to prove that no matter how great the director, his sphere is not the didactic film. Simply stated, it is their opinion that the genius of Pabst will reapply itself to the weaving of soporific fairy tales for the workers that make up the bulk of movie audiences.

When the truth finally becomes known, we will learn that what Pabst meant was that he is through with the "social film" under the auspices of capitalist firms that gag the artist who has something vital to say, and who permit him to say it only under conditions of severest restrictions.

S. BRODY

I AM A FUGITIVE FROM A CHAIN GANG by Robert E. Burns.
An R. K. O. Picture, starring Paul Muni.

Billboards on the fences around vacant lots and the front of the theatre that shows "I am a Fugitive" will sizzle with the producer's and exhibitor's screams that here, at last, is a picture that tells the whole truth, exposes a vile practice to the public eye. But just as you've been fooled by "truth about sex" films coming out of Hollywood, so you'll be fooled by "truth about government and justice" films coming from there.

When the film shows the chain-gang, it's shown only as a stage for our hero, and more falsely, as a single injustice having no connection with our otherwise pure, beautiful, and justly administered courts and government. The picture says that once the chain-gang evil is rooted out, our country will be once more the perfect and untroubled United States. But there is no such thing in capitalism as a single injustice. Chain-gangs are only one growth from a rotten system.

Neither do they show you the truth of a whole class and a whole race persecuted and oppressed by this noble American institution. Our hero, white and good-looking, returned from that romantic World War, begins to whine idealistically about the lack of romance in his factory, escapes from his "hampering" routine to ride the rods up and down the coun-

try, until a mistaken crime in a carefully unidentified state lands him in a chain-gang where we are privileged to see the mental and physical tortures he, as a sensitive individual, undergoes there. He escapes, rises in the world to the post of a skilled and wealthy engineer, is betrayed, returned to the chain-gang (some more mental and physical torture) escapes again, leaving the film dangling in the air, an unfinished statement, a less than half-truth. Where do we see the corruption of the courts, the maneuvering of politicians and bosses who fill the gangs with workers who protest, Negroes who demand their rights?

No, we're not allowed to see any of this because it's not relative to the distressing adventures of Paul Muni. Paul Muni does not play the part of a Negro, so we are shown none of the facts available in Spivak's book *Georgia Nigger*. The part the Negro race plays in the film is a curious one. We are led to suppose that a Negro's life in a prison camp alternates between singing songs and sweating picturesquely. Nothing is shown of the separate quarters for Negroes, special punishments (tortures), lynching or casual murders of Negro prisoners.

The film is a half-way measure, consciously falsifying facts and obscuring logical conclusions, and is therefore more dangerous than a false film that doesn't pretend to be more than false. Publicly, "I Am a Fugitive" is out for reform, but privately it is out for sensation.

DAVID KING

ONE-SIXTH OF THE WORLD'S SURFACE by Russell Wright.
Published by the author, 6234 Porest Ave., Hammond, Indiana.
\$1.25.

In that the author of this book is a student at Northwestern University who has just returned from an extensive tour of Soviet Russia this book should prove of great interest to the general student body. The book is an honest if abortive attempt to sum up the entire phenomena of Russia in one hundred and forty-five pages. Needless to say the book hardly does justice to the subject, but it presents a point of view somewhat unique: a Mid-west American student's ideas about Soviet Russia.

Though the book is rather poorly written it contains a sincerity which might have otherwise been lost under the weight of fine rhetoric. In a sense it makes good supplementary reading for the report of the National Student League delegation in the Soviet Union which appeared in previous issues of *Student Review*.

M.B.S.

About Our Contributors

DONALD HENDERSON is the Executive Secretary of the National Student League. He was among the four students recently arrested at a protest meeting in the City College of New York.

EDMUND STEVENS, a student at Columbia University, is the Chairman of the National Committee for the Student Congress Against War.

S. SMALL is a graduate of New York University. She is at present making a special study of Latin-America.

BERNARD REINES, one of the younger playwrights, is a graduate of Harvard University.

THE OCTOBER CLUB is a society in Oxford University for the study and advancement of Communism.

JOSHUA WINTERS is the pseudonym of a student at the University of Minnesota.

NEIL GARDNER is the pseudonym of a former student at McGill University now studying in New York. On his return to Canada he intends to organize National Student League groups.

A Weapon for Students

THE new academic year is here. The War Department is already sounding its trumpets. It is calling for more cadets, for more R.O.T.C. units. Hoover whose saber-swinging cavalry routed 7,000 bewildered veterans must have more soldiers, more tear bombs.

WHY?

BECAUSE this winter the wrath of starving men is bound to assert itself. And the rulers are afraid.

BECAUSE imperialist conflicts are approaching a boiling point. Germany is demanding more arms. Japan, not satisfied with the destruction of Chapei, with the seizure of Manchuria, is demanding more land for sources of raw materials.

BECAUSE, amidst failing peace conferences and rejected arms cuts the imperialist countries are making concerted plans for war. They are forming a ring of menacing steel threatening the Soviet Union, the country building the new society and culture of the future. The interests of American capital are welded in that ring!

The NATIONAL STUDENT LEAGUE is conscious of these war manoeuvres. It is rousing students to immediate action. It is already assuming an international role. It has participated in the International Student Conference and the World Congress Against War held at Amsterdam. It is distributing leaflets and organizing meetings to root out the R. O. T. C. menace from the colleges.

The **Student Review** is the interpreter and the leading weapon of this revolutionary student movement. The editorials, the articles and book reviews serve to define its philosophy and direct its actions. **YOU MUST READ IT** to be fully informed about this rapidly growing movement.

The ranks of students supporting the NATIONAL STUDENT LEAGUE and the **Student Review** are growing day by day. You, the students, are the backbone of this movement. The revolutionary student movement must spread to every college campus. We must have 5,000 New Members, and 5,000 New Subscribers before Christmas!

Join the NATIONAL STUDENT LEAGUE! Subscribe to the STUDENT REVIEW!

Two Pamphlets Out Soon :

WAR AND THE STUDENT 10 Cents

THE STUDENTS UNDER THE SOVIET (The report of the N. S. L. delegates in the Soviet Union) 10 Cents

ON SALE— CULTURE AND THE CRISIS 5 Cents

NATIONAL STUDENT LEAGUE
13 WEST 17th STREET, NEW YORK, N. Y.

- ☐ I accept the program of the NATIONAL STUDENT LEAGUE and hereby apply for members. (First Quarterly dues of 25¢ must accompany this application.) If a graduate state so.
- ☐ Please enroll me as a subscriber to **THE STUDENT REVIEW** for one year. (10 issues \$.75). It is not necessary for a subscriber to be a student.

NAME

ADDRESS

CITY

STATE

COLLEGE ORGANIZATION

Date Book Issued Book No.

5,000 New Members!

5,000 New Subscribers!