



Student Review

VOL. IV, NO. 3

MARCH, 1935

TEN CENTS

WORLD FRONT AT BRUSSELS!

BY SERRIL GERBER

EDITORS and COCKTAILS by James Wechsler

NEW LOW RATES TO THE SOVIET UNION

Take advantage of the special
winter excursion rates now in effect

Complete round trip ticket to and from the Soviet
Union with five days in Leningrad including hotel,
meals and sightseeing

\$162.00 up

Round trip to France and England as low as \$110.00

**TORGSIIN ORDERS EXECUTED IN THE
QUICKEST AND MOST DIRECT WAY**

WORLD TOURISTS, INC.

175 FIFTH AVENUE

NEW YORK CITY

ALgonquin 4-6656-7-8

EXCURSION boats and buses chartered for organizations at
lowest prices

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----|
| EDITORS AND COCKTAILS, by <i>James Wechsler</i> . . . | 5 |
| WORLD FRONT AT BRUSSELS, by <i>Serril Gerber</i> . . . | 8 |
| WE MEET AT ST. LOUIS, by <i>Adam Lapin</i> . . . | 11 |
| LIBRO E MOSCHETTO, by <i>William Leonard and Sid- ney Alexander</i> . . . | 13 |
| SOUTH REVISITED, by <i>Maurice Gates</i> . . . | 15 |
| EXPULSIONS AT CALIFORNIA, by <i>Celeste Strack</i> . . | 17 |
| FENCE-SITTERS AT BOSTON, by <i>Jean Ford</i> . . . | 19 |
| MARCHING FROM GEORGIA, a poem, by DAVID SCHREIBER . . . | 20 |

Book Reviews, by *Dina Glanz, Joseph Greenspan,
and Theodore Draper*

Drawing, by *George Grosz*

N.S.L. CHAPTERS!

Fill All Student Review
Quotas by March 15th

\$1000 is our goal

Drive for Subscriptions &
Contributions Immediately!

SAVE STUDENT REVIEW

TEXTBOOKS WANTED

HIGHEST PRICES PAID

Used and new textbooks sold at discounts up to 50%
Mail orders filled the same day received

SCHIFFER

25 WILLOUGHBY STREET

Brooklyn. N. Y.

EVERYTHING FOR THE STUDENT

STUDENT REVIEW

31 EAST 27TH STREET
NEW YORK CITY

I hereby subscribe to the STUDENT REVIEW
(\$1 for 12 issues).

Name.....

Address.....

Are you a member of the N.S.L.?.....

STUDENT REVIEW

Vol. IV March, 1935 No. 3

Editor

Sidney Alexander

Managing Editors: David Schreiber
William Leonard

Business Manager: Bessie Tackill

Advertising Manager: Samuel Chavkin

Editorial Board

Dena Glanz Florence Sachnoff
Louis Redmond Robert White

Subscription: \$1 for 12 issues

(Foreign, add 10c postage)

Make checks and money orders payable to
Bessie Tackill

Published by the NATIONAL STUDENT LEAGUE
31 East 27th Street New York City

THE April 5th strike has been established as a world-wide movement by the Brussels Congress. American students who are now in the midst of preparing their demonstrations must understand the importance of building a permanent anti-war movement which will involve the widest number of students and their organizations. Enthusiastic strikes and demonstrations will be ineffective if they do not serve to crystallize anti-war sentiment into the broadest possible organizational forms.

Our cue in building this united movement, is given by the delegates who have returned from the Brussels Congress. The National Student League is in hearty accord with the representative of the National Committee of the Student LID in Brussels, when he states:

"What will the world student Congress mean to the American student movement? Just as much

as the American student movement wants it to mean. The World Congress, has, abroad, plenty of momentum. It is up to the American students to build their own movement. It is up to us, while we have a considerable degree of civil liberty, to devise ways and means to build a movement of students that will increase the one and prevent the other."

We were therefore amazed at the refusal of the members of the LID committee which met jointly with the NSL, to immediately follow up the Brussels Congress by supporting a call of the delegates to all student organizations to meet in order to plan the April 5th strike, and a national student congress which will build the united front in connection with the World Student Committee. Joseph Lash, representing the Student LID, made the astounding assertion that he did not think other student organizations should be on par with the LID and NSL in the calling of the April 5th strike, and he thought that the Brussels movement should become a "clearing house" in this country. Of course this is only a polite euphemism for killing the entire movement initiated by the Brussels Congress.

At this writing, the National Committee of the Student LID is being polled on the matter. We are sure that students throughout the country will see the need for breaking down all sectarian barriers in the way of the widest possible united front together with the students all over the world. April 5th must be the stepping stone to the student congress which will set up this united movement in the U. S.

IF there was any doubt after the strike of 25,000 students last April, that American students were vitally interested in the question of war, the Literary Digest Poll is further evidence of the dissipation of the apathetic attitude. Contrary to the clear-cut formulation of demands of last year's strike, and those being worked out for the April 5th strike, the Digest Poll does its utmost to confuse the issues involved. Throughout the country, high school and college students, will strike against imperialist war, for schools not battleships, against fascism, and for the abolition of the instrument of the war department in the schools, the ROTC.

Issued after the Supreme Court decision sanctioning compulsory military training, the Literary Digest does not consider it sufficiently important to ascertain the attitude of students on the ROTC. Obscuring the fact that an imperialist nation cannot wage a defensive war, we are confident that thousands of the 81 percent who declared their opposition to aggressive war, and the 63 percent who oppose an American navy and air-force second to none (as a guarantee of peace) will be on the streets April 5th.

The strength of the April 5th strike which has already been endorsed by the National Student League, the Student LID, the National Council of Methodist Youth, and the American Youth Congress, is that students of diverse opinions and affiliations will find common grounds in their opposition to war and ROTC. It is with a view toward widening the strike that the NSL is working to secure the sponsorship of the strike by a maximum number of student organizations,

and greets the decision of the student delegates to the Brussels Congress, to secure a united leadership for the April 5th strike.

The National Student League is confident that ever larger numbers of students who will strike on April 5th, will accept its program on war and fascism. Many understand already that war is a product of the conflicts between imperialist nations for the division of the spoils of the economic world, and that one of the most dangerous elements of the war danger, is the menacing attitude of imperialist Japan in the Far East, and Hitler Germany on the West, toward the Soviet Union. The provocations of those openly aggressive nations who are seeking to bring to nought the peace policies of the Soviet Union, are indicative of the fundamental antagonism between the capitalist world and the USSR.

Students are learning that only an alliance with labor and the abolition of the capitalist system offers any guarantees for the abolition of war. Prepare to strike on April 5th!

THOSE priceless Gold-Dust twins of American journalism, Bernarr Macfadden and William Randolph Hearst, are at it again. As Hollywood and Miss Marion Davies so well know, Mr. Hearst is a paragon of virtue; hence, they harken to his words when he declares we must rinse the academic bathtub of "communist filth." And Mr. Macfadden, whose *True Stories* and *True Confessions* have played so great a part in the Renaissance of American Culture, maintains in masculine prose that "communist poison is being injected into our American Schools"

and that the only solution is to "hang the traitors!" This, ironically, enough, appeared in a publication entitled *Liberty!*

Unfortunately these statements are not merely funny. The power of the Hearst press to control legislative policy was indicated only recently by the surprising defeat of the World Court in the Senate by a Hearst-controlled minority. In the past, as in the present, the California publisher's bestial ranting has possessed an uncanny propensity for being translated into administrative acts. Professors and students, whether Communist, Socialist, or Liberal, recognize the fascist threat that is contained in these Hearst articles. United-front anti-Hearst meetings have been held at which it was disclosed that reporters, masquerading as students seeking admission, sought to unearth "incriminating" evidence against professors at Syracuse University and Teachers' College. Communists are not solely involved in this. An almost invisible tinge of political pink is quite sufficient to precipitate a red-scare from Mr. Hearst, which will result in drastic expulsions and dismissals unless challenged by immediate united-front student action.

Macfadden — whose score of gutter periodicals has injected, not the Communist "poison" of awareness to our social system, but cheap aphrodisiacs into the American working masses—is no less a danger. And the silence of the "clean" capitalist press is tacit approval of both Hearst and Macfadden. Actually, these men function merely as the mud-glutted spearhead of a deeper fascist drive on the part of the entire American

capitalist press. Heywood Broun, the militant president of the Newspaper Guild, recognized this basic fact when he stated recently in N. Y.: "I would just as soon participate in an anti-Roy Howard meeting as one declared against William Randolph Hearst!"

THE NSL chapters in the California high schools do things with a thoroughness that gets results. All last term there was marked resentment in the Los Angeles high schools against the compulsory payment of a towel fee with physical training courses. The towel fee is one of those annoying petty grafts that administrations can usually get away with. The Los Angeles students, of whom a high percentage are the children of unemployed parents, decided to do something about it. They held meetings, issued leaflets, signed petitions. The school officials played the old game of passing the buck. Nobody knew who was responsible for the towel fee. The students are now taking the case to the state legislature. They are circulating a petition among students and citizens demanding the abolition of the fee. They will probably win too. The students of Belmont High School in Los Angeles have shown the same tenacity in insisting on their academic freedom. When Jack Dixon, popular student, liberal, and candidate for president of student council, was barred from the elections, the NSL issued leaflets and demanded that Dixon be permitted to run. The NSL was faced not only with the hostility of the administration but also of the ROTC boys who attacked the NSL members distributing one of their leaflets. Instead of restraining the

ROTC hoodlums, the principal, Mr. Benshimel, called down the NSL members to his office. He threatened expulsion. The NSL chapter hit back hard. At the hour which Benshimel had fixed for the interrogation of the NSL members and their parents, a demonstration was called in front of the principal's office. The demonstration was a huge success. Almost the entire school participated. The principal began to make concessions. He urged the ROTC leaders to refrain from the more violent forms of activity. He dropped all charges against the NSL members. Finally the NSL was offered a room in the school and official recognition from the administration if it would drop the fight against the ROTC. The NSL refused and issued a leaflet explaining the situation to the students and demanding unconditional recognition. The chapter intends to continue the fight for legal status in the school. It can hardly lose if it sticks to its guns.

THE present issue of the *Student Review* has appeared in the teeth of the gravest financial difficulty. And unless immediate action is taken by the NSL chapters there is the danger that this issue will be the last. There is no reason why this should happen if the *Review* agents in various chapters embark upon an immediate subscription and contribution drive. At the very least a monthly magazine must have a \$1000 fund. The newer and more attractive format of the *Review*, the increased use of illustrative material, and the demand for regular publication make this sum a minimum necessity.

The *Review* agents and NSL

members generally must aid in this fight. A drive for contributions must be immediately launched. Subscriptions must be increased. Money for issues sold must be immediately forwarded. Each chapter must pledge at the very least ten dollars, and responsible NSL members must see that this sum is fulfilled and sent into the *Review* office by March 15th. Unless these actions are taken, we shall—like the Bedouins—fold up our tents and silently steal away.

We believe that the dissolution of the *Student Review* would be a calamity to the National Student

League. A revolutionary student movement without a national organ is about as effective as a deaf-mute. Such a magazine serves a double function: it integrates the widely separated chapters of the NSL and it serves to introduce the National Student League to prospective members. In this sense, it is an organizer both within and without the ranks. But, we repeat, unless we raise \$1000 by March 15th, the *Review* will be forced to suspend publication. The NSL must take immediate steps to prevent such an occurrence. Save the *Student Review*!

EDITORS AND COCKTAILS

JAMES WECHSLER

THE history of the college press is one of neither enlightenment nor valor. Tracing back through the files of our college dailies reveals an almost unbelievable ignorance, an unhesitant pandering to Administrators and a blatant disregard for any genuine issues on the Campus or elsewhere. Editors lived in an unsullied vacuum. There was neither initiative nor content to their writing. The subject matter can be charitably called "consciously irrelevant." Boards of Trustees must have lived in a state of perpetual gratitude for the mental wholesomeness of their proteges.

Perhaps no more vivid evidence of the impact of the crisis can be found than the groping, feverish awareness which has begun to permeate the pages of college organs. It has assumed diverse forms. It manifests itself more often in furious reaction than in restless militance. But the awakening has focused the spotlight on the papers and those who edit them, endowed their activities with a sudden prominence and built them into a force which must be reckoned with.

Certainly Harvard students, remembering the "Heil Hanfstaengl" episode, must be conscious of the strategic role which a college editor can play. It is lamentable that his influence is most visible when he aligns himself with the most bitterly reactionary

clique. But there is on the other side the growing endeavor of college editors to resist the tide of Trustee-domination; this resistance has often been portrayed in equally dramatic manner—the numerous expulsions and suspensions of editors in recent years bear witness to this.

All these phenomena have served to place the college press in the foreground. Hence efforts to organize the opinion of the editors cannot be lightly dismissed. The events I will describe are indicative of such an attempt on the part of one of our most distinguished and determined citizens—William Randolph Hearst.

Last September there convened in New York an assemblage of some fifty college editors. Similar gatherings had taken place before, but this, because of the critical events of the previous Spring, was of major importance. The result was the formation of an Association of College Editors which would function with a central news bureau and act in concert on specific issues.

I think that those who assumed the leadership of this unit were serious and ambitious and conscious of real responsibilities. The president was Francis Smith, Editor of the *Daily Princetonian*, who has demonstrated honesty and courage in a college described by its own constituents as "ripe for fascism." With surprising earnestness and energy the group set to work.

Its first project was an "Open Letter to William Randolph Hearst." It consisted of a bitter attack on his policies of "arrogant nationalism" and labeled him a "menace to the peace of the world." Now this may appear to have been an obvious and not too original move; but in the light of past history it was of considerable meaning. There was and is a long way to go; the attack on Hearst too often isolates him from other publishers equally vicious, representing equally reactionary interests.

But this was a step in the general direction of awareness. The letter was published in about two hundred college papers with a circulation of some proportions. And Mr. Hearst's circulation manager must have been decidedly upset, judging from ensuing events.

Two weeks later the Hearst press carried a front-page editorial reply. With that I shall not deal. It was the usual Red Scare and Yellow Peril which accompanies Mr. Hearst's tendency to turn green when he sees his investments imperiled.

And the college press, with varying intensity and understanding, struck back at this reply. Peace was not yet in sight for the circulation department. Further overtures were soon made.

Mr. Stanley Beaubaire, Editor of the *Stanford Daily*, is either a surpassingly naïve or commonly shrewd young man. He prefers the former description, I suspect. And I will grant him his point. At any rate, it was this Mr. Beaubaire who, some time after this exchange of fire, sent out letters to the editors of about forty college dailies in the United States and Canada inviting them to a conference in Washington, to be held during Christmas week.

The letter remarked that a gentleman by the name of Hearst would pay all bills—railroad fare, meals, hotel expenses.

This was a generous offer and boys from all over the country who had no place to go over the holidays were not inclined to reject it. There was a natural amount of scepticism in the woods of Oklahoma and the streets of New York. But one who hasn't seen the Lincoln Memorial is likely to wonder what it's all about. Hence there was fairly unanimous acceptance of the invitation. A few of us, perhaps over-fearful of Hearst gold, paid our own way. A larger number insisted upon making clear that they were not going to look down the throat of this gift horse—but that they went with misgivings.

So Hearst wrote the checks and the editors of two-score college dailies assembled in Washington to get his money's worth.

The conference can best be described as unique. (This is a miracle of understatement.) The "serious problems of the college press" which we were allegedly called together to discuss evaporated in cocktails and hot air. But the entertainment was satisfactory. I do not know how much the sponsors knew of brewing unrest. I do not know if they were aware that I (with the tacit agreement of a few others) was prepared to submit an anti-Hearst resolution. Nor could I estimate whether they guessed that the boys who were signing Mr. Hearst's name on meal-checks were decidedly hostile to their benefactor. Whether deliberately or not, however, they cautiously avoided a showdown. They substituted interviews for discussion, cocktails for resolutions and speeches for organization.

California — Here We Go!

Meanwhile, those of us behind the anti-Hearst move were not over-concerned. We had feared two things: the establishment of an organization under Hearst's aegis and the passage of any Hearst "go back where you came from" resolutions. But it was swiftly evident that no one, if he so desired, would have dared to suggest them. And it was also clear that, even with manifest anti-Hearst sentiment, this would not have emerged on the floor. Too many of the delegates felt the rules of hospitality; they were ready to attack Hearst—but not when he was paying for their railroad fare home. And this was a long way from California.

Hence we quietly trooped in to meet President Roosevelt. We stood around like uncomfortable men who had wandered into a ladies' room by mistake and listened to a record-breaking interview between Mr. Roosevelt and the President of the United States. It was speedy and abrupt and soon we were out of our predicament. The air was good outside.

That was only the beginning. Throughout all this we were being led around by a sleek, soft-spoken gentleman by the name of Williams who was fabled as Hearst's chief editorial writer. No one was sure of his identity; we were sure he was running things. Mr. Williams, in between an ingratiating solicitude for our past and future welfare, told us impartially about the Yellow Peril and big navies.

In the evening the great truth emerged. It was announced that the assemblage would convene for discussion the following afternoon on the train returning to New York. This was at least reassuring; some of us were fearful that the sessions might have been taking place in some secret latrine without our knowledge. We attended the banquet with renewed calm. The principal speaker was Richard Washburn Child, former ambassador to Italy and one of Hearst's leading writers. Since that time Mr. Child has passed away, and out of respect and lack of space I will omit mention of his remarks. It is impossible to ignore, however, one leading refrain which he repeated at high pitch: "the function of a newspaper is to tell the truth and let the reader decide." Anyone who has read the late Mr. Child's essays will understand why that remark was greeted with subdued Bronx and Oklahoma cheers.

I could go on endlessly. The next day we were herded into busses for Mount Vernon where we laid another wreath, smiled at the newsreel-men and pondered the obligations of the college press.

But the end was near. We hopped the train for New York that afternoon. One of the boys remarked that he had begun to believe in the old kind of fairies.

It is plain that no momentous developments will emerge from Mr. Hearst's conclave. There is, however, one significant episode to relate. Immediately after the conference ended, I drew up an anti-Hearst resolution and circulated it among about thirty editors. Seventeen signed it, mostly those present at Washington. It condemned the "Red Scare" and pledged to combat it. And, from recent college editorials, most of them are keeping their word.

One must not exaggerate the importance of this. As I have said, anti-Hearst feeling is confused; the concept of academic freedom is vague and wistful in many minds; the economic bases of Mr. Hearst's attacks are not clearly perceived in most sectors. But one factor cannot be minimized either — the inescapably strong hostility which Hearst aroused, the real earnestness with which these editors wish to preserve our dying democratic rights. They don't, in many instances, understand why they are dying; they are uncertain or ignorant of the class character of fascism; but they are superficially opposed to it. That opposition will, in some cases, disappear; in others it will ultimately take coherent form.



*Don't look now, but the guy
next to me used to be a pro-
fessor of mathametics at
N. Y. U.!*

GEORGE GROSZ.

WORLD FRONT AT BRUSSELS

SERRIL GERBER

Serril Gerber, University of California at Los Angeles undergraduate, was the NSL representative to the World Student Congress against War and Fascism at Brussels. The American delegation, and the groups they represented included:

Sanford Solender, N.Y.U.; Morris Milgram, SLID; George Edson, New England Anti-War Conference; Phil Russell, North Carolina U. Anti-War Conference; Lyonel Florant, Howard University Liberal Club; James Morgenthal, Columbia University Anti-War Conference; and Gerber. Three Canadian students also attended.

THOUSANDS upon thousands of American students will leave their college and high school study rooms one day this April in a three-, four-, or ten-fold multiplication of last year's campus strike against ROTC, war and war preparations. And within the same month hundreds of thousands of South American, English, European, African and Asiatic students—from "democratic" France and England, from fascist Germany and Italy—will proclaim their anti-war determinations, in powerful strikes, where possible, in daring demonstrations, in revolutionary, illegal actions where governments have formally withdrawn the right of protest against war.

This united international manifestation of student refusal to permit against-the-wall capitalism to attempt economic stabilization at the expense of millions of workers' and students' lives, is the major international action to come out of the first world Student Congress against War and Fascism, which gathered the representatives of awakening students throughout the world in a mighty convention in Brussels the last three days of 1934. The building of the international student strike was declared the primary activity in the coming months for the World Committee as a whole, as well as for each of the affiliated sections which we must work to set up in every country throughout the world.

Forbidden in Geneva by a Swiss government that had police only to protect fascist students and feared "international complications" if their fascist darlings, with police protection, attacked the undefended world anti-fascists; proscribed in Lyons, France, by a government that could not countenance the "irresponsible internationalists"; the Congress of students from 31 countries that lie in every geographic, economic and social continent, met finally in the Great Concert Hall at Brussels, to lay plans for consolidating the international student movement against war and fascism: thanking not the generosity of Belgian officialdom, but the power and influence of the strong Belgian student groups—practical recognition by the enemy.

The World Congress sat in closed session in a guarded hall. Ex-liberals, Christians, ex-fascists, revolutionaries who braved terror and persecution worse than ordinary, and even death, to steal away from fascist and semi-fascist countries, from African, Asiatic and South American colonies, sat grimly with reds and socialists, revolutionaries and liberals, churchmen and League of Nation enthusiasts. There has never been a student congress of such magnitude, with such breadth, such expressed unity of purpose and the will to achieve that purpose. The united front of such extremes as the Oxford University October Club and the League of Nations Union of the large English delegation, was projected on an international scale in most of the 31 delegations which made up the 375 official representatives to the Congress.

The growing desire of all sincere fighters for the student interests for closer and closer consolidation of the student front was given tremendous impetus by the formation of this permanent international united action movement, which combines organically within its broad ranks even now, all important student anti-war, anti-fascist groups throughout the world, almost without exception—and which gives promise, by the inclusiveness of its militant, yet non-restrictive program, of drawing to it those few groups who did not represent themselves at the Congress.

We in America may learn much—and the seven American delegates did learn much—from the advanced stage of student unity in England, France, Czecho-Slovakia, Belgium, and almost every fascist country of Europe, where the undergraduates have discovered, true, too late to be effective in preventing fascism—that only by uniting all groups who declare their readiness for action on the fullest *common* minimum program possible, can students be a help or achieve marked results in attaining their common or individual aims. The vicious practice of standing off fifty feet and pumping bullets of hatred at those who do not completely agree with one's own full belief, and receiving their bullets in return, will never unify—except in death—the student movement in America or anywhere else. The Congress definitely is built on this united front idea. The Congress, of course, reasserted the full right of its member groups to present independently their own particular programs and conclusions, to convince students of their correctness. But it insisted upon profiting from the classic lesson of the German students—united action or defeat.

Socialists Go Left

The socialist students at the Congress, oddly enough, acted for a time as the extreme left-wing, insisting that the program of the Congress must firmly come out for the abolition of capitalism and the establishment of a socialized society as the only means of ending war. The revolutionary student groups, together with the liberals, the communist and Christian students lined up solidly against this move, which would result in the serious limiting of participation in this anti-war, anti-fascist work, and would narrow beyond all effectiveness the student front that is necessary to the fight, especially at present. The majority of the delegates pointed out to the socialists that they must not demand complete acceptance of their program; that they must not cause the withdrawal of large sections of the Congress, if it were possible—and they said it was possible—to have both a broad Con-

gress and an effective program, without passage of the socialist resolution. The socialist delegates agreed; thereby cementing the eight national groups in the International Socialist Student Federation to the united front.

In fact, Jef Rens, international secretary of the I.S.S.F., declared at the final session, the complete adherence of his international organization to the Congress, its program and plan of work.

There was another type of student unity displayed at the Congress which rivalled the general common will for its thrillingness and significance. I speak of the wonderful understanding and comradely feeling which was developed for the first time between students of big, powerful, capitalist nations and students of the colonial and semi-colonial countries which suffer the imperialist aggression and eternal exploitation of the former. There were tense moments when English students met the Indian delegation, when French met representatives from the North African provinces, when the American delegation met the Mexican, Porto Rican and South American students.

Some of the English students were inclined at first to doubt the necessity of including in the Congress program the fight against imperialism and colonial oppression. But when the colonials had spoken . . . when a powerfully built Hindu spoke of the awful toll exacted from 400,000,000 of his people that the British empire might continue, of the 3,500,000 who had joined the numberless additional landless peasants during the last ten years, of the unspeakable ignorance of his people of whom one in fourteen was granted the privilege of literacy . . . when the North Africans spoke of a country of 60 millions of people, where not a single university existed . . . when the South American students spoke of the greed of American imperialism, of the fomenting of internal strife to conceal the foreign robbery . . . then the colonial commission presented a unanimous report. Then the meaning of "white man's burden" became manifest in all its horror.

"We consider," states the Manifesto of the Congress, "that the struggle against war and fascism cannot be separated from the struggle against imperialism, and therefore we demand the independence of colonial countries in order to insure the free development of national culture and of education . . ."

Many colonials spoke of two particular

kinds of war: wars of the imperialists, such as the Spanish-American and the Great War, in which they were the pawns and booty seized by the victors; and war which they themselves found necessary to prepare and wage that they might be free from imperialist oppression. Against the first they asked and pledged common struggle. For the second they demanded the support of the international student movement. The Congress pledged support.

The Congress suggested, and we in America must soon begin actively to prepare a Pan-American Student Anti-Imperialist Conference. September, 1935, was tentatively set; Montevideo named as the place. At such a Congress the American student movement would tighten the bonds which tie together the North and South American student struggle against American capitalism's exploitation of Latin America. A country which oppresses another country cannot itself be free, said the Argentine boy.

Wake Up, Professor!

Still another kind of unity was manifest at the World Congress. The presence there of some seventy professors who had come individually and from their professional anti-fascist organizations all over Europe to act jointly with their students in defense of educational facilities, culture and true-learning, against reaction, fascism and war. Professor Rivet, director of the great French Museum and one of the world's most notable scholars, spoke as chairman of the Vigilance Committee, anti-fascist organization of five thousand French intellectuals who have placed themselves behind the working class in its fight for a new order. The intellectual is no temporizing force, no balance for extremes; he must be a fighter—by pen, brush, book and deed—for culture and a just social order. The American delegation felt the demonstration of support given by European professors rather wistfully, for they recalled the too-scattered cases of united teacher-student action in America. This experience is valuable if it will serve to increase the efforts of students to work jointly with sincere instructors, if the broadcast of it will serve to popularize the truism that the professor's final lot must be cast, in his own interests and in the interests of human knowledge and progress, with the advancing working class and student movement.

Looking forward to receiving greetings from Henri Barbusse, renowned anti-fascist

writer, the Congress had to content itself in view of his illness, with hearing a reading of his message to the students. Cheer after cheer for the staunch battler followed upon the conclusion of his stirring appeal for action! immediate, all-inclusive action!

The insistence that students and instructors movements, while stronger when together, were alone impotent in the struggle against war and fascism, and *must* follow the lead of the main body of potential munitions-factory workers, longshoremen, sailors and soldiers—the working population of each country—was clear and acceptable to all at the Congress. An unexpected dramatization of this axiom brought delegates wildly shouting to their feet. Nine young workers from munitions and chemical factories near Paris, elected by their shop-mates to bring greetings to the Congress, proclaimed the unity of all workers of hand or brain in the anti-war fight. Their leader spoke to the point: the general strike in case of war must be prepared today by supporting workers in all their struggles for free organization and better conditions; unity between workers, students and intellectuals is not a matter of words but of deeds; in Paris workers protect student anti-fascist demonstrations, and students pass leaflets in front of factories.

The understanding of this point and the declaration in the Congress documents that only a fundamental change in the economic order can solve the problems of the student and workers make the possibilities of the Congress broad and real. "We are suffering from the effects of a society founded on the exploitation of man by man, a society which is approaching the end of its existence, a system which is opening the way to war and fascism"—Manifesto. "In fighting against war and fascism we fight against their system, based upon the exploitation of man by man"—Declaration of Students Rights.

The Congress told many sad tales of setback to line up with the spirited reports of triumph and advance. The Congress loudly cheered mention of the April 13 strike of 25,000 in America; it applauded the thousands of French students who marched side by side with the Paris workers in the great anti-fascist strike last February; it shouted for the undergraduates who drove the fascists out of the college of medicine in Madrid last December; and for the students who by quick publicity and mass demonstration prevented fifty Paraguayan students from leaving to serve on the Gran Chaco

front as ordered by their government. And it gave valuable lessons in tactics to many who had less spectacular stories to tell, less brilliant development to show.

Many frightened governments had forbidden the sending of delegates; others that rule by terror had refused passports or imprisoned delegates attempting to leave the country. Six Spanish delegates spent Congress-time in prison. So did Polish and several Balkan representatives. Professor Constantinescu of Jassy University and head of the Rumanian initiative committee for the Congress had entered his second month of hunger strike as protest against being jailed. The powerful, joyous delegation from Soviet Russia—the only country in the world where students find no danger of retrenchment, no discrimination, no threat of being forced to serve in a war for another's profit—was also detained with technical difficulties and unable to reach the Congress. From a group of Japanese students in jail came greetings signed "from those who live in the tempest of fascism and reaction."

Two Italian students were present, bringing a pitiful tale of the destruction of culture and the perversion of the school and textbook for the war-hungry motives of Black Fascism. Austrian students told of the "beauties" of "clerico-fascism" and the secret illegal work the university students were engaged in to wipe out another brand of open capitalist terrorism. An Argentine student got through, bearing his credentials inside the cuff of a shirt he was thus forced to wear from his home to Paris.

But the outstanding report was that of the lone German student, whose very presence gave the Congress a thrill and an inspiration that will remain forever with 375 staring, amazed, anti-fascists. It happened this way.

A Nazi Spills the Beans

Rumors spread that a German Nazi was at the Congress. And several hours later there was the chairman confirming the many-tongued whispers. A German Nazi—no, not a spy—an *anti-fascist student, active in the Storm Troops*. He was to deliver now the report of the German student movement.

Delegates cards were checked. The doors were locked. Sound ceased to exist. Silently he appeared on the rostrum; young, light-footed, impossible to be recognized in his big grey trench coat, dark glasses, false moustache and large peaked cap. He placed

his notes on the stand. He gripped the stand with bony hands. Tightly. He never relaxed them. He began to speak.

In a low, carrying voice, one filled with such bitterness as had not been expressed at the Congress heretofore, the anti-fascist Storm Trooper told his story. He was a student. In 1931 and '32 he listened to political discussion. Communists, Fascists. The anti-fascists spoke of the glorious society to be achieved after they had conquered. A socialized system; unending opportunity for education, music, science, industry. He listened longingly. The fascists spoke of immediate bread, employment upon graduation, security, uniforms and marching, "German Socialism," "National Socialism." He was fairly poor. He was hungry. Soon he became a Storm Trooper.

Hitler the Hypocrite

The acidity of his hatred of Nazi-ism, his utter disillusion and consuming intention to blast it from the face of the earth, he spit out sharply in few words.

"In everything which they promised us, they have deceived us.

"Hitler's program is the destruction of the people, not national and social emancipation. Our universities have become arsenals of war. When we march with closed ranks through the streets, when we practice with weapons, machine guns, and hand grenades, when we are instructed in the racial and national superiority of our people, what else can all this be called, other than war preparations?"

"What did Hitler accomplish? Only 9,000 out of 40,000, of those who matriculate are admitted to the colleges. Unemployment faces graduates. The chasing of the Jews from the academic professions brought no improvement. For the student a terrific increase of fees appeared.

"Resistance is growing . . . The students are rebelling. Everywhere there are anti-fascist student groups which regularly issue papers and pamphlets and continually work among the students. We know that our struggle will and must end with the defeat of Hitler. . . . Your fight against Hitler fascism must turn against the Hitler emissaries who come into your countries."

He outlined some methods of work used within the Storm Troops.

He concluded: "Long live the common struggle of students of all nations, the united front against fascism on both sides of the barricades."

He disappeared.

"Free Thaelmann! Free Thaelmann! the great anti-fascist leader!" stormed simultaneously in half a dozen languages from the throats of the delegates, who had jumped to their feet in tremendous tribute to the steel and fire of the German student movement. But he had gone. Back to the great prison of Germany. Back to the Storm Troops. Back to his comrades for the completion of their historic task.

It was at this point that the American delegation most closely felt the horror of fascism and reached the most solemn declaration to battle against it. The work of the Congress had just begun.

What will the World Student Congress mean to the American student movement? It points the opportunity and the necessity for drawing much closer those elements already active in the anti-war, anti-fascist student front, for drawing into one great anti-war, anti-fascist student organization—which shall be, more loosely, a permanently constituted movement—those groups and those hundreds of thousands of student liberals, Christians, etc., who have not yet been won to action. The World Congress has plenty of momentum. It is the duty of all participants, of all other organizations to build and build the American Section of the World Committee while there is yet time and opportunity. There must be no slackers, no reneging. The principle, the tactics are clear.

COMPASS SPECIALS TO THE SOVIET UNION

1. Selection of 36 tours 40-62 days \$216 up
2. Physiological Congress 42-day tour . . . \$254 up
3. Moscow University summer school and tour—65 days \$385 up

For information and literature apply to

COMPASS TRAVEL BUREAU

55 West 42nd St. New York City
L.Ongacre 5-3070

WE MEET AT ST. LOUIS

ADAM LAPIN

THE four student conferences held during Christmas week have general interest primarily because they presented an excellent picture of the currents and tendencies in the American student movement. At the conventions of the NSL and the Student LID the problems of unity and of united front were of paramount importance; although for different reasons and although different conclusions were arrived at. The National Student Federation is torn between support of demands put forward by the militant students, and toward becoming the official campus agency of the Roosevelt administration. The latter tendency is the one being applied in practice. The Student in Politics Conference, which made its debut last year in Washington, admitted its own decease. Indeed it had no alternative.

The Student in Politics

The Student in Politics Conference has significance only as an anachronism. It was initiated in 1933, largely through the efforts of the LID, as a clearing house for student opinion. It would undertake no activity and although the Chamber of Commerce didn't ask much for its auditorium in the way of cash, it merely asked that there be no resolutions. And of course hell broke loose on the floor. LID and NSL members fought to permit discussion and for the right to pass resolutions. The real issues were clear-cut between those who wanted a symposium united front and those who wanted a united front based on campus issues. The minimum program agreed upon by the NSL and LID would easily have secured the approval of the delegates were not a motion passed to refer the program to the executive committee. Although the program was badly emasculated there remained something definite about ROTC, retrenchment, academic freedom, and Negro discrimination.

At the meetings of the continuations committee the NSL was the *only* organization that took the program seriously and tried to propose activity. The committee remained moribund until the suggestion was made that a second conference be held in St. Louis. Shortly afterward, without making any secret about it, both the NSL and the Student LID also arranged to have their conventions

in St. Louis. At once, some of the conservative organizations raised a howl. Proximity with the two left-wing organizations would tinge the conference red. What happened was that the NSL and LID sent few delegates and this contributed pretty heavily to the failure of the second conference which had less than a hundred delegates. Students simply won't travel all over the country to hear a few big-shot speakers. They have shown that they will take an active interest in conferences called for specific purposes, on problems that are of real importance to them.

Student in Politics will be easily forgotten. Once it was offered as a palatable and dignified substitute for the united front. Now it has distinguished itself only by its affiliation with a really active and important united front of youth, the American Youth Congress. The proceedings of the Student in Politics Conference were notable only because they inevitably centered about one of the vital student problems of the day: student unity, and because they revealed the inability of the leadership of the Student LID to agree on the character of the LID and on its reasons for opposing unity.

Where Does the LID Stand?

Ever since it has been confronted with the necessity of participating in student activities, the LID has been subject to a bewildering array of schemes and differing points of view. William Gomberg and his followers of the New York Young Peoples Socialist League proposed once and for all to make the LID a part of the Socialist Party machinery. This group wants "real stuff." They prefer genuine "Socialist" activity, organizing shops and supporting Socialist Party candidates for election. Paying lip-service to the struggle for student interests, they make it clear that they consider this type of activity subordinate, and unrelated to the real purpose of the organization. The motion for affiliation to the Socialist Party was defeated by a 49 to 9 vote at the Student LID convention.

Similar to this point of view is that advocated by Joseph P. Lash, secretary of the Student LID, who finds amalgamation impossible for reasons which do not yet exist,

but will arise in the future. He stated on the floor of the Student in Politics Conference, that he is of the opinion that at some time in the future the Socialist Party will become the party of the American masses. At that time he believes the Socialist students should affiliate to the party. Amalgamation is impossible now because at that future date, the Socialist students would have to split the organization in order to affiliate it to the Socialist Party.

When Lash had concluded his remarks, Monroe Sweetland, Organizer for the Student LID, pointed out that Lash was merely expressing his own point of view and not the official position of the Student LID. Sweetland gave a very simple reason for opposition to amalgamation. He maintains that you just can't trust the NSL. This thought was expressed in somewhat more elaborate language in the official resolution adopted by the LID convention: "Just as long as the Communist Party, working through the National Student League, under the guise of non-partisan activity, continues to follow its present sectarian attitude toward other radical organizations, just so long will this stand in the way of the all-essential of good faith in an amalgamated organization." This is the second national convention at which Sweetland has "looked forward to the day" when amalgamation will be possible, and he seems to be making a habit of it. When Kenneth Meiklejohn, former vice-chairman of the Student LID, amended Sweetland's motion to include a committee to meet with the NSL in order to investigate the possibilities of amalgamation, Sweetland opposed the motion. He prefers to "look forward to the day" when NSLers and LIDers will be in the same "amalgamated" concentration camp.

For Amalgamation

The very "left" position of those who deprecate the student struggle for immediate demands and the united front against war and fascism, while high sounding phrases about "socialism" are bandied about, received a forceful rebuff from the delegates who came from fascist countries to the international congress in Brussels. These students, including some who had formerly been in the ranks of the fascists, laid particular emphasis on the necessity for carrying on struggles along the lines of immediate student problems. These delegates maintained that the fascists were able to trick the students largely because they came to

them with bread and butter slogans, because they promised to solve their immediate and urgent problems. Too often it seemed to the students that the radicals spoke in vague and idealistic accents while they had nothing concrete to offer. It is a dangerous policy to negate that phase of the class struggle where students can be most effective: on the campus, all in the name of "revolution and socialism."

From its inception the NSL has proposed one direction and one path for the student movement. From the beginning we have maintained that all the profound problems and conflicts of society are reflected on the campus. ROTC, Negro discrimination, retrenchment, the suppression of academic freedom and the formation of fascist groups on the campus, are all expressions of the struggles in the outside world. What is more, these are very real problems to the majority of students; real, because they are direct, immediate and urgent. Students can be revolutionary by hitting hard at the reflections of reaction and capitalism in the school. The NSL has been a revolutionary organization because it has been able to involve thousands of students in strikes, in demonstrations and protest around immediate problems and has been able to show in these actions, the broader implications of student problems, the fact that these problems will find no ultimate solution without a very basic change in the structure of society and the abolition of the capitalist system, which can be effected only under the leadership of the working class. Students have been won to support of strikes and the struggle of the workers for unemployment insurance as well as the essential alliance of students with workers in the fight against war and fascism, all the more readily, when the experiences of campus struggles have shown the fundamental similarity between the problems facing the students and the workers.

At the convention of the National Student League, held in St. Louis, the questions of the united front of all students and student organizations and the proposal for the unification of the Student LID and the NSL was placed in the center of discussion and the resolutions for future activity. The record of activity during the year 1934 gave conclusive evidence of the fact that the NSL program has influenced every significant development in the student movement. Wherever the Student LID has been active, it has been along the lines of the stu-

dent issues, as contained in the program of the NSL, and what is more, that action has almost invariably been in a united front. The NSL convention reiterated its proposal that the Student LID recognize the trend taken by its own activities in a movement such as that expressed in the April 13 strike, and in the strikes for academic freedom and against fascism in the University of California and the College of the City of New York. In short we proposed one united student organization.

The decision of the NSL to fight for this proposal despite the action taken at the Student LID convention is interpreted in the current issue of *Student Outlook*, to mean that we will utilize this drive for unity, as a "splitting issue." One need but compare the attitude of the NSL and Student LID delegates at the Student in Politics Conference to see that the only indication of "acrimonious debates" and mud-slinging, came from Monroe Sweetland who had the task of proving the ethical perfidy of the National Student League. The sincerity of the National Student League is to be judged in the record of its activities and the most recent indication of the fact that it is precisely the National Student League which wishes to avoid making the student movement the arena for a sectarian "struggle for control" is to be seen in our attempt to broaden the base of the anti-war movement as a consequence of the Brussels Congress.

A Specious Argument

The *Student Outlook* states: "The delegates did not wish to make the student movement the arena for a battle between the Young Communist League, the Young Peoples Socialist League and other political groups to whose interest it might be to capture the student movement."

One is tempted to ask why the Rutgers—N.J.C. chapter of the NSL which contains members of the Young Peoples Socialist League, the Young Communist League and unaffiliated students, has not become an arena for such a struggle, but has shown on the contrary, the similarity of the issues facing students of different beliefs, and the possibility for common struggle on this basis. The communists in the National Student League have made clear their position. They have established their own Young Communist League organizations on the campus, and they do not seek to control a mass student organization, but have instructed their members to work for the building of a militant

student organization, uniting the NSL and LID members, and affiliated to no political party. The communists are evidently ready to allow the students to judge the validity of their program on the basis of their struggle on the immediate demands of the students, and for unity in the ranks of the students.

It is very significant that all the previous arguments of the Student LID leadership that the union question and political issues will not permit amalgamation, have been discarded in the statement of the LID convention on amalgamation, and in the article contained in *Student Outlook*. Evidently, the support given by the National Student League to workers in unions of the American Federation of Labor (California Longshoremen, textile workers) has shown that while a student movement need not accept the fascist principles of A. F. of L. leaders such as Matthew Woll, and the sell-out policies followed by Gorman and Reeve in the textile strike, it can and must support the workers in the American Federation of Labor in the struggles they are conducting.

Having hitch-hiked in zero weather some 1400 miles, the delegate from the University of Syracuse reported on the harmonious co-operation of NSL and LID members in one organization on the campus, the Social Problems Club. Although the New York City delegation comprised a very small proportion of the delegates, their report on the formation of functioning chapters of the NSL in 28 of the city's colleges, and 40 of its high schools, met with a great deal of enthusiasm. While the number of college chapters increased by 26 during the past year and the number of high school chapters, by an equal amount, the total membership increased 40 percent.

Delegates from the University of Wisconsin chapter which increased its membership manifold during the past year, complained of the lack of anything in the NSL program pertaining to the agricultural students, and a decision was adopted to include such material in the program. Reporting on the fight against Jim-Crowing and discrimination against Negro students at the University of Michigan, and the campaign against the dropping of Willis Ward, Negro football star in the game with Georgia Tech, the representatives from the U. of Michigan made every delegate at the convention, conscious of the fact that discrimination must be fought on every campus in the country. Speaking for the chapter at the Medi-

cal School of Washington University, the St. Louis delegate showed that students in the professional schools can be organized into the NSL, and he pointed out the importance of working in the classrooms and laboratories, to recruit students into the NSL. Most NSLers at the Med. School were recruited while cutting up cadavers.

As the most important immediate task facing the students of the United States, a detailed discussion was held on the preparation of the April 5th strike against war and fascism. Delegates were conscious of the need for removing every possible obstacle in the way of setting up the widest possible united front for the strike, by calling strike conferences in the schools, and supporting the united movement to be initiated by the Brussels Congress. At the time of the convention, Serril Gerber, organizer of the National Student League in California, was with the American student delegation, which the NSL had aided in sending to the World Student Congress in Brussels. The NSL convention decided to utilize that world congress for the building of a broad united movement against war in alliance with the students of other countries. We realized the need for permanence in the anti-war fight,

and for utilizing the April 5th strike in order to build a strong united front in support of the Brussels program.

After the return of the Brussels delegates, and their enthusiastic determination to carry out the decisions of the congress, we propose to the delegation, the calling of a national congress of students which will set up the united student front in this country. The probable date of such a congress would be during the Easter vacations.

The inability of municipal and state governments to balance their budgets, and the limitation on FERA jobs, brought the need for a widespread drive against retrenchment, to all the delegates at the NSL convention. Chapters were called upon to emulate the example of the NSL, M.I.T., and Brooklyn College, in setting up Associations of FERA employees. The demand for extending FERA jobs to all students in need, and for raising the minimum wages, must be raised in all colleges. High school students from Chicago, Los Angeles, New York, St. Louis, and Washington, explained that the demands for high school students must center about direct relief for those in need. The NSL is making every effort to build the student movement in the high schools and

to spread the April 5th strike to the secondary schools of the nation. Every NSL chapter is responsible for the organization of chapters in the local high school, and for spreading the strike against war to those schools. The closing of almost the entire public school system in the state of Alabama, and the drastic cuts in expenditures for public education, makes the work among high school students and the fight against retrenchment generally, of primary importance for the National Student League.

In deciding on the campaigns against retrenchment, against war and fascism, against Negro discrimination, for the strike on April 5th, and a national student congress against war, the convention of the National Student League drove home the need of convincing every individual member of the Student LID and every chapter of the Student LID, of the necessity of unifying the militant student movement. The most effective guarantee that our fight for unity will succeed, is the building of the organization, which is striving for unity. Our campaign for 2500 new NSL members by the middle of April is an easy goal to achieve if the shoulder of every NSL member is put to the wheel.

LIBRO E MOSCHETTO

WILLIAM LEONARD
SIDNEY ALEXANDER

THE history of Fascist education in Italy has taken place in a twelve-year unsuccessful attempt to solve the contradictions in capitalist economy. Unemployment, mass starvation, wage-cuts of tremendous proportions, and ever-increasing war preparations have formed the background for academic repression of the severest kind and for the conversion of the Italian educational system into one huge myth-making unit whose ideal product is summed up best in the words of Mussolini: *Libro e Moschetto*; "A Book and a Rifle: A Perfect Fascist!"

The Fascist Drive

The first overt encroachment upon academic freedom in Italy came on December 24, 1925, in the "law on the dismissal of State Employees," which provided that the government might dismiss state employees, including professors, "who place themselves in a position which is incompatible with the general political tendencies of the govern-

ment, by manifestations in or outside of office." (Our emphasis.) It was at this time that Fascist students were organized into the "Fascist University Groups"—the famous GUF—which have constituted in effect an espionage system to report the wayward faculty. Leaders of the GUF are not elected, but appointed from above by Fascist officials.

By February, 1929, this process had intensified to the extent where Augusto Turati, Secretary General of the Fascist Party, could state: "I . . . assume in my quality as secretary of the party, the direct organization of the *privat docenten*, assistants, and instructors . . . with the definite intention of giving them a solid and harmonious organization, according to the principles and necessities of Fascism." Any vestigial pretense of democracy in education was completely destroyed when it was further provided, in December of that year, that vacancies in Italian universities would henceforth be filled not by the faculty, as

had been the custom, but by the Fascist government officials. Nor was this all. The Roman toga was thrown further over the universities in May of the next year, when it was ordained that presidents and deans of universities, as well as principals of primary and secondary schools, were to be members of the Fascist party of at least five years standing.

Gear by gear the machine for repression was being set up. An outstanding example of its operation had already occurred. On May 25, 1929, Benedetto Croce, the Italian philosopher, delivered a speech in the Senate in which he criticized the Lateran Agreements between Pope Pius XI and Mussolini. Immediately, Signor Cosmo, a professor at the University of Turin, and twenty-five of his students, sent Croce a letter of congratulation. The letter was intercepted by the police, and the professor, together with the students, was deported to the penal islands of the south. As late as

January, 1931, after two years, some of the students were still incarcerated on the island of *Ponza*. The incident was but one of many of the same kind.

Under the pressure of continued opposition, the Fascists were forced to serve up their *pièce de résistance*. By a Royal Decree of August 28, 1931, all university professors were compelled to sign an oath swearing "to exercise the function of teaching and to fulfill all academic duties with the purpose of forming active and valiant citizens devoted to the country and to the Fascist regime." The similarity of this oath to New York's recent Ives Bill need not be emphasized. Fear of prolonged unemployment in a country of sub-gutter living standards forced many professors, not necessarily sympathetic with the Fascist regime, to sign the oath. The salaries of high-ranking university professors seldom exceed \$1300; yet the logic of the pocketbook, meager as it was, proved more cogent than the conscience.

At the present time, it is impossible to attain professorial rank in an Italian university without first belonging to the Fascist Party, which means that the professor has sworn to "serve with all his strength, and if necessary with his blood, the cause of the Fascist revolution." The shadow of the toga is complete.

As the last vestige of self-respect has been taken from Italian teachers, so the last penny has been drained from their pockets. It was necessary to economize on the salaries of teachers in order to build up the Fascist war machine. Italy, with its social service expenditure among the lowest of any leading European country, and with 70 percent of its budget devoted to war services and debt, swung the axe again and again on the salaries of all its teachers. Royal decrees, in November 1930 and April 1934, have made reductions ranging from 18 to 24 percent of what Italian school teachers were receiving in 1930. This at a time when 56 percent of the revenue is derived from forms of taxation falling directly on the consuming public, and when the single non-transferable tax, that on capital, provides only 2½ percent of the total revenue!

From Womb to Tomb

Even to the most naïve reader of the *Emporia Gazette*, Mussolini is known as one of the foremost sword-rattlers of modern times. Not a rotogravure section is complete without a picture of *Il Duce*, riding a motorcycle, atop a white horse, or strik-

ing an agonizing, neo-Caesarian pose. This is no mere puppet show. Mussolini in this sense symbolizes the end of the capitalist era, when the armor of feudal war lords must supplant the badly-tattered dress suit of capitalist democracy. Again and again Mussolini has stated—the most recent utterance being at the end of the August war manoeuvres at Bologna—that the sole end of the Fascist State is the "creation of a nation in arms." And the most potent force for such creative work is the educational system.

Only the womb and the tomb limit the sphere in which militarism has been grafted on the educational system, in Fascist Italy. The most recent "educational" decree, that of September 18, 1934, according to the *Bulletin de Presse de l'Internationale Des Travailleurs de L'Enseignement*,

is based, in its provisions, upon the principle that, in the Fascist State, the functions of the citizen and the soldier are one. As a result, from 8 to 55 years of age every Italian is obligatorily enrolled in a military or semi-military organization; from 8 to 18 years, a period of pre-military preparation, in which the youth receives a moral and physical education which adapts him to the job of soldiering—and this as much in the schools as in the *Balilla* or *Avanguardisti*. At 18 years, no longer at 21 as hitherto, he becomes a soldier in the sense that, from this time on, he is submitted to strict military discipline. . . . At 21 he enters military barracks and puts to the proof of practice his previous training. After his period of active service the citizen soldier remains, until the age of 55, subject to constant training in the maintenance of his military effectiveness. In short, . . . from infancy to old age, in school, in the university, in practical life, and in middle age, everywhere and always obligatorily, the Italian citizen lives in a militaristic atmosphere and a war-like climate. Thus he possesses that "military conscience" which is the supreme end of *Il Duce*. (Our emphasis.)

The intellectual progress of an Italian is as follows. At the age of 8 he is formally enrolled in the *Balilla*. At 14 he passes into the *Avanguardisti*. From this he enters into the *Giovani Fascisti*, as a prelude to entrance into the Fascist Party, which takes place when he reaches 21. The *Giovani Fascisti* include the Fascist university students.

The red thread of militarism runs through the entire patch-quilt of these organizations. The *Balilla* is commanded by school teachers who are members of the militia, and the *Avanguardisti* by military officers. The *Avanguardisti* are definitely trained for military life; machine-gun instruction is a regular part of the curriculum. In the schools

proper, teachers who are members of the militia have recently been ordered to appear before their classes in full uniform. This is a more stringent application of the principle enunciated in October, 1933, when Fascist students in the universities were commanded to present themselves at the final examinations for their degrees wearing black shirts.

Pietro Learns What's What

In Fascist Italy the history of all hitherto existing society is non-existent. Preceding the March on Rome (in a Pullman car), all was Dark Ages, and the Renaissance has since begun. A law declares that "textbooks in history, geography, economics, and law, and elementary school readers must be in accordance with the historical, political, juridical, and economic requirements established since October 22, 1922." The stark simplicity of the historical process is indicated by the fact that a single *State textbook* comprises for each elementary grade all the spelling, arithmetic, history, religion, and geography to be absorbed during the year! This is part of the campaign to bring about "the spiritual formation of the new Italian."

The first continuous sentence the children learn to read is: "Let us salute the flag in Roman fashion; hail to Italy; hail to Mussolini!" In one story, a father says to his boy: "Italy is great, strong, powerful, and feared, and you, my boy—," and the child interrupts him, saying, "I am an Italian, how fortunate!"

A reading lesson for seven year olds: A child asks his father. "Tell me, daddy, did you know the soldiers who died in the war, whose names are inscribed on the monument?" "Certainly," says daddy, and tells all about them. "And who killed them?" asks the child. "Our enemies, the Austrians and the Germans." Then the text describes the boy's reactions: "The idea that he one day will be a soldier, will fight and vanquish the enemies of his country, inspires him during the entire evening."

Fascist morality, according to a fourth-grade textbook: "There are three cases in which to kill is not a sin: in the case of necessary defense against an unjust attack, in case of war proclaimed by the legitimate authorities, and in case of capital punishment also sanctioned by the legitimate authorities." In order that little Pietro may know what he is killing people for, he receives the following gem: "Every man has some possession and every one has the right

SOUTH REVISITED

MAURICE GATES

to possess in peace the much or little that is his and which is perhaps the fruit of long and prudent savings or the compensation for holy labor, or anyway, a dear inheritance from his fathers."

The divine right of Mussolini is the basis for the precept that every little Fascist must be a good soldier. A second-year text explains: "When the wise man was asked, 'What is the highest virtue of a child?' he answered, 'Obedience.' 'And the second?' 'Obedience.' 'And the third?' 'Obedience.'" And obedience to *whom* is further expatiated: "Every authority comes from God; who resists authority resists God . . . The fourth commandment, together with the names of the father and mother, also includes the heads of religious, civic, and political society, whose authority comes from God."

In the same textbook, a controversy between a boy and his sister over toy soldiers, and toy dolls is settled by the grandfather: "You, master general, must know that if the little girls did not love their dolls so dearly you would not have so many soldiers for war." "This is splendid," says the boy; "why?" And grandpa answers: "Because the soldiers are the sons of the little girls." A benediction in the text, beneath a picture of peasant women, runs: "God bless you and give you male children." How startled Darwin would be if he knew that in Fascist Italy evolution proceeds from the ape to the cannonball!

We emphasize the prevalence of jingoism in the lower grades because it might be thought that there it would be less rampant. It is obvious, however, that this jingoism is not only continued beyond the formative period of education, but is intensified in the higher branches. For example, the very *identification card* of a student at the University of Turin declares: "Do not forget that Dalmatia is Italian and that, nevertheless, it belongs to Jugoslavia!"

Inasmuch as the Italian *tabula rasa* is riddled with bullets from its very birth, it is no wonder that the Fascists have been completely barren in the literary and artistic spheres. One of the writers recently interviewed Max Ascoli, a well-known professor of political philosophy, who has resided for the past three years in the United States. When asked about the quality of Italian student publications under Mussolini, he replied that such publications have a chance to live "only if they are more fascist than

NOTHING on my recent trip South, during which I visited a number of Negro schools, impressed me quite as much, as the general awareness of the Negro students of their own problems. Negro students in these schools, not only face the problem of students in general but also problems which are peculiar to them as a group.

Discrimination, the Negro student meets, in many forms. First, the very existence of the schools is a discrimination. The restrictions placed over them by religious and philanthropic boards, together with governmental agencies, is discrimination. The denial of ROTC units is discrimination, as is also the denial of Phi Beta Kappa. Unequal appropriations and denial of entrance into public, tax-supported schools, falls under the same heading. The cases are myriad. It is indeed, a large issue, not separable from the general struggle of the entire Negro people against oppression and for their liberation. All these things reflect the thoroughly conscious attempt of the dominant class in our society to keep inferior, to downgrade an entire people.

the Fascists." And indeed, in a country of two million unemployed, and where, in order to be eligible for the meager relief benefits, one must have paid in at least 48 weekly contributions during the two years preceding unemployment, it is obvious that students, who have had no opportunity to contribute, will of necessity be "more fascist than the Fascists." For only in this way can they secure the recommendation of the officials of the GUF and thus attain petty niches in the governmental bureaucracy. Like Fascist Germany, Fascist Italy fears the growth of an "intellectual proletariat." It seeks to evade this menace by absorbing students into the governmental services. Of the last batch of provincial secretaries appointed, for example, about 20 percent were chosen from among the white-haired boys of the GUF.

Here is a pretty example of capitalist contradiction. For in order to defray the expenses of the ever-growing, top-heavy bureaucracy, the Fascists are forced to dip into the shallow coffers of the Italian peasants and farmers. What limited social legis-

When Negro students fight against any manifestation of these on their campus or in their immediate vicinity, they are conducting activity for the liberation of the Negro people and against their general oppression. When Ishmael Flory led students in a demonstration against the lynchers of Cordie Cheek, and when he led in a protest against the appearance of Fisk students in a segregated theatre, he was leading in a fight against the entire system. This fact was more significantly grasped by Dr. Thomas Elsa Jones, president of Fisk, than by George Streater, in his article in *Student Outlook*, "Can the South Be Organized?" When students at Virginia State College struck against the numerous restrictions placed upon them, whether they knew it or not, they were striking against the will of the Southern ruling class, as expressed by their president, Dr. Gandy. When Howard University students protested against the omission of lynching at the Crime Conference, they protested against the Federal government's tacit implication that lynching was not to be considered a crime.

lation funds exist, as well as the postal savings deposits, have become a "bank" from which the government must "borrow" in order to pay the small salaries of the growing petty bureaucracy. Thus starving Pietro is robbed in order to pay emaciated Paolo!

This, then, is Fascist education: a hodgepodge of rank militarism and mis-history—barracks for classrooms and the syllogisms of bayonets. In a very profound sense the misguided and—thanks to Mussolini—culturally illiterate youth of Italy have become our instructors. Dr. Ryan of the New York City Board of Education, and other prominent "educators" have lately openly expressed the opinion that the United States would do well to adopt some of the features of Fascist Italian education. The reason is not hard to find: American education is a reed in a similar economic wind. ROTC, and CCC camps are seeds whose maturity we can study in the *Balilla*, the *Avanguardisti*, and the *Giovani Fascisti*. Here are the developed forms, the American counterparts of which militant students in the United States must attack at their very roots.

It would be impossible for the Negro student in the South to fight against discrimination in any form, or against the denial of any democratic privilege and not fight at the same time against the capitalist government, against the will of the Southern lyncher.

If war should break out in the near future, Negro students will be called upon to furnish man power as they were in the last. If fascism should express itself more directly in America, Negro students being a part of an oppressed people, would face consequences, whose magnitude is difficult to gauge today. On every campus that I visited, the students as a majority, were aware of this. Perhaps they did not know what should be done, but with war and fascism, they realized they would be among the victimized.

Retrenchment is not something new to them. Negro schools have always had it to contend with. When the general effects of retrenchment were felt by students everywhere, the Negro student began to feel it in a more intensified form than previously. By this, allies in this struggle were created.

The petition presented by white students (including the NSL chapter) of the University of Virginia, together with students from Virginia Union University, to the State authorities, demanding equal appropriations for Negro and white schools, shows the trend the fight against retrenchment is taking.

It is precisely this, which makes the article by George Streater, in the current *Student Outlook*, official organ of the Student League for Industrial Democracy, completely incomprehensible.

When he says, "No amount of romancing by Negro radicals . . . can change the essentially *opportunistic character* of the various revolts of Negro students down to the present date," frankly I was baffled, until I came to his explanation of what he meant by *opportunistic*. He says, "Essentially . . . student revolt in the South is directed against leveling forces. The white student wants to escape the poor white (workers—M.G.) of failures. The Negro students want to escape the masses of black oppressed." Yes, I agree, the Negro student does want to escape the oppression of black people, and that brings forth the question, by what means? It is here that the conscious revolutionary must play his role, by pointing out that this can only be done through

an alliance of himself with black and white workers.

The ridiculous adherence to the Socialist Party-Student LID practice of abandoning immediate issues and fighting for abstract theorems drives Streater into the position of opposing the demand for Phi Beta Kappa in Negro colleges.

"While Phi Beta Kappa increasingly becomes an instrument of snobbery, despite its cherished tradition . . . a student organization (NSL—M.G.) makes its bid for interest at Howard University by agitating for Phi Beta Kappa at Negro Colleges." He then asks what right has a student organization devoted to the overthrow of the present system to enroll adherents under false pretenses? "It should," he says, "be remembered that a baby weaned on a sugar teat still sucks his thumb."

The reference escapes me, but isn't it a bit shallow to pose the question in this fashion? Phi Beta Kappa is supposed to be an organization that recognizes scholarship, therefore it seems perfectly logical, to demand that they recognize scholarship of Negro students also; not to recognize scholarship among Negroes belies the policy of the organization and constitutes discrimination. To say that Phi Beta Kappa would make Negro students snobs is beside the point entirely. To fight for food for the unemployed, is I suppose, to make them plutocrats. The City College Phi Beta Kappa chapter has joined the fight to reinstate the expelled students. The Phi Beta Kappa chapter at Amherst is entering the fight against the organization's discrimination against Negroes. Phi Beta Kappa is what you make it. Phi Beta Kappa can be used in the interests of students.

Tomorrow & Tomorrow

This whole misunderstanding, emanates from a basic cause. That is, a gross misunderstanding, or distortion, if you please, by the Socialist Party and reflected in the Student LID. It is again the stated policy of the SLID to scorn immediate demands of students in their striving for their ultimate perspective. Only in this case it leads to disastrous conclusions.

In their program the Student LID after reciting the various forms of discrimination against minority peoples say, "Discrimination against any group is intolerable." Here they are humanitarians. It is wrong and those who cause it are naughty. Their sensi-

bilities are shocked by discrimination. Such an approach is a little less than nauseating. Nowhere is there even an attempt at analysis of the Negro question. "*The Negro himself will have to work out his own salvation.*" His interests lie with the great mass of labor everywhere, with the exploited in every land. Organized, he can obtain his freedom, a decent manner of living, and equality with all men. The Student LID *participates as far as it can in his fight for status.*" (Italics mine—M.G.)

Nowhere is there any reference to the historical necessity of *joint struggle*. By their use of *participate* and *status*, they demonstrate that they conceive of the fight for Negro rights not as part of the general student struggle but as something apart. Instead we have the astonishing admission in the Student LID program: "The Negro will have to work out his own salvation." What do they mean, organized he can obtain his freedom? He is organized now. Into churches, fraternal societies and the like, is this what they mean? Or do they possibly mean Jim-Crow locals? Then the condescending attitude that appears when they say that the SLID "participates" (note the word) in the Negro's fight for "status." How gracious of them!

By way of contrast, we refer Mr. Streater to the National Student League program. Two fundamental schools of thought are here opposed. The National Student League, which says to Negro students: Organize on your immediate demands. Ally yourself in this struggle with the white students, who are similarly struggling against various evils, and with the working class, which alone can provide a permanent solution to your problems. We proclaim this a common fight. We advance this in contradistinction to the SLID which would neglect immediate demands and fix your gaze on a removed tomorrow.

The National Student League's program is not the program of a political party; it does not take a stand on the question of self-determination of the Black Belt as Streater's article implies. (See NSL program.) The National Student League bases its program upon immediate student demands. We are not humanitarians. We are not a group of pseudo-left revolutionaries. Negro students, given the choice of the NSL program of concrete and immediate action, and the SLID program of vague "status," vague "participation," and vague humanitarian slogans will inevitably choose the former.

EXPULSIONS AT CALIFORNIA

CELESTE STRACK

AT the University of California at Los Angeles there have occurred recently a series of administrative acts which, for their impressiveness as omens of a rising tendency, match the latest expulsions at City College. Taken together they show the trend in American college administration toward increased ruthlessness and severity in the suppression of student liberties when these encroach upon the settled order of things. Just as industrial strikes which promise to be successful are now broken by pitting troops against the strikers, and just as the prophetic Mr. Hearst has lately promised to bless an American fascist movement whenever one becomes necessary to check Communism, so do the Robinsons of New York and the Moores of Los Angeles defer to the swastika when the leftward swing of their students begins to discomfit the paymasters in control of their universities.

Like City College, UCLA has on the one hand a record of administrative reaction and, on the other, the reputation of incubating radical students. For ten years the major issue has been the question of ROTC and the students' right of free speech in combating it. Each time the students attempted to bring liberal speakers to the college, the Better America Federation, the American Legion, the Daughters of the American Revolution and other reactionary groups came to Provost Moore's office with sheaves of protests and threats to bring pressure on the legislature, so that appropriations (of the people's money!) would be reduced.

These skirmishes helped the student body to get a clearer idea of just what it wanted in the way of student rights. The influence of the National Student League and of the newly elected liberal Student Council were beginning to make an impression. As a result, within the first five weeks of school, four clashes between the students and the administration occurred.

The first dissension took place over the proposal of the Navy League that UCLA sponsor an essay contest among southern California schools on the subject of "Our Navy." With the administration's acceptance, the Student Council pointed out to

Dr. Moore that the motives of the League were somewhat odorous, since the organization is largely composed of munitions manufacturers. Dr. Moore professed to be "convinced," and the offer was refused.

It had been customary, on Armistice Day, for UCLA and the American Legion to divide the proceeds of the football game. The Council decided to terminate this custom, voting to sever all cooperation with the Legion because of its function as an outlet for militarist propaganda. The Council further suggested that a pacifist speaker be sent to the Legion instead of the usual ROTC parade detachment. The Legion did not appreciate these suggestions.

Added to these incidents was the decision of the Council to investigate the finances of the Student Co-op. Profits, which were supposed to revert to the student body, were shown the books. The administration seemed unusually anxious to delay the investigation.

Super-Patriots and the NSL

By the time the question of a Student Forum had appeared, the administration had already been besieged by scores of super-patriots demanding that everybody within a rope's-throw of the campus be prevented from engaging further in "unpatriotic" and "subversive" activities. Meanwhile, the recent successes of the students had served to bolster confidence in their ability to obtain common objectives. The National Student League was consolidating ranks for the struggle which threatened.

The breach between the students and the administration was widened perceptibly when the Council voted in favor of a student-controlled Forum, only to have Dr. Moore instruct John Burnside, student body president, to prohibit all further discussion of the Forum question. (That day a group of perhaps fifteen students who had gathered between classes on the quad to discuss the Forum, were amazed to see Dr. Moore scurry down the library steps publicly accusing them of holding a "communistic" meeting.) On Wednesday, October 24, the Council met and in disregard of Dr. Moore's orders discussed various plans for the

Forum, postponing definite action until after November 6.

The next day a group of students met to consider support of the Forum. It was tentatively agreed to use the right of initiative provided in the student body constitution, which guaranteed the right to petition the Council to submit the Forum question to a student-wide vote. At this meeting, an "unofficial representative" of Dr. Moore threatened that if we attempted to use our right of initiative in connection with the forum, our constitutional rights would be taken from us! Not satisfied with this openly fascist pronouncement, he took further steps. When an enlarged group met on Friday to make a definite decision on the petitions, two policemen were present. They said they were there to break up a "communistic" meeting, and, if petitions appeared, would arrest everyone in the room. Several of us were quite aware that we were under constant police surveillance. The atmosphere was tense indeed that Friday afternoon.

Monday at noon, five of us were suspended without warning or hearing. Thomas Lambert, chairman of the men's board, Mendel Leiber, member of the Council, Sid Zagri, head of the forensics board, and John Burnside, student body president, were suspended on the charge of "using their student body offices to help the National Student League destroy the University." I was charged with repeated violations (unnamed) of the University regulations, including the holding of "communistic" meetings on the campus.

Within an hour, forty students had formed the General Student Committee for Reinstatement. Action—that was the demand. By midnight we had decided upon a mass demonstration for tomorrow at 10 A.M. Organization: defense committees, speakers, steering committee, building committees for publicity. I remember somebody saying, "Well, if fifty show up we'll see it through." As we worked we forgot our hesitance. Everything set; must have been about 3 A.M. Then: "Say, if we pass the word to meet on the Library steps, the cops will be there first; our speaker won't have a chance."

"I've got it. Call the meeting for the library, and then at the last minute switch it across the quad in front of Royce Hall. Right!"

Ten o'clock found the campus cops on the Library steps, carrying clubs. 10:02 found, not fifty, but hundreds of students assembled across the quad in front of Royce Hall.

"This is to be an orderly meeting! We are here to discuss the suspensions and demand free speech and a public hearing." It was our first speaker, the NSL organizer. The cops had come and had broken through a weak spot in the defense squad. The speaker was knocked down. Another took his place; then another. Slowly, the cops were pressed out of the center. One of them got nasty. A flying tackle by one of the students landed him in the bushes.

The meeting continued. Football players, summoned by an administrative official, elbowed through the crowd, trying to scatter the meeting. Then sirens drowned the speaker's voice. The riot squad was here, fifty of them. It was the first time most of the 3,000 students had come face to face with the "law" under such circumstances. They were bewildered.

Hold That Line

The meeting was over as far as speakers were concerned, but the students remained. The crowd broke up into hundreds of small discussion groups. Every member of the Reinstatement Committee was the center of a group. The cops tried to wedge into the center, but the students only crowded in closer. Finally, the groups dispersed of their own accord. We had protested, and we had learned.

In the days that followed, the fight assumed many appearances. Dr. Moore hurled vituperative charges against the students, and against the National Student League in particular. The familiar red herring reached a point where it walked by itself, like Hamlet's ghost. The newspapers carried daily scareheads: "Ten More UCLA Suspensions Rumored." The Student Committee for Reinstatement met daily and issued bulletins on the latest developments.

At Los Angeles Junior College, 675 students signed a petition demanding immediate reinstatement and recognition of student rights. Berkeley staged a protest meeting. Stanford protested editorially. Outside organizations began to respond. Nation-

wide protests swamped the Provost's office.

Meanwhile, a vigilantes group had been organized. The athletes were at the bottom of it, of course: it has become an almost predictable development in college struggles that the athletes will be on the side of administration and reaction. Naming themselves the "UCLA Americans," two hundred swore an oath pledging themselves to "drive radicalism off the campus, by force if necessary." Now, Dr. Moore assured the press that the great mass of students (200) were supporting him, whereas only a small subversive element (3,000) sympathized with the radicals.

Once again, the reactionary forces which had lobbied for the suspensions renewed pressure upon Dr. Moore. The American Legion, the D.A.R., the Better America Federation, all gave the campus the appearance of a convention hall as they formed lines two miles long outside his office to congratulate him on his prompt action in saving the school from destruction. Dr. Moore preened, and issued daily statements to the press, of which the following is an especially pearly bit:

"The stage was set to deliver the University to the untender mercies of the National Student League."

Look behind the apparent actors in the UCLA playlet. That shining young David, Dr. Moore, those double-barreled Better America Federationists, and the star-spangled Daughters, are mannikins strung to the hands that direct all reactionary activities in California: the large shipping trusts, the banking interests, the industrial interests of the State.

On the Board of Regents itself the following groups are represented:

Southern California Edison Company, which helps to finance the Better America Federation, a radical-baiting organization;

Security-First National Bank, whose chairman was on the Morgan preferred list; Anglo-California National Bank, controlled by Standard Oil of California;

Crown Zellerbach Paper and Power Company, whose holdings extend from California to Canada, New York and Honolulu;

Pacific Steamship Company, noted for its brutal role in the West Coast maritime strike;

Southern Pacific Railroad, with two and a half billions of assets;

Metropolitan Life Insurance, the second largest corporation in America;

Pacific Gas and Electric; and The Bank of America.

As the implications of the suspensions became more apparent, the fight spread beyond the boundaries of the campus. The NSL went on the air—two radio broadcasts of fifteen minutes each. Liberal organizations, discussion groups, churches and clubs added their resolutions to the pile which was rapidly overshadowing the reactionary stack. Workers became aware of a striking resemblance between the treatment of the students and the treatment which they themselves have received at the hands of the large industrialists and their henchmen. Only a few months ago we had sent truckloads of students to picket at San Pedro. Now one of us would tear into the room yelling: "The carpenter's local and the rubber workers are back of us!" Trade union papers carried the story; we began to feel that we were really a part of an enormous fighting front that reached far beyond campus boundaries.

In the third week of the suspensions, our first victory came. The four boys were unconditionally reinstated and restored to their student-body offices. Later in December, I, too, was permitted to return to school on a similar basis, and the emphasis now swung to the struggle for a student-controlled open forum.

The semester has just closed, and the local National Student League is preparing to open the new term with an increased drive for a student-controlled open forum.

The Fight Begins

Just as we achieved the reinstatement of the suspended students by mass action, so must we utilize the same tactics in this struggle for a student-controlled Open Forum. Our victories in the past do not necessarily betoken an end of administrative terrorism at UCLA. Dr. Moore's capitulations in the matter of the suspensions simply mean that in that instance he was not prepared to back up his actions; it does not mean that similar actions will not occur again, and with greater severity. Student vigilantism is by no means laid under; rather, its possibilities are just beginning to be realized by administrators of the Moore and Robinson type. The possibilities of an organized student fascist drive portends a danger which must be countered with organization among militant and class-conscious students, stronger, more thoroughgoing, better aware of what they are doing than ever before.

FENCE-SITTERS AT BOSTON

JEAN FORD

THE occasion was the NSFA Congress. The time, the Christmas holidays. And the Boston Parker House presented a festive background for the fine delegation of Harris tweeds, briar pipes and fraternity pins assembled from approximately 200 American educational institutions—the cream of the American Campus, come together in an atmosphere of culture to weigh the problems of youth.

To those of us who recall the last NSFA Congress at Washington, with its accompanying overtones of Jim-Crowism and panicky distrust of radicalism, reports of the Boston gathering perhaps, on the surface, give the impression that the NSFA is edging gradually along the liberal pathway. We read how the delegates lifted their voices in condemnation of Mr. Hearst, the Ives Bill, and the American Legion. How they stated that a main function of government is to insure security for its citizens; that present NRA labor arbitration boards afford an unfair balance of power to capital; that this must be changed; that unemployment insurance and the 30-hour-week are necessary and should be instituted into our social system.

This sounds splendid. It undoubtedly warmed many liberal hearts. But in the ears of some few, suspicious delegates at the congress the lofty sentiments rang with strange hollowness. And that this attitude of skepticism was justifiable can be best explained by an account of the complete deserting from the colors which took place on the floor of the congress when the committee on Academic Freedom presented its report. Throughout the congress, the committee had been meeting to formulate resolutions upon cases of infringement of academic freedom. At one of the final plenary sessions it presented its report.

The first resolution—a broad declaration in which the Federation was to state that it believed in the Constitution and its “guarantees of free thought and speech”—was overwhelmingly passed.

The next resolution—for the immediate and unconditional reinstatement of all 37 disciplined C.C.N.Y. students—met a peculiar fate. From the audience there rose to his feet a young stalwart who pointed

out to the gathering that action on the C.C.N.Y. case might lead to “international complications.” It was upon the weight of this logic that the motion for reinstatement went down to defeat.

Thereafter, the committee presented its third resolution—for the immediate and unconditional reinstatement of the Louisiana State University students who were expelled for protesting Huey Long’s censorship of their college paper. Immediately the resolution was denounced with violence by the Louisiana delegates (*five strong*), who demanded that the NSFA take no action upon the case, since “it is now being handled to the satisfaction of the students of L.S.U.”

Handled to their satisfaction? With the students still ousted, the *Reveille* censored, and Huey Long on the L.S.U. Board of Trustees?

The Logic of Do-Nothing

In spite of the opposition, in spite of all facts, logic and consistency, the congress voted down the reinstatement of the students. Since the previous splendid declaration about “constitutional guarantees” and “free thought” had become meaningless and absurd, one delegate moved to have the C.C.N.Y. and L.S.U. cases stricken from the record. “We obviously do not have the courage of our convictions. We will become a laughing stock to anyone reading about what has happened here,” he told the congress. This motion, ironically enough, was passed by a huge majority.

And what about academic freedom?

To many of the liberally minded delegates, these open violations of the previous stand were viewed as very unfortunate. Many of the students were disappointed. But they could still point with reassurance to the other resolutions which had been passed. Look, they said, we condemn the Ives Bill, we demand security for everyone, unemployment insurance, the thirty-hour-week. That’s really a lot.

But to some few, pessimistic delegates, the glib reversal of an unequivocal stand upon academic freedom signified much more than an unfortunate mistake or lack of consistency on the part of the NSFA dele-

gates. It signified a deep and underlying weakness in the organization itself.

Here was a group of fine, up-standing young people who had assumed a liberal attitude upon issues which fundamentally they did not understand, and from which they could be swayed with a minimum of logic by anyone who had an axe to grind.

Elections for the new year’s officers were at hand, and the congress was fairly teaming with campaigning and intercollegiate deal-making. When smoke of battle cleared away, the two main candidates appeared to be Charles Wise of West Virginia University, and Thomas Neblette, graduate of a Mississippi college, but very closely connected with the Louisiana State University. So closely, in fact, that he was considered as an L.S.U. delegate, and, during the melee which took place over the Louisiana State-Huey Long censorship resolution, he had vigorously championed the cause of the L.S.U. delegates.

It was bad enough that Neblette was nominated. He had shown himself to be in favor of a stand which certainly should not be that of the president of a courageous and progressive student organization. The liberals at the congress, realizing this, threw their support behind Wise.

But they were met with the news that an anti-Semitic whispering campaign, begun by Wise’s opponents, had already seriously damaged his chances. It was not very surprising that Neblette was elected.

In such a manner, employing such tactics, did the NSFA assembly elect their next president.

And what about the future policy of the NSFA? What will the gentleman from Louisiana attempt to do with the organization? Has the NSFA fascist tendencies, or does it offer a good field for left wing activity? How many of the “mistakes” on the part of the delegates were due to ignorance, how many to reactionary conviction?

Judging from the results of the Boston conference, it would seem that there are certain very definite dangers in the NSFA. These dangers must be watched—fought against—both within the organization and from the outside by all who work toward revolutionary student unity.

BOOK REVIEWS

MARCHING FROM GEORGIA

The winds are certain in November. They
have browsed
Everywhere in the grasses, cropped the trees
bare,
Licked the gutter ponds to ice . . .

I don't want New York
Or Buffalo or Montreal or . . .

Now then is time
To pace the overhead flocks southward to
the palms I've never seen.

I'm no serf whose footsteps can be bought
and sold. I'll wander
Anywhere free, in God's country, watching
autumn retreat to full summer
South and deeper south

But stay away from Georgia
Where spring comes with lynchings blooming
on every tree.

Stay away or drag thirty pounds of iron on
the county roads.

The country's free, and if you want to hitch
from winter

To the southern nights . . . odor heavy . . .
and the palms you've never seen,

Pack up nad go,

But stay away from Georgia
Or Alabama . . . or the Carolinas . . .
or Florida . . . or . . .

No, fellows, if ever we're to live our south-
ern summer

We'd better travel together, shoulder to
swinging shoulder, lots of us.

Stop off at Washington and grab the keys,
because on our way

We have hundreds, and hundreds of locks
to click open.

—DAVID SCHREIBER.

Hobos & Heroes

You Can't Sleep Here, by Edward Newhouse,
Macaulay Co.

Only one of the many Hoovervilles that sprang
up over New York City at the beginning of the
depression is left. According to a newspaper re-
port, these men are one happy family, living
joyfully together, thankful for their tin shacks
and the Roosevelt bounty that permits such lux-
ury. But *You Can't Sleep Here* gives you an en-
tirely different picture. There is none of this
God-bless-our-happy-home smugness in New-
house's book. You see the lives of these men full
of bitterness and frustrated hate. You see the
madness of the small shopkeeper, hunted and
persecuted by the fear that something yet re-
mains to be taken from him. You understand the
pride of the musician forced to beg pennies in
alleys.

Edward Newhouse writes with a terseness
and a clarity that belie the first novel. Simply
and unassumingly he tells the story of Gene
Marsay, ex-newspaper man, out of a job, and
sick of sponging on his friends. He sleeps in
parks and railroad waiting rooms, the vice
squad or station guards always at his heels, al-
ways there to tell him, "Get a move on . . ." He
finally becomes a squatter in a shanty town
and lives there till evicted with the rest of the
colony by the real estate interests of the neigh-
borhood. Gene adjusts himself. When there's
nothing to eat he begs rotten vegetables from a
good natured A & P clerk. On warm summer
nights his thoughts drift to his girl. He goes on
the picket line with Chuck Andor, the red. The

revolutionary movement begins to assume a per-
sonal significance for him. He organizes a strike
against the eviction, punches a police lieutenant
and lands up in a hospital. The book ends
abruptly.

The primary fault of the novel is its ineffec-
tual attempt at open-mindedness. Newhouse
doesn't want to point a moral. He doesn't want
to say, "Look! two and two equal four! . . ." so
he cuts the book short, leaving the reader be-
wildered and dissatisfied. Neither intensity nor
incisiveness is gained thereby. Because of this
faulty objectivity, Marsay, the red, never as-
sumes the aspects of a clear-cut personality.
There remains too much newspaper Bohemian-
ism about him. Marsay's girl, the Chesterfield
ad, who wanders beautifully but pitifully dumb
through the book, never comes off. Newhouse un-
doubtedly meant her to be sweet, loving and
charming. But she isn't. She is just a stupid girl,
unconscious of what is going on around her. All
the other characters are indicated rather fully
canvassed. Only the residents of shanty town are
successfully pictured. Here are real people with
blood in their veins, and occasional dirt behind
their ears. Gene's friends, the city editor and
his wife, while well groomed, never attain any
reality. They just remain wise-cracking shadows
without substance or emotion.

Nevertheless, making allowance for a first
novel, Newhouse has really given us a good
book. The occasional self-conscious phrase, the
schematic structure of the story, and the sketchi-
ness of his characterizations are difficulties which
he can surely overcome in time.

—DENA GLANZ.

Jingo Kindergardens

*A Study of the Stated Aims and Purposes of the
Departments of Military Science and Tac-
tics and Physical Education in the Land-
Grant Colleges of the United States*, by
Willard L. Nash, Ph.D.

On Tuesday, December 4, 1934, the newspa-
pers reported the decision of the United States
Supreme Court in the case of two University of
California students who refused to submit to
military training on religious and conscientious
grounds. The decision frankly discarded the
soothing verbiage of college catalogues where
military training is described as "a course in
physical training" whose purpose is "to foster all
that makes for right living, good citizenship and
high efficiency."

Upholding the decision of the lower court that
the school authorities were justified in expelling
the two students, the court bluntly said: "And
yet he may be compelled, by force, if need be,
against his will and without regard to his per-
sonal wishes or his pecuniary interests, or even
his religious or political convictions, to take his
place in the ranks of the army of his country
and risk the chances of being shot down in its
defense."

In the light of this interpretation of the mean-
ing of military training in the schools, Dr. Nash's
study assumes greater significance. Beginning
with the historical background of the problem,
he investigates the aims of military training and
physical education in the schools, and the proced-
ures employed by these departments in achiev-
ing their aims. Among others, the three primary
objectives of the military science department are
to give a course in physical training, to develop
national leadership, and to give citizenship
training.

In regard to the first objective of the ROTC,
we will quote Dudley A. Sargent, M.D., director
of the Hemenway Gymnasium at Harvard Uni-
versity: "After taking the most favorable view
possible of military drill as a physical exercise,
we are led to conclude that its constrained posi-
tions and closely localized movements do not
afford the essential requisites for developing the
muscles and improving the respiration and circula-
tion, and thereby improving the general health
and condition of the system. We must further
conclude that in the case of any malformation,
local weakness, or constitutional debility, the
drill tends, by its strain upon the nerves and
prolonged tension on the muscles, to increase the
defects rather than relieve them."

This, you must understand, is the most favor-
able view possible. Dr. Nash hammers away at
this point with authoritative facts and figures,
and we begin to divine that West Point has a
rigorous course in physical education in order to
counteract the evil effects of the military drill.

The second purpose, to develop leadership in
a national emergency, Dr. Nash finds very
vaguely defined by the War Department. The
only probable conclusion he can draw is that
by this is meant nothing but "a habit of obedi-
ence to superiors and the demand of strict
obedience from inferiors."

On the third claim of military training, Dr.
Nash quotes from the ROTC manual, infantry
and various other publications:

"The mission of the ROTC is to awaken in the students an appreciation of the obligations of citizenship, to prepare him to discharge his duties as a citizen . . ."

Then the author quotes from the War Department's *Manual on Citizenship*, used in the classes of the training corps, and shows how the War Department interprets the central ideal of this "citizenship":

"Democracy; A government of the masses. Authority derived from mass meetings or any other form of 'direct' expression, results in mobocracy. Attitude toward property is communistic. . . . Attitude toward law is that the will of the majority shall regulate whether it be based upon deliberation or governed by passion, prejudice and impulse, without regard to consequences. Results in demagogism, license, agitation, discontent and anarchy . . ."

Dr. Nash limits himself to the "stated aims" of the military science departments. In his work he proves that these stated aims are not attained and that there is little effort made to attain them. What then is the unstated aim of the ROTC on the Campus? Dr. Nash leaves the question unanswered.

A study of the militant student movement in the United States, however, answers what Dr. Nash does not. The purpose of the ROTC is to create a jingo-military spirit among American students so that upon graduation the happy graduate will march away from his Alma Mater in the Mussolini style, a degree in one hand and a rifle in the other.

—JOSEPH GREENSPAN.

Are Immortals Blind?

Wine from These Grapes, by Edna St. Vincent Millay, Harper's, N. Y.

Not Mine to Finish, by Genevieve Taggard, Harper's, N. Y.

The publication of a new book of poems by Edna St. Vincent Millay is an event, if not so momentous as the return of Paley's comet, at any rate to be spoken of with bated breath. She is, you see, an immortal, and professors of English Literature and reviewers for the N. Y. Times have already chiseled out her niche in the marbled walls of the established Parnassus. The dangers of this adulation, I think Miss Millay herself would readily admit. The critical function is suspended and the established responses occur in high gear. A week after publication, the poetess recites in Town Hall, and women's clubs all over the country proceed to swoon.

Now this reviewer is not attempting to devalue Miss Millay. She is an accomplished poet—within her limitations, a great one. But admitting the smoothness of her cadences, the precision of her phrase, the polished finish and nicety of her imagery—her limitations should be stated. She is unfortunately a Professional Poet, and Professional Poets write not because of an inner emotional need but because of sheer inertia. They have their public and their posthumous reputation to think of, and so the great bloodsoaked themes of the day go begging at their door.

Not that Miss Millay hasn't grown. Her *Apostrophe to Man* (on reflecting that the world is ready to go to war again) cries out bitterly:

Detestable race, continue to expurge yourself, die out . . . which is a far cry indeed from the sapling lyricism of the Renaissance. But the ultimate mood is one of despair nicely turned; so nicely turned, in fact, that the despair becomes a little precious and quite suspicious. Her meticulous technique acts as a fender between her native response to the emotions upsurging from a class-racked society, and the spontaneous expression of that response. Thus she can write two sonnets in memory of Sacco and Vanzetti which are abstract encomiums to abstract justice in terms of an anaemic Elizabethanism:

As men have loved their lovers in times past
And swung their wit, their virtue, and their grace,

So have we loved sweet justice to the last,
That now lies here in an unseemly place. . . . The obvious insincerity here results from the flaw of inappropriate language. One cannot dress up the nakedness of class justice in silken Platonic breeches.

The sequence of eighteen sonnets — *Epitaph for the Race of Man*—is undoubtedly Millay's high water-mark. The last sonnet commencing:

Here lies, and none to mourn him but the sea,

That falls incessant on the empty shore,
Most various Man, cut down to spring no more;

Before his prime, even in his infancy

Cut down. . . .

reveals the poet at her masterful best in that form in which she has no contemporary rivals. Bitter she is, and yet mature, the cruel point of her disillusionment velveted with a woman's pity. . . . "Strive not to speak, poor scattered mouth, I know." But her knowledge does not cut deep enough. The struggle of worker against exploiter is resolved to a comprehensive struggle of Man against Man. And so she flees:

. . . cleave henceforth to Beauty;
expect no more from man.

But the very beauty of man's striving for a new social order escapes her, and Beauty is but an exquisite etching of a fawn asleep upon the moss. Those who cry for the Universal in art will maintain that Millay has proved herself bigger than her time. But such critics are confounding universals with non-concretized genera. The greatest poets (e.g. Whitman, Shelley) have realized that the universals of their art were to be found by creating emotional symbols for the progressive significances of their time. And this Edna St. Vincent Millay has thoroughly failed to do.

—S. A.

THE STAGE—A QUASI-REVOLUTIONARY PLAY

Sailors of Cattaro, by Friedrich Wolf;
Civic Repertory Theater, N. Y.

Sailors of Cattaro has not received the criticism it deserves and needs. Most of the reviews have accepted it as revolutionary in the vein of *Stevedore* or *Peace on Earth*, some even more revolutionary than the other two, whereas there have only been intimations here and there that *Sailors of Cattaro* is no help to the revolution.

It has all the ingredients. By now, a mere hint of the plot must be all that is necessary. Sailors on a warship in the Bay of Cattaro revolt and for some time the rebellion has considerable chances of success. They set up a sailors' council, they seize the officers, the mutiny is spreading to all the other ships in and out of the harbor. The first act ends with a red flag blowing gaily in full view of the audience.

But this play is about the decline and ultimate defeat of the mutiny. In this sense, it raises several interesting problems for revolutionary drama, and revolutionary art in general. It would be silly and stultifying to maintain that organizations like the Theatre Union can only put on plays that end in victory. The labor movement has suffered too many setbacks to be kidded into the belief that it has always tasted victory. Nor is it necessary to look at the problem only from

this point of view. Revolutionary defeats are sometimes of the utmost importance and point the way to victory. In historical perspective, the revolution of 1905 is more than a mere defeat. The bloody uprising in Canton was more than a mere slaughter. They were also preparations, costly ones, for victory.

But there are defeats and defeats. It would be equally unrealistic to laud *Sailors of Cattaro* simply because the dramatist, Friedrich Wolf, had the audacity and forthrightness to write a play around a defeat. For revolutionary principles, failures in themselves have no value. Whether they are useful or not, entirely depends upon whether they teach us something that is precious, that is a precondition of victory. To turn a phrase, there are Pyrrhic defeats: A few more failures like that and we cannot help but win!

Sailors of Cattaro is astronomical distances away from such a play. On the contrary, the very materials of the drama, which are shot through and through with revolutionary implications, seems to escape from the grasp of the dramatist and the play is made to say things and point morals which will be very unfortunate if they are heeded. This not to be wondered at. To write about a failure and still wring from the analysis hope and a fighting spirit is not

easy. When the ingredients are not controlled, a wicked broth may be the result. This is what happened in *Sailors of Cattaro*.

The whole drama turns on the actions of the sailors' council. How is this council portrayed? Is it the center of action supplying the collective leadership of the mutiny? Not at all. The sailors' council in this play is the seat of the failure. There are some healthy words said about the sailors' deputies in Vienna who will bring no aid because all a Parliament can do is talk and equivocate. This may be true but for all the evidence in *Sailors of Cattaro*, this is all a sailors' council does too. The mutiny is licked because the council was white-livered and talkative.

The mutiny could only be saved by decisive action, that is the moral of this play. Who was there in all the rebellion who could supply that action? Not the council. Within the council there is a very small element, we are permitted to see three men, who know that only a decisive dash and attack will save the mutiny. A good deal of the drama revolves around the clash between the majority of the council and the leader of the mutiny who knows what to do but will not disobey the council to the last. No spectator can avoid saying: Oh, if only Rasch would throw the council overboard! And fight!

There are many more details but this is the heart of the matter. In the audience itself, the council never appeared on the stage but they received very audible snickers. I have been told by many others that the audience reaction was precisely the same on other nights. If this is true, than *Sailors of Cattaro* is teaching a very unfortunate lesson. Sailors' councils are not the instruments through which revolutions are made or led. The persistence of the leader of the mutiny in following the council to stultification and defeat was very laudable, but where did it lead? To miserable failure. It would have been better had he at least tried fighting against the will of the council. Then the mutiny would have had a chance, would have gone down with glory. Instead, it went down shamefully.

I submit that these are the plain, the most important lessons of the play. Any "untutored," "unsophisticated" worker or sailor seeing this play could get no other impression. I have spoken to many and I have tried to verify this point. I think I have.

I do not think that revisions in revolutionary theory are necessary. But I think that a more critical, less receptive mood when confronted with plays like *Sailors of Cattaro*, where the intentions are impeccable but the results are very sad, is absolutely a necessity.

—THEODORE DRAPER.

Business Notice!

No chapter will receive *Reviews* unless they have completely paid for, or, otherwise accounted for, all past *Reviews*.

COMMUNICATIONS

Work Replies

To the Editor of *Student Review*:

Having read George Streator's communication to the *Student Review* re the article "Fisk's Fighting Heritage" which I wrote I am sending the following reply:

Streator's communication which appears in the December *Student Review* attempts to deny the fundamental class-struggle character of the epoch-making strike of the Negro Students at Fisk in 1924-25 by charging me with "mis-statements," "lies," etc. . . . I told Mr. Draper when he asked me to write the article on the Fisk strike that we were planning a series of articles on struggles of Negro students for our weekly paper, the *Negro Liberator*, and the Fisk article should be first. I intended to "get the leader of the strike, George Streator, who kept records of the strike, to write the article." If the article was satisfactory for the *Student Review* I would get Streator's permission to reprint it. George Streator agreed to have the article for the *Negro Liberator* fully a month before the deadline of the *Student Review*. In spite of 2-3 hour discussion with him and two visits to his home he did not write the article. I therefore prepared the account for the *Student Review* from memory. The almost unavoidable errors which I made in dates, chronology, etc., I do not consider of great importance, but since George saw fit to base his entire "refutation" on them I have gone back to the files of the *Crisis* for the facts and details.

Streator says: "The Fisk student strike was called . . . on February 6, 1925, out of protest to the dismissal from the university of four students. . . . The previous November, Lewis, Anderson and Streator had indicted the president in his presence before the Board of Trustees. . . ."

My statement in error was that the strike took place early in December.

The *Crisis* states that the student "riot" took place in November. It wasn't a simple "indictment" by the three students named by Streator but an actual strike by the student body. They "refused to attend classes," "they beat tin pots and pans," they "paraded and yelled," etc., until the Trustees who were meeting there were forced to hear the committee. Most of the demands were granted. In the two months that followed, the president, McKenzie, refused to put through any of the demands granted by the Trustees and as the opposition of the students became more and more articulate he proceeded to arrest the student leaders thereby precipitating the second, larger strike. * * *

Streator says that I do him "a conspicuous disservice" when I "intimate that he followed DuBois into the swamps of reformism. George is forgetful. He lost or gave up his job as Editor of the *Crisis* because of his support for DuBois last year. And DuBois, while he taught Karl Marx to negro students in a southern college, publicly advocated "voluntary" segregation for the negro people! Is this a reformist

position or does George Streator understand what "swamps of reformism" are? * * *

In the *Crisis*, Oct. 1924, after a biting exposure of current conditions at Fisk. The *Crisis* says, "Fisk needs a new president, a reformed Board of Trustees and a reconstituted faculty." Here, before the strike, DuBois took a brave, even revolutionary stand even though he omitted the demand for a Negro president.

Came the November "riot." Then the February strike. And now let's complete the quotation from DuBois which George began: *Crisis*, April, 1925. (All emphasis mine, M. W.)

"It is not a question of race (sic!). . . . No colored man has demanded a colored president at Fisk (?) Student revolt has been headed off repeatedly by expulsions of the leading spirits. . . . Men and women of Black America, let no Negro send his child to Fisk until Fayette McKenzie goes."

Well here is the answer in the same article! "Many have done me the honor of suggesting this and the former uprisings. I did not!" And since he (DuBois) himself says he did not suggest strike to win the demands of the students, continue reading what he wrote in his April article, at the time when George wants us to believe that he was urging continuance of the strike: "I should have advised against the 'riot' because I doubted the stamina of the students to carry it through."

George's whole letter is a defense of his fair name, his "character" as he says. The fact that he sent his "refutation" to the editor within a week after the appearance of the issue while he could not prepare his promised article in six weeks is highly suggestive.

Yours,
MERRILL C. WORK.

Looking Forward

To the Editor of *Student Review*:

A copy of your *Student Review* has recently fallen into my hands, and I cannot refrain from telling you of my joy that such a splendid publication is being put out by a group of the youth of this country. It augurs well for the future!

As the widow of Edward Bellamy, whose books, "Looking Backward" and "Equality" are giving hope of better things to millions all over the world, I hail with joy every evidence of awakening public consciousness. And I rejoice especially when I find young people seeking to analyze the civilization of today, and putting forth feelers toward the sun of the new day, which can be built, and which can be built as they desire it.

With deepest appreciation of your enthusiastic spirit, and an earnest hope that it may inspire an ever-increasing circle of our youth to service in the greatest cause the world has ever known—the cause of humanity—I am,

Yours sincerely,
EMMA S. BELLAMY,
Springfield, Mass.