# THE AMERICAN UNIVERSITY AND THE STUDENT PEACE MOVEMENT, 1919-1941

By

JOHN CHARLES PAIGE II

Bachelor of Arts

University of Wyoming

Laramie, Wyoming

1971

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
MASTER OF ARTS
July, 1973

THE AMERICAN UNIVERSITY AND THE

STUDENT PEACE MOVEMENT,

1919-1941

Thesis Approved:

Charles M. Dollar
Thesis Adviser

Theodore L. Agnew

John A. Sylvester

N N Durham
Dean of the Graduate College

# PREFACE

This study of the student peace movement of the twenties and thirties is not so much an end as it is a beginning of research in this area. It paints in broad strokes the outline of the movement. The primary material for this subject is vast and for the most part unorganized. Numerous college newspapers, yearbooks, and magazines contain articles that can be compiled into local history of the student peace movement. Hopefully, others will fill in these areas and continue the work started here.

The author wishes to express his appreciation to his major adviser, Dr. Charles Dollar, for his guidance and assistance throughout this study. Appreciation is also expressed to the other committee members, Dr. Theodore Agnew and Dr. John Sylvester for their invaluable assistance in the preparation of the final manuscript.

A note of thanks is given to the staff of the O.S.U. library, especially Miss Vicki Withers, for their valuable help in the research of this paper. Thanks are also extended to Mrs. Dixie Jennings for her assistance in typing the manuscript.

Finally, special thanks are expressed to my mother and father for their encouragement, understanding, and many sacrifices during my college career.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

# CHAPTER I

## BEGINNINGS OF REVOLT, 1919-1932

In 1962 the United States government began committing soldiers to a smoldering Vietnam conflict. As the United States' commitment in Vietnam escalated, groups of college students began to protest the American involvement in the war. The type of protest that was most common was the "teach-in". A "teach-in" consisted of a gathering of professors and students in which the history of American involvement in Vietnam came under critical discussion.[1]

The Vietnam War gave impetus to the forming of anti-war groups on the college campus. One of the more significant of these groups was the Students for a Democratic Society. In 1960, the League for Industrial Democracy, a socialist organization, made efforts to reconstitute its college organization. The League changed the name of the campus organization from the Student League for Industrial Democracy to the Students for a Democratic Society. This organization outlined its program and goals at a meeting in 1962 at Port Huron, Michigan. Here, the organization expressed opposition to the policy and programs of the Communist Party of the United States, but approved of socialist programs. They also expressed their opposition to the United States' involvement in

---

[1]Joseph Conlin, American Anti-War Movements (London: The Glencoe Press, 1968), p. 108.

Vietnam.[2]

By 1965, the Students for a Democratic Society claimed a membership of 2,000 students in some 70 chapters. That year at the national convention at Camp Maplehurst, Kewadin, Michigan, held June 9 through June 13, delegates from the University of California (Berkeley), the University of Wisconsin, Columbia University, Harvard University, and Boston College, to note just a few, were in attendance. Since 1965, the Students for a Democratic Society has devoted most of its time and effort to increasingly radical action against the United States' involvement in Vietnam. The organization set April 17, 1965, as a date for a mass demonstration against the war to be held in Washington, D.C. The Students for a Democratic Society invited the various peace groups to join them in this demonstration, but refused to let other groups co-sponsor the protest. Among the groups participating were Communist organizations such as Youth Against War and Fascism and the May Second Movement Club. This policy of joining with Communist organizations in a common effort by the Students for a Democratic Society led to dissention and the League for Industrial Democracy withdrew its financial support of the society.[3]

By 1967, the Students for a Democratic Society protest activity included harassment of campus recruiters from the military services, the C.I.A., and Dow Chemical Company. During this period, the membership grew to 6,000 students and 227 local chapters were established. In 1968, this group began to develop internal factions and the headquarters lost

---

[2]Philip Luce, The New Left (New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1966), pp. 141-143.

[3]Ibid., pp. 149-151.

control over the local chapters.[4]

Meanwhile on the campus, the majority of the college students supported the government war effort until the spring of 1968.[5] The apparent reason for the campus revolt was the "Tet" offensive. For several months, the United States government had been predicting that the war was almost over when the Viet Cong and North Vietnamese launched a nationwide offensive in South Vietnam, attacking the major cities of the country and even the United States Embassy in Saigon. Americans were shocked as they watched United States jets drop napalm bombs on Saigon. The belief that the war was almost over crumbled.

The students rallied behind Democratic Senator Eugene McCarthy of Minnesota and his campaign for the Democratic presidential nomination. McCarthy's pledge to withdraw American troops from Vietnam elicited widespread support. His strong showing in the New Hampshire presidential primary reflected the growing anti-war sentiment in the country. On March 31, 1968, President Johnson announced the cessation of American bombing in North Vietnam and the beginning of peace talks in Paris.

Peace demonstrations continued on college campuses with campaigns. In October of 1969, students on college campuses throughout the nation participated in a Moratorium Against the War. On November 15, a Mobilization Against the War was held which culminated in a march on Washington, D.C. The leaders of the movement pledged to hold one type of demonstration or another until America disengaged from Vietnam. This

---

[4]Richard Petterson, "The Student Left in American Higher Education," Students in Revolt, eds. Seymour Lipset and Philip Altback (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1969), pp. 208-210.

[5]"Survey of College Students," Gallup Opinion Index, No. 37, (July, 1968), p. 35.

movement reached its peak with the announcement by President Richard Nixon in May of 1970 of the incursion into Cambodia by American and South Vietnamese troops and the resulting massive demonstrations at college campuses throughout the nation.[6] At Kent State University in Ohio national guardsmen shot and killed four students causing students around the country to protest more vehemently. The demonstrations increased to such a pitch that some colleges were forced to close down for periods ranging from one day to the rest of the semester.

This student activism of the sixties has been discussed in numerous books and articles. In these works, there is usually mentioned the student activism of the 1920's and 1930's and a comparison between the two movements is given. Seymour Lipset and George Schaflander in their book, Passion and Politics: Student Activism in America, see both movements as being led by anti-capitalist students from the upper class. They also find the main centers of resistance for both movements as being Harvard, Yale, Dartmouth, the University of Wisconsin and the University of California with its various branches. In their view, the youth movement of the thirties was not a genuine youth movement, but rather the auxiliary of the adult peace movement.[7] Philip Luce in The New Left concludes that cooperation with the Communists as a debilitating factor for both peace movements.[8] Harold Draper, in his article, "The Student Movement of the Thirties", for Rita Simon's As We Saw the Thirties, takes a nostalgic

---

[6]Seymour Lipset and Gerald Schaflander, Passion and Politics: Student Activism in America (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1971), pp. 43-45.

[7]Ibid., pp. 161-168.

[8]Luce, pp. 150-151.

look at the student movement of the 1930's and sees it as the forerunner of the 1960's movement. Norman Birbaum and Majorie Childers in their article, "The American Movement", for Julian Nagel's Student Power, claim that the student protestors of the thirties were both the spiritual and literal parents of the student activist of the 1960's.[9]

Yet, none of these authors looked deeply into the student peace movement of the thirties. They failed to consider the movement in terms of its increasingly anti-fascist direction. Also they failed to note that there were many divisions within the earlier peace movement. There were Communist segments, socialist segments, anti-R.O.T.C. segments, liberal segments and church oriented segments and a constantly changing relationship among these groups. This thesis will attempt to offer a more balanced picture of the student peace movement during the period from 1919 to 1941 and the more important peace groups. In addition this thesis will evaluate their individual successes and failures.

In order to understand the peace movement of the twenties, it is necessary to give a brief background on the history of the American military and its involvement on the college campus. Military education began on campus in 1862 with the passage of the Morrill Land Grant Act and, military training remained confined to land grant colleges and universities until passage of the National Defense Acts of 1916 and 1920. These acts provided for a two year military training program, funded by the War Department, to be set up on any university campus that requested the establishment of such a program and would furnish at least 100 students

---

[9]Norman Birbaum and Majorie Childers, "The American Movement," Student Power, ed. Julian Nagel (London: Merlin, 1969), p. 133.

willing to train.[10]

Before the First World War, there were 115 units of the R.O.T.C. on college campuses, but by 1917, the War Department had created the Student's Army Training Corps which spread to some 500 institutions.[11] The S.A.T.C. gave rise to a number of complaints against it. Alexander Meiklejohn, President of Amherst College, claimed that the S.A.T.C. programs were not well thought out and he saw a dangerous spirit of militarism being introduced on the college campus.[12] In November of 1918, the S.A.T.C. programs ended, but were replaced in 100 colleges by Reserve Officers Training Corps and Civilian Military Training Camps with some 200 other schools expressing a desire to join in these programs.[13] The change over came very quickly, for R.O.T.C. units could use the equipment of the disbanded S.A.T.C. program.

The rejuvenated R.O.T.C. program required four years of military training for the college student. The first two years of this training were compulsory at most institutions. Students who continued in the program were given a free uniform, a sum of $10.40 a month, and 70 cents a day for the six week summer camp.[14] In addition to these inducements, some colleges gave the students extra gifts: Colorado Agricultural

---

[10]Arthur Ekirch, The Civilian and the Military (New York: Oxford University Press, 1966), p. 219.

[11]"Military Training in Colleges," School and Society, IX (January 4, 1919), p. 25.

[12]Alexander Meiklejohn, "The Colleges and the S.A.T.C.," The Nation, CVII (December 7, 1918), pp. 697-698.

[13]"Reserve Officer's Training Corps in the Colleges," School and Society, VIII (December 28, 1918), p. 766.

[14]David Thomas, "Compulsory Military Training in American Colleges: 1. The System Attacked," Current History, XXIV (April, 1926), p. 28.

College presented to the student an overcoat suitable for wearing to either military or social functions, and Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College gave each successful military student his own sabre and scabbard.[15] The military established its own fraternity, Scabbard and Blade, made campus beauties honorary colonels, and ended the school year with a grand military ball.[16]

In 1925, one hundred and twenty-four colleges had R.O.T.C. courses, and of these schools eighty-three had some form of compulsory military training. The total cost of the program was nearly $4,000,000 and the War Department invested some 768 officers and 1,064 enlisted men in running the programs.[17] During the next year, the military had training programs in some 308 colleges and high schools which involved over 125,000 students.[18] By 1927, the number of colleges participating increased to 280, and in 1931, R.O.T.C. had found a home in 313 colleges enrolling 147,009 students in its programs.[19]

Soon discontent surfaced concerning the presence on campus of military training programs. The first successful attack on compulsory R.O.T.C. came at the University of Wisconsin. It had been assumed in most institutions that R.O.T.C. drill was compulsory by law. The Wisconsin legislature, under pressure from the students at the University of

---

[15]"Eighty-Three Enforce It: The Spread of Compulsory Military Training in Colleges," The Survey, LV (December 15, 1925), p. 341.

[16]Thomas, p. 28.

[17]"Eighty-Three Enforce It" The Spread of Compulsory Military Training in Colleges," p. 340.

[18]Thomas, p. 29.

[19]James Wechsler, The Revolt on Campus (New York: Covici-Friede Publishers, 1935), pp. 123-124.

Wisconsin, passed a bill in 1923 which made military drill an optional activity.[20] The students had the option of taking physical education courses rather than drill. This law was soon questioned and the United States Attorney General, William D. Mitchell, ruled that the states had the right to make military training optional.[21]

The opposition to military training programs was not limited to the college campuses. In 1925, Winthrop D. Lane, a socialist from New York, wrote a pamphlet entitled Military Training in Schools and Colleges of the United States: The Facts and an Interpretation, which attacked the concept of military training in the schools. Lane argued that military training in schools leads only to more military training in more schools. Further, he claimed that this growth of militarism harmed the students and that it was detrimental to the concept of academic freedom. Military training was condemned because it sanctioned the use of war in foreign policy.[22] Senators William Borah and George Norris, Jane Addams, and Professor John Dewey, among others, praised the pamphlet.[23]

This pamphlet inspired the formation of the Committee on Militarism in Education. The purpose of the Committee was to eliminate military

---

[20]Zona Gale, "Don't Be Silly," The Nation, CXXVIII (April 10, 1929), p. 422.

[21]"Military Training in Land-Grant Colleges," School and Society, XXXII (July 5, 1930), pp. 11-12.

[22]U.S. Congress, House, Committee on Military Affairs, "Statement of John Nevin Sayre," Hearings on Abolishment of Compulsory Military Training at Schools and Colleges, 69 Congress, 1st session, 1926, H. R. 8538, pp. 266-267. This is from a copy of the Lane pamphlet that Reverend Sayre presented as evidence to the committee.

[23]Eighty-Three Enforce It: The Spread of Compulsory Military Training in Colleges," p. 340.

training programs from high schools and colleges.[24] The first chairman of the organization was the Reverend John Nevin Sayre, who was a minister in the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States of America, Secretary of the Fellowship of Reconciliation which was a pacifist group, and a member of the American Civil Liberties Union.[25]

The Committee on Militarism in Education took its battle against military training to the Congress in Washington. In 1925, a group including four United States Senators, the President of Vassar and spokesmen for the Young Men's Christian Association, the Federated Council of Churches and the Methodist Episcopal Church, petitioned Congress to eliminate military training from the schools.[26]

In 1926, Republican Representative George Welsh of Philadelphia introduced a bill that would abolish compulsory military training in all educational institutions except for military schools.[27] This bill was sponsored in the Senate by Republican Senator Lynn Frazier of North Dakota.[28] Hearings were held before the House Committee on Military Affairs, and various peace groups, educators and church groups testified against the military training programs.[29] It seemed for a moment that compulsory military training might be abolished, but Congress took no action on the bill. Many members of Congress were not aware of the

---

[24]U.S. Congress, House, Committee on Military Affairs, p. 187.

[25]Ibid., p. 188.

[26]"Military Training and American Schools and Colleges," School and Society, XXII (December 9, 1925), p. 777.

[27]Congressional Record, 69 Congress, 1st session, p. 2936.

[28]Ibid., p. 6424.

[29]U.S. Congress, House, Committee on Military Affairs, pp. 1-275.

extent of the military training programs nor did they see these programs as representing a militaristic device threatening the welfare of the country. In addition, it was felt that this was a matter that should be left up to the individual states or colleges.[30] Had not Wisconsin ended compulsory military training without federal intervention?

This first defeat only convinced the Committee on Militarism in Education that the public must be educated to the dangers of campus militarism. The next years brought forth a flood of pamphlets from the Committee on Militarism in Education on the evils of R.O.T.C., and this organization began concentrated attacks on the local level. In 1929, the Committee opposed the establishment of a R.O.T.C. unit at Jamaica High School in New York.[31] After a three year battle, the Commissioner of State Education for New York upheld the right of the high school to permit compulsory military training.[32]

The battle shifted to the national arena in 1931, when Republican Representative Fiorello LaGuardia of New York attempted to have an amendment attached to the Army Appropriation Bill that stipulated,

> That none of the funds appropriated in this act shall be used for or toward the support of any compulsory military course or military training in any civil school or college, ... but nothing herein shall be construed as applying to essentially military schools or colleges.[33]

Representative George Welsh argued that compulsory military training

---

[30]Ekirch, p. 222.

[31]"Opposition to Military Training in High School," The School Review, XXXVII (March, 1929), p. 169.

[32]"Military Training in a New York High School," School and Society, XXXIII (June 6, 1931), p. 746.

[33]Congressional Record, 71 Congress, 3rd session, p. 2261.

polluted the youth of America. To show the nationwide opposition to compulsory military training, he named twenty-five national organizations opposed to compulsory military training. Included among these organizations were the American Federation of Labor, the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church of the United States of America and the American Federation of Teachers.[34]

Republican Representative Carrol Beedy of Maine argued that the United States foreign policy was contradictory in that we spoke of peace, and yet forced our youth to prepare for war.[35] The opposition, led by Republican Representative Henry Barbour of California, argued that passage of the amendment amounted to government supervision of education.[36] He made his point, for the amendment was defeated by a 162 to 50 vote.[37]

Despite this setback, the Committee on Militarism in Education went back to a campaign of petitioning Congress to act against the militarization of the colleges. Dr. George Coe, a member of the Committee on Militarism in Education and a retired Professor of Education at Teachers College, Columbia University, in 1932 presented a petition to the House Military Appropriations Committee asking for the removal of the War Department from the campus. The petition had over 300 signatures of college presidents and professors, who contended that the War Department was unlawfully interfering with the states' rights to regulate their

---

[34]Ibid., p. 2270.

[35]Ibid., p. 2268.

[36]Ibid., pp. 2262-2263.

[37]Ibid., p. 2279.

educational institutions.[38]

By 1931, the Committee on Militarism in Education was running low on funds and began to negotiate with the National Council for the Prevention of War in hopes of merging. The National Council for the Prevention of War was founded in 1921 by representatives of seventeen peace organizations. The headquarters of the National Council were located in Washington, D.C., and the organization had an operating budget of $160,000 for 1931.[39] Under the plan to merge the National Council for the Prevention of War would assume the staff and budget of the Committee on Militarism in Education. However, the membership of the National Council for the Prevention of War decided against the merger on the grounds that an attack on compulsory military training was unlikely to succeed.[40]

During the time the Committee on Militarism in Education carried out its fight against compulsory military training, church groups became interested in the anti-war crusade. The motivating spirit behind this dedication to pacifism was the belief that war represented a collective sin of mankind which need not be tolerated. The 1926 conventions of the Northern Baptists, the Presbyterian General Assembly, the Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America, the Society for the Advancement of Judaism, the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, and the National Council of Student Young Men's Christian Association passed resolutions condemning compulsory military training

---

[38]"Condemn R.O.T.C.," The Christian Century, XLIX (February 10, 1932), p. 205.

[39]Merle Curti, Peace or War: The American Struggle, 1636-1936 (Boston: J. S. Canmer, 1936), pp. 272-273; Ekirch, p. 225.

[40]Ekirch, p. 225.

programs at schools and colleges. In 1927, the National Council of the Congregational Churches of the United States passed a resolution condemning compulsory military training at schools and colleges, and in 1930, the General Synod of the Reformed Church in America and the Western Unitarian Conference passed similar resolutions.[41]

The churches actively participated in ecumenical actions against war. On November 13, 1921, the first meeting of the National Convocation of Universities and Colleges on Disarmament was held in Chicago. The convocation included representatives from Protestant, Roman Catholic and Jewish educational institutions. Participating in the various programs were: Dr. A. W. Harris, corresponding secretary of the Board of Education of the Methodist Episcopal Church; Dr. Robert Kelly, secretary of the Council of Church Boards of Education; Dr. Nehemic Boynton, head of the Church Peace Union; and Sherwood Eddy, the international secretary of the Y.M.C.A. The convocation attracted over five hundred delegates representing more than two hundred colleges and universities. These delegates approved a list of resolutions suggesting that the country should make a reduction in armaments and army personnel and urged that colleges offer courses showing the evils of war and the necessity of social cooperation.[42]

The question of how to end war came up in the ninth quadrennial convention at Indianapolis of the Student Volunteer Movement for Foreign Missions in January of 1924, which had 7,400 delegates from 709 colleges and universities. This group had originally been founded for the purpose

---

[41] Congressional Record, 71 Congress, 3rd session, pp. 2270-2271.

[42] "The National Convocation of Colleges on Disarmament," School and Society, XIV (December 3, 1921), pp. 517-518.

of sending American students to preach the gospel in foreign countries, but by 1924, the group was becoming involved in political questions. The convention debated four resolutions on the best way to avoid war. The first resolution called for the country to prepare for the event of war in the hope that this action would bring any future war to a quick termination. The second resolution declared that war should be abolished through a process of education, but non-resistance to war was futile. The third resolution declared the League of Nations as the best hope to avoid war, but some situations called for the use of war to be the only solution. The fourth resolution called for the members to reject war completely. The students voted in favor of the second resolution with the fourth resolution being the next most popular.[43]

The eleventh quadrennial convention of the Student Volunteer Movement was held in Buffalo, New York in January of 1932. The 2,200 delegates here voted in favor of a motion to request President Herbert Hoover to name a student to the American delegation to the World Disarmament Conference to be held in Geneva, Switzerland. Next, the delegates voted on several disarmament questions, one of which dealt with compulsory military training in colleges. The vote was 1,172 against compulsory military training and 47 in favor. The delegates voted 1,252 to 128 in favor of granting the individual the right to refuse participation in war.[44]

Student groups also took direct action against compulsory military training. In 1924, two students returning from the Methodist Student Conference reported to the other students at De Pauw University that

---

[43]New York Times (January 2, 1924), p. 22.

[44]John Scotford, "Student Volunteer Convention Swings Back to Conservatism," The Christian Century, XLIX (January 13, 1932), p. 66.

compulsory military training was an evil that should not be allowed to continue. The students were shocked by such heresy, but in the summer of 1924 the Methodist General Conference condemned war.[45] This was followed by a petition from a group of the De Pauw students to President Lemuel Murlin of the university stating that they did not want to be forced to be trained for war. The president rejected the petition on the grounds that the resolution of the General Conference did not sanction this type of action.[46]

President Murlin then called upon a faculty committee, composed of seven members including an R.O.T.C. officer, to investigate the military problem at the school. The committee recommended that the compulsory feature of R.O.T.C. be ended. The president refused to take this action and instead asked the Educational Policy Committee of the faculty to vote on the question. This committee had eleven members including the vice president of the university. The committee voted 8 to 2 with one member not voting in favor of abolishing compulsory military training. For a moment, it seemed that the anti-R.O.T.C. forces had won, but then the advanced military student officers petitioned the president asking that compulsory military training be kept. President Murlin announced that compulsory military training would remain at De Pauw. Finally, in 1929, President Murlin was replaced by G. Bromley Oxnam, a former private secretary for pacifist Sherwood Eddy and member of the Committee on

---

[45]Raymond Wade, ed. Journal of the Twenty Ninth Delegated General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church held in Springfield, Massachusetts, May 1-May 29, 1924 (New York: The Methodist Book Concern, 1924), p. 303.

[46]Ellis Cowling, "Compulsion at De Pauw," The Nation, CXXV (July 20, 1927), pp. 59-60.

Militarism in Education, and he made any participation in the program a voluntary one.[47]

The battle against war was not waged completely by teachers and religious groups, but also by ideologically centered groups and students. The Young Communist League of the United States organized in 1922, and in their May, 1923, convention, affiliated with the Young Communist International, adopting the regulations and outlook of that organization.[48] During the twenties this group remained small, and showed very little interest in student affairs until the thirties. Then, following part orders, the Young Communist League became active in the student peace movement. Prior to this they had viewed students as being, "'petty-bourgeois' by definition and unstable intellectuals by occupation."[49]

The activity against war and R.O.T.C. was not limited to the student anti-war organizations. Other student organizations began their own efforts at individual universities to end compulsory military training. In November of 1925 at a meeting of the Social Problems Club of the City College of New York, the members voted in favor of having a student referendum on the question of retaining compulsory military training on the campus. The student council supported the referendum and President

---

[47]Sherwood Eddy, Eighty Adventurous Years: An Autobiography (New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1955), p. 205.

[48]U.S. Congress, House, Special Committee on Un-American Activities, "Testimony of Walter S. Steele, National Republic, Chairman of the American Coalition Committee on National Security, Representing Various Organizations," Hearings, Investigation of Un-American Propaganda Activities in the United States; hereinafter referred to as I.U.P.A., 75 Congress, 3rd session, I, 1938, p. 584.

[49]Hal Draper, "The Student Movement of the Thirties," As We Saw The Thirties, ed. Rita Simon (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1967), p. 165.

Sidney Mezes of the college set a date for the vote.[50] The student body voted 2,092 to 345 in favor of ending compulsory military training.[51] The faculty voted in favor of retention of compulsory military training, and this decision was agreed to by the Board of Trustees.[52] So compulsory military training remained at the City College of New York. In November of 1927, Alexander Lifshitz and Leo Rothenberg, both students of the City College of New York, were suspended from the school for attacking the schools' compulsory military training program at a meeting of the campus Liberal Club.[53] The Board of Trustees later reinstated Rothenberg after he had apologized for his remarks, but the battle against R.O.T.C. was to continue and will be discussed in the next chapter.[54]

Students at Pomona College in California waged a far more successful campaign with the board of trustees in ending compulsory military training. The University of Missouri arranged for a student referendum on compulsory military training, but the board of regents unanimously endorsed military training and the vote was called off. Other unsuccessful protests occurred at the University of California, the University of Kansas, the University of Nebraska, the University of Georgia, the University of Minnesota, and the University of Washington.[55]

---

[50] New York Times (November 14, 1925), p. 16.

[51] Ibid. (December 11, 1925), p. 1.

[52] Ibid.

[53] Ibid. (November 15, 1927), p. 9.

[54] Ibid. (November 19, 1927), p. 19.

[55] "The Revolt Against Military Training," The Nation, CXXI (December 2, 1925), p. 616; "Militarizing America's Youth," The Nation, CXXI (December 16, 1925), p. 694; "Eighty-Three Enforce It: The Spread of Compulsory Military Training in Colleges," p. 340.

Ohio State University students voted against compulsory military training by a vote of 1,009 to 700. The military had argued unsuccessfully that: first, opposition to military training was part of a sinister bolshevist-pacifist plot; second, that R.O.T.C. taught students how to handle and lead men; and third, the purpose of R.O.T.C. was to prepare the country for the eventuality of another war. The students disagreed as shown by the vote, but compulsory R.O.T.C. remained.[56]

At Coe College, Iowa, the faculty voted against compulsory R.O.T.C., only to be overruled by the Board of Trustees. The local American Legion post took an active part in defense of the board's actions. The students wanted a public debate on the question, but decided to wait until tempers cooled, and this ended the protest.[57]

In 1927, the students at Cornell University urged the faculty to end compulsory drill, but the proposal was defeated by an overwhelming vote of the faculty. Nevertheless, the fight continued, and in 1931 the faculty voted 81 to 38 in favor of ending compulsory drill.[58] This seems to reflect the nationwide trend in the late twenties against military training programs. A poll of some 24,345 students taken on various college campuses by the Intercollegiate Disarmament Council in 1932 showed that 81 percent of these students opposed compulsory military drill, but a much smaller group, only 38 percent, wanted the abolition of campus

---

[56]"Again the Student Speaks," The Nation, CXXII (February 3, 1926), p. 105.

[57]Thomas, p. 27.

[58]"Military Training at Cornell University," School and Society, XXXIII (May 23, 1931), p. 688.

military training altogether.[59] Still, there was increased student interest in ending military training programs.

The period between 1919 to 1932 was one of formation for the anti-war forces. The universities and colleges emerged from the World War with various and growing military training programs on campus. Many of these programs were discontinued, but the number remaining on campus was a tremendous extension of pre-war military presence. This extension created a conflict between those who saw a dangerous spirit of militarism threatening the basic structure of the university and those who saw R.O.T.C. benefiting the country and the schools. The former group included Christian pacifists, progressives and isolationists, while the latter group contained military authorities and patriotic organizations like the American Legion.

During the twenties, churches popularized the idea of Christian pacifism on the campus through their youth organizations. The most vocal organization to attack the R.O.T.C. was the Committee on Militarism in Education. Their attempts to lobby for legislation to abolish R.O.T.C. met with failure partly because of congressional indifference to the question and partly because Congress felt that any decision on this matter should be left to the individual institution or state.

The students began to work for the removal of the military from the campus. The successes in this fight were few and the defeats many. The campus rebels lacked any national direction for their protest, but the seeds of discontent had been sown, and soon the students were to unite in their battle against militarism. In the next few years both the students

---

[59]"Youth Votes for Peace," The Nation, CXXXIV (January 27, 1932), p. 91.

and the organizations were to escalate their attack on R.O.T.C. and war. These developments are discussed in the next chapter.

## CHAPTER II

## THE GATHERING OF BELIEVERS, 1932-1935

During the years between 1932 to 1935, the student peace movement grew in size and gave birth to national anti-war organizations. The most important event to come out of these formative years was the active involvement of the Communist Party and the Socialist Party in the student peace crusade. This involvement gave the movement a strong organizational basis.

The Communist Party had remained aloof from campus politics in the twenties, but by the early thirties, the Party was in the process of creating a "united front" with non-communist groups in pursuit of common goals. The Young Communist League entered into the youth movement with a program calling for the end of R.O.T.C. on campus and attacking both foreign and domestic fascist trends.[1] Gilbert Green led this group and he followed the Party line without question. His official position was that of national secretary until 1937, when he became the national chairman. This group remained small and exerted minor influence on campus affairs, but it is of interest because it followed the twists and turns of

---

[1]United States Congress, House, "Exhibit No. 84: Daily Worker, May 19, 1933." Hearings, Investigation of Un-American Propaganda Activities in the United States; hereafter referred to as I.U.P.A., Appendix Part I, 1940, pp. 545-549.

Communist Party policy without hesitation or deviation.[2]

The Communist organization that became the most active and influential on campus was the National Student League. The National Student League was begun in New York City in 1931 when a group of Communists, Socialists and liberals attempted to form an independent student group to act on social questions.[3] This group viewed the depression as being the start of the destruction of capitalism. The only teacher who was deeply involved with this group was Donald Henderson, an economics teacher at Columbia University, who became the first executive secretary of the organization.[4]

The group dedicated itself to fight against discrimination, the stifling of academic liberty and the encroachment of the military on the college campus.[5] The first victory that the National Student League achieved was the reinstatement of undergraduate Reed Harris to Columbia University after his dismissal for his articles critical of the school administration in the college paper, The Spectator. The League called for a student strike to support Harris, and on April 20, 1932, the University reinstated Harris.[6] This victory enhanced the position of the National Student League as being the leader of the student movement in

---

[2]Hal Draper, "The Student Movement of the Thirties," As We Saw The Thirties, ed. Rita Simon (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1967), p. 164.

[3]James Wechsler, Revolt on the Campus (New York: Covici-Friede Publishers, 1935), p. 95. At this time, Wechsler was very active in the National Student League and so writes favoring the League.

[4]Draper, p. 166.

[5]Wechsler, p. 96.

[6]Ibid., p. 115, 117.

New York.[7]

In December, 1932, the National Student League sponsored a Student Congress Against War meeting in Chicago. There had been a previous Youth Congress against war in Germany in 1932 and the movement in America was supported by writers Theodore Drelser and John Dos Passos. Active in the formation of the congress were James B. Matthews, a Communist activist, who in 1938 emerged as chief researcher for the United States House of Representatives Special Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities, and Donald Henderson. Henderson publicly resigned from the Socialist Party to join the Communist Party in 1932, and because of this action his teaching contract at Columbia was not renewed. The National Student League organized a strike on behalf of Henderson, to no avail. The university refused to reinstate Henderson, and he spent the rest of his life working for the pro-Communist Farm Equipment Workers Union.

The Chicago convention attracted more than 600 delegates from colleges and universities. These delegates represented: Socialists, Democrats, Republicans, Communists, pacifists and various other campus groups. This convention helped to formulate the principles which guided the student anti-war movement. The delegates analyzed the reasons for war. War was viewed as an inherent part of the capitalist, imperialist system and military preparedness as a situation which made war inevitable. They viewed individual acts of pacifism as mere futile gestures. The delegates then discussed ways of preventing wars. The main actions to be taken against war should consist of formation of alliances between various peace groups, public denunciation of war as an instrument of national

---

[7]Draper, p. 167.

policy, and militant protest by all peace groups in unison to end the encroachment of the military on the campus. This convention laid the groundwork that would support the future efforts of the student peace movement. At this time, however, the movement reached no firm agreements on possible anti-war coalitions.[8]

This strategy was transformed into action when the first student strike against war occurred on April 13, 1934. The strike brought about by the cooperation of the National Student League and the Student League for Industrial Democracy along with other anti-war groups including the Young Communist League, owed much to the Vigilance Committee Against War.[9] This group will be discussed later on in the chapter. The Student League for Industrial Democracy had its origins back at the turn of the century. Jack London, Upton Sinclair, and others in 1905 formed the Intercollegiate Socialist Society. This group evolved into the League for Industrial Democracy which had a student sector called the Intercollegiate Student Council. This group was reorganized into the Student League for Industrial Democracy in 1932 and given more freedom of actions from the adult organization than the previous youth group had enjoyed. Still, the Student League for Industrial Democracy was financially dependent upon the League for Industrial Democracy as the officers of the youth organization were paid by the adult organization. Joseph Lash, who had graduated from New York University in the early twenties, was the executive secretary for this organization.[10]

---

[8]Wechsler, pp. 135-139.

[9]Ibid., pp. 171-172.

[10]Draper, pp. 157-158.

The anti-war strike for 1934 consisted of a one hour protest lasting from 11:00 to noon.[11] The date was picked to commemorate the entrance of the United States into the First World War. The total number of students participating in the strike was 25,000, and of whom, 15,000 were from the New York City area. The remaining students who participated in the strike were for the most part from the schools in the Middle Atlantic states.[12]

The second anti-war strike, held on April 13, 1935, lived up to being a nationwide strike. Colleges from coast to coast joined in strike activities with the number of student activists reaching the 150,000 mark. The type of activities varied from a full fledged strike to a mere prayer meeting for peace. The New York colleges again had large groups of students participating, but this time equally large numbers of students in Los Angeles, Chicago and Philadelphia also took part. The strike was endorsed by the National Council of Methodist Youth, the Student League for Industrial Democracy, the National Student League, the Middle Atlantic Division for the Interseminary Movement, the American Youth Congress, the youth section of the American League Against War and Fascism, and local chapters of the YMCA and YWCA.[13]

In the New York Metropolitan area, 15,000 students joined in the strike. This large turnout was accomplished through the efforts of the New York Strike Committee, composed of Joseph Lash representing the student League for Industrial Democracy, Warren Burgbee from the National Council of Methodist Youth, Robert Clemons of the Interseminary Movement,

---

[11] New York Times (March 13, 1934), p. 46.

[12] Draper, p. 171; Wechsler, p. 171.

[13] New York Times (April 13, 1935), p. 1.

Waldo McNutt of the American Youth Congress, Joseph Cohen of the National Student League and James Lerner of the American League Against War and Fascism.[14]

Throughout the country the protesters faced varied reactions. At the University of Chicago, the demonstration against war ended in rioting when eggs and stench bombs were thrown at the student demonstrators. The demonstrators at Princeton University were addressed by Norman Thomas, Socialist leader and a graduate of Princeton. At Columbia University, the student protesters were addressed by the editor of the school paper, James Wechsler. Also attending the rally was the director of the American Civil Liberties Union, Roger Baldwin. The University of Minnesota students listened to Governor Floyd Olson of the Farmer-Labor Party. This address was not sanctioned by the administration of the school.[15]

A listing of the schools involved in this second anti-war strike is given in the Appendix. If one looks at the strike by regions, the East had the most colleges participating, with fifty-two schools joining in the protest. Next came the Midwest with thirty-five schools having demonstrations, then the West with thirty schools having demonstrations, and finally the South with twenty schools having demonstrations.

James Wechsler, a member of the National Student League and editor of The Spectator, wrote a book, Revolt on the Campus, in 1935 about the student youth movement. He saw the main target of the student strikes as being the military training programs on campus. According to him, those who opposed the student strikers belonged to a reactionary bloc composed

---

[14]Ibid., (April 12, 1935), p. 23.

[15]Ibid., (April 13, 1935), pp. 1; 3.

of the Reserve Officers Training Corps, Fraternity Row and the Athletic Associations.[16] This argument is not verified, for of the 147 schools joining in the student strike only forty-seven had R.O.T.C. units on campus and a still smaller number, twenty-six, enforced compulsory military training. The strike showed the growing disillusionment of youth with war, rather than just opposition to compulsory military training on the campus.

The cooperation of the National Student League and the Student League for Industrial Democracy in the anti-war strikes of 1934 and 1935 paved the way for the merger of these two groups. In June, 1935, the national committee of the Student League for Industrial Democracy voted to combine with the National Student League, the new organization becoming the American Student Union. The formal creation of the new group took place during Christmas week of 1935. George Edward Jr. assumed the position of national chairman; Joseph Lash, national secretary; Serril Gerber, executive secretary; James Wechsler, director of publications; and Celeste Strack, the leader of the high school section. Edward and Lash were members of the Student League for Industrial Democracy, while Wechsler, Gerber and Strack were members of the National Student League. The formation of a National Board of the Union took place, and on this board were Communists, Socialists and a small group of college intellectuals.[17]

The first conflict in the American Student Union arose over whether or not to adopt the "Oxford Pledge". The "Oxford Pledge" originated at Oxford College in England in 1933 when the college resolved that English

---

[16]Wechsler, pp. 288-290.

[17]United States Congress, House, "Testimony of Walter Steele," I.U.P.A., 1, 1938, pp. 582-583.

students would not fight for king nor country in case of war. This movement quickly spread to the United States, where on one college campus after another the students signed a pledge that they would never support the United States government in war. The Communists and some Socialists did not want the pledge to be endorsed by the American Student Union, but the majority overruled this group, and the pledge became part of the policy of the American Student Union.[18]

The most ardent support for the "Oxford Pledge" came from the Intercollegiate Disarmament Council, which originated in Geneva, Switzerland in 1931 among American students studying there. The United States headquarters for this group were in New York and the chairman of the council was a 1932 graduate of Yale, James Frederick Green. In 1933, the Intercollegiate Disarmament Council, with the help of the National Student Federation and the Brown University newspaper, The Daily Herald, sent out ballots to 730 colleges. The ballots gave the student the opportunity of endorsing the "Oxford Pledge", or the "Brown Pledge", or he could declare that he would support the government in any war. The "Brown Pledge", had been written by the editor of The Daily Herald, and declared that the signer would not fight in a war unless the United States was invaded. The results of this poll were to be presented to President Franklin Roosevelt and the Congress.[19]

A total of 21,725 students from some sixty-five colleges sent back their ballots to the Intercollegiate Disarmament Council. Of this number, 8,415 students supported the "Oxford Pledge", 6,089 students supported

---

[18]Draper, pp. 174-175.

[19]"The Intercollegiate Disarmament Council," School and Society, XXXVII (April 15, 1933), pp. 482-483.

the "Brown Pledge", and 7,221 students indicated that they would support the country in any war.[20]

The Intercollegiate Disarmament Council held Intercollegiate Conferences in various regions to bolster support for the "Oxford Pledge" and "Brown Pledge". One of these conferences was held for seven universities and colleges in the San Francisco region. This meeting was typical of the regional conferences held by the Intercollegiate Disarmament Council in that eighty student delegates from Stanford University, the University of California, St. Mary's College, Mills College, San Mateo Junior College and the San Jose and San Francisco State Teacher's Colleges attended the San Francisco meeting. This group voted 44 to 19, with 16 students abstaining, to adopt a resolution pledging refusal to accept any military service during wartime.[21] The vote and meeting of the council showed the growing concern among the college students on the danger of war.

The Communists were also very interested in the student attitude toward war. Communist groups were beginning to change in attitudes from being anti-war to becoming anti-fascist, and the Communist Party was eager to have its youth groups implement this policy. In 1935, the Young Communist League, following the Communist Party line, rejected the "Oxford Pledge" as being obsolete, and began to work toward the goal of "collective security".[22] Essentially, this was a policy advocating that the United States should join with Soviet Union in a move to stop fascism in

---

[20]"Pacifism in the Colleges," The Literary Digest, CXVI (May 27, 1933), p. 17.

[21]Ibid., pp. 17-18.

[22]Draper, pp. 173-174.

Europe.[23] After 1935, the Communists were to cause much friction in the peace movement due to their stand on the "Oxford Pledge".

Another Communist organization with influence on the campus was the American League Against War and Fascism. The roots of this organization began with the Amsterdam World Congress Against War held in Holland on August 27, 28, and 29 of 1932. More than two thousand delegates from twenty-seven countries attended the Congress. The convention adopted resolutions praising the Soviet Union and condemning capitalism for being the cause of war.[24] During the meeting a World Committee Against War was formed, the American division of this group becoming known as the American Committee for Struggle Against War. This group organized a United States Congress Against War, to be held on September 29 and 30 and October 1, 1933. This Congress was supported by the Committee on Militarism in Education, the National Student League, the Young Communist League, and by more than forty other Communist and non-Communist organizations. Out of this Congress emerged the American League Against War and Fascism complete with a youth section. The goals of the League included: stopping by mass demonstration and strikes the manufacture of materials essential to war, and exposing the preparation being made by the government for war while opposing the imperialist policy of America.[25]

The Second Congress Against War called by the American League Against War and Fascism, met in Chicago, Illinois, on September 28, 29 and 30 of

---

[23]Ibid.

[24]United States Congress, House, "Testimony of Harry Freeman Ward, Chairman of the American League for Peace and Democracy," I.U.P.A., X, 1939, pp. 6232-6233.

[25]Ibid., pp. 6233-6237; 906-908.

1934. The meeting attracted more than 2,000 delegates from thirty-five states, and represented churches, anti-war associations, youth groups and labor unions. The program adopted by the Congress was similar to past programs.[26] An important shift occurred when the chairman of the League, James B. Matthews, resigned and was replaced by Harold Ward.[27] This shift made the League more compliant to the Communist Party line.

The most important contribution that the League made to the student peace movement was in the formation of the Vigilance Committee Against War. This committee brought together the National Student Federation, YMCA, YWCA, National Student League, Student League for Industrial Democracy, American Youth Congress and the National Council of Methodist Youth. This committee developed the outline for the student strikes against war.[28]

Another organization that emerged during these years was the American Youth Congress. This group attempted to organize all youth groups into one organization to speak for the nation's youth. Miss Viola Ilma, supposedly the daughter of Prince Ali Youseff Ilma of Abyssina, was the driving force behind the first Congress held at New York University on August 15-17, 1934. This first Congress was largely financed by Miss Ilma. The invitations for the Congress were sent out by the Central Bureau of Young America, an organization created by Miss Ilma. The purpose of the Congress was to build a youth movement that would support the

---

[26]Robert Lovett, "The Congress on War and Fascism," The New Republic, LXXXV (October 17, 1934), pp. 263-264.

[27]United States Congress, House, "Testimony of James B. Matthews," I.U.P.A., III, 1938, p. 2170.

[28]United States Congress, House, "Testimony of Walter Steele," I.U.P.A., I, 1938, p. 339.

President, and to help get young people off the relief rolls.[29] This first Congress received greetings from Mrs. Franklin Roosevelt, who took a more active part in the American Youth Congress in later years.[30] Her activity in the Congress will be discussed in the next chapter.

Invitations went out to 121 organizations including: the YMCA, YWCA, National Student League, National Student Federation, Student League for Industrial Democracy, Young Communist League, Young Republican Clubs and Young Democrat Clubs. Miss Ilma set up the Congress in such a way as to assure herself control of the movement. She was the chairwoman of the convention, and no one could speak from the floor without her permission. Also she controlled the "executive board", which decided on the resolutions to be discussed, and the "board of governors", which made all final decisions on matters of procedure.[31]

This dictatorial control of the Congress led to a revolt. Outside the convention site at the opening session pickets representing eleven youth organizations demonstrated, claiming that the Congress was being organized in an undemocratic manner. Among the group demonstrating were the Young Communist League, the Student League for Industrial Democracy, the National Council of the YMCA, and the National Council of the YWCA.[32] The opening speeches at the convention were made by Fiorello LaGuadia, then mayor of New York, and Governor John Winant of New Hampshire. After they left Miss Ilma came to the podium, and after several unsuccessful

---

[29]"Youth Divides," The New Republic, LXXX (August 29, 1934), p. 62.

[30]New York Times (August 16, 1934), p. 19.

[31]Ibid.

[32]Ibid. (August 15, 1934), p. 5.

attempts to talk to the delegates, adjourned the meeting. Later that day a second meeting was called, but again the delegates demanded that Ilma give the delegates a bigger voice in the running of the convention. She again adjourned the meeting, but the delegates refused to leave and instead elected Waldo McNutt of the Rocky Mountain Regional YMCA as the chairman of the convention.[33] This group passed resolutions asking for higher wages, shorter work hours in industry, and the end of the use of war in settling international disputes.[34]

Meanwhile, Viola Ilma and a group of sixty supporters had taken refuge in a nearby hotel. This group elected Ilma as the chairman of the convention.[35] Unfortunately she was the chairman of a convention that she no longer controlled. Miss Ilma complained that the convention had been stolen from her by a group of Communists.[36] Closer to the truth is that she found herself facing revolt because of her own attempt to become the sole arbiter of the Congress. The emergence of the Communists to a position of influence in the American Youth Congress and the part this organization played in the student peace movement will be discussed later.

The attack on war and R.O.T.C. was not limited to youth groups. The Committee on Militarism in Education, which had been active in the twenties in attacking R.O.T.C. was committed to the same goals in the thirties. Lack of funds seriously hampered its activities. Consequently, the major effort this group made was to support legislation by Republican

---

[33]Ibid. (August 16, 1934), p. 19.

[34]"Youth's Vote," The Survey, CXX (September, 1934), p. 289.

[35]New York Times (August 16, 1934), p. 19.

[36]"Youth's Vote," p. 289.

Senator Gerald Nye of North Dakota and farmer-laborite Congressman Paul Kvale of Minnesota; introduced in the Seventy-Fourth Congress, the bills would have ended compulsory military training on the college campus.[37] Neither bill made it out of the Military Affairs Committee, to which both were assigned.[38] Still, Senator Nye used material supplied to him by Oswald Villard, a member of the Committee on Militarism in Education and editor of The Nation magazine, in his attack on the national defense budget.[39]

The early thirties also found various church groups participating in anti-war conferences. The most active church organization in this respect was the Methodist Episcopal Church. In the fall term in 1932 at the University of Maryland, Ennis H. Coale, a freshman from Belair, Maryland, a member of the Methodist Church, and Wayne Lee, a sophomore from Washington and a Unitarian, declared that they could not participate in military training, for it was contrary to their religious beliefs. Both students were suspended by the President of the University, appealing to the Board of Regents, which upheld the suspension.[40]

With the support of the Methodist Episcopal Church, Coale took his case to the courts. He contended that forced military training was a violation of his religious beliefs. Judge Joseph Ulman of the Superior Court of Baltimore agreed and issued a mandamus for Coale to be

---

[37]"Slowing the Military March," The New Republic, LXXXV (September 20, 1935), p. 47.

[38]Congressional Record, 74th Congress, 1st Session, pp. 884; 693.

[39]Congressional Record, 74th Congress, 2nd Session, pp. 6610-6611.

[40]"First Blood in the Fight Against Forced War Drill," The Literary Digest, CXV (February 18, 1933), p. 18; "Maryland Can Compel Military Training," The Christian Century, L (December 6, 1933), pp. 1524-1525.

reinstated to the university. The university then appealed this decision to the Court of Appeals, which reversed Judge Ulman's decision. The reason for this reversal was the introduction of material not presented in the previous trial. It was argued by the lawyers for the university that Coale was acting not out of conscience, but out of a desire to join the Committee on Militarism in Education.[41] Coale took his appeal to the United States Supreme Court, but the Court dismissed the case finding no substantial federal question involved.[42] Thus, this attempt to end compulsory R.O.T.C. through the courts failed.

In 1934, the Methodist Church was once again defending students for refusing to take compulsory military training. Albert Hamilton and Alonzo Reynolds Jr., both Methodists, were suspended from the University of California at Los Angeles for refusing to enroll in R.O.T.C. The case was taken to the State Supreme Court and then to the United States Supreme Court on the grounds that compulsory R.O.T.C. violated the students' constitutional right of religious freedom as well as the spirit of the Kellogg-Briand Pact outlawing war.[43]

The United States Supreme Court ruled that forced military training did not violate the students' constitutional rights. The court decided that attending state universities was a privilege granted by the states, and that the state was within its rights to make military training as a condition for attendance. It was further ruled that the privilege of

---

[41]"Maryland Court Upholds Compulsory Drill," The Christian Century, L (July 12, 1933), pp. 900-901.

[42]Coale, et al. vs. Pearson, et al., 290 U. S. 597 (1933).

[43]Hamilton, et al. vs. Regents of the University of California, 293 U. S. 246-249 (1934).

being a conscientious objector was granted by Congress and was not found in the Constitution.[44] Thus ended the hope of abolishing military training through the courts.

In the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1928, a resolution had been adopted which condemned military training in high schools and compulsory military training in college. This anti-war attitude was also found in Methodist youth groups.[45] At the first meeting of the National Council of Methodist Youth in Evanston, Illinois, August 30 to September 2, 1934, some 1,000 delegates attended from all sections of the country. They adopted a series of resolutions that opposed both compulsory and voluntary military training. They further declared that in following the teachings of Christ they could not sanction or participate in war.[46]

The reaction against war was not limited to students involved in religious groups. On campuses around the nation, students worked against war. The actions of the students for the most part were directed toward the nationwide strikes and anti-war activity. Still, individuals and groups did conduct anti-war and anti-R.O.T.C. activity at such campuses as Ohio State University, the University of California at Los Angeles, and Cornell University. That there was a growing trend in the early thirties among college students toward pacifism, can be seen in the "College Peace Poll" taken by The Literary Digest in

---

[44]Ibid., 262-265.

[45]John Langdale, ed., Doctrine and Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church, 1932 (New York: The Methodist Book Concern, 1932), p. 561.

[46]T. Otto Nall, "Methodist Form New Youth Body," The Christian Century, LI (September 19, 1934), pp. 1182-1183.

cooperation with the Association of College Editors in the first months of 1935. Three hundred and fifty thousand ballots were mailed out the week of January 12, 1935 to 118 colleges and universities to be distributed to all men and women over the age of eighteen, with results sent back to The Literary Digest for tabulation.[47] By February of 1935, 65,000 ballots had been returned from sixty schools. Forty of these schools had voluntary R.O.T.C. and eighteen had compulsory R.O.T.C. It would seem that students at these schools would not strongly support the pacifist position. Yet, 68.31 percent declared that they would not fight if the United States invaded the borders of another country. Also, 90.25 percent felt that the government should control the munitions and armament industry.[48] This last percentage probably reflects how the hearings on the munitions industry held by Senator Nye had affected the college student.

The period between 1932 to 1935 was one in which college protest against war shifted from a scattered movement of local origins to an organized national movement of mutually supporting national organizations. The next period of the movement from 1935 to 1939 was to see the movement become shaken by internal conflicts and transformed from an anti-war movement into an anti-fascist movement. In 1935, the movement was growing and expanding, but in a few years was to crumble.

---

[47]"Digest Help Poll Articulate College Generation," The Literary Digest, CXIX (January 12, 1935), p. 38.

[48]"The League Holds Slim Lead in College Poll," The Literary Digest, CXIX (February 2, 1935), p. 6.

# CHAPTER III

## BATTLE AGAINST WARS, 1936-1939

At 10:45 A.M. on April 22, 1936, Joseph Lash, executive secretary of the American Student Union, and journalist Drew Pearson announced in a nationwide radio address on the Columbia Broadcasting System that in fifteen minutes students throughout the nation would stage a one-hour demonstration against war.[1] Nearly 500,000 students participated in demonstrations at 100 colleges around the country.[2] At some schools the college or university president not only sanctioned the strike but joined in the anti-war rallies. At Vassar College, Dr. Henry Noble MacCraken, president of the college, urged students to do less talking and take more concrete actions against war.[3]

As in past years, the strike was organized by the American Student Union with the cooperation of the Student League for Industrial Democracy, the National Council of Methodist Youth, the Youth Section of the American League Against War and Fascism, the National Student League, local chapters of the YMCA and YWCA, the Veterans of Future Wars, and the

---

[1] New York Times (April 22, 1936), p. 25.

[2] "Students: Striking for Peace, for Teachers, and for Honor," NewsWeek, VII (May 2, 1936), p. 32.

[3] New York Times (April 22, 1936), p. 25.

Interseminary Movement.[4] The goals of the strike were to end compulsory military training in the schools, and to have college students endorse the "Oxford Pledge". The protest faced opposition; at Tulane University, fights broke out during the peace rally; at the University of Kansas, the strike was broken up when someone threw a tear gas canister into the demonstrating students; and at Temple University members of the football team threw tomatoes at the strikers.[5] The American Legion and the Daughters of the American Revolution declared the student strike to be a subversive activity.[6] Still, the anti-war strike was growing, and 350,000 more students were involved in 1936 than in the previous years' strikes.

Participation in the student strike was growing, but so was the dissent within the peace movement. By 1936 the Communist Party of the United States of America had abandoned its staunch pacifist view, instead advocating cooperation between the United States and the Soviet Union as a means to preserve world peace. Earl Browder, the leader of the Communist Party in the United States, proclaimed in a nationwide address that the danger of war came from the actions of the fascist powers of the world. He went on to demand that action be taken by the United States government to join with the Soviet Union and save Spain from the ravages of fascism. This, Browder felt, was the only honorable peace policy.[7]

At the 1936 Christmas convention of the American Student Union the

---

[4]"Striking for a Warless World," The Literary Digest, LXXI (April 11, 1936), p. 35.

[5]New York Times (April 22, 1936), p. 25.

[6]Ibid., p. 2.

[7]Earl Browder, The People's Front (New York: International Publishers, 1938), pp. 70-74. This is from Browder's nationwide broadcast on the National Broadcasting Company radio network on August 28, 1936.

Socialists, who opposed Browder's "peace policy", introduced a resolution denouncing the policy of "collective security" as being pro-war. The Communists, following Browder's lead, and liberals joined forces to defeat this resolution.[8] The apparent reason for the liberals voting with the Communists was their view of the Spanish Civil War, in which the liberals felt that fascist aggression was an evil that could only be stopped by decisive action. An example of the changing attitude of liberals can be seen in the actions of the executive secretary of the American Student Union, Joseph Lash. Lash began to doubt the wisdom of the pacifist standpoint in 1936, and in May of 1937 he went to Spain, spending three months there. Intending to serve in the Loyalist forces, and actually spending some time with the McKenzie-Pepipineau Battalion, Lash never actually joined the army. Instead, once he got to Spain, he spoke to youth groups there on young people in America.[9] On returning to the United States, Lash used his position as the executive secretary of the American Student Union to support the lifting of the United States' embargo on trade with Spain.[10]

The split between the Communists and liberals, who supported a program advocating "collective security", and the Socialists, who advocated the retention of the "Oxford Pledge", surfaced in the 1937 convention of the American Student Union. Opening at Vassar College on December 26,

---

[8]Patti Peterson, "Student Organizations and the Antiwar Movement in America, 1900-1960," American Studies, XIII (Spring, 1970), p. 156.

[9]United States Congress, House, "Testimony of Joseph Lash," Hearings, Investigation of Un-American Propaganda Activities; hereafter referred to as I.U.P.A., VI, 1942, p. 2811.

[10]United States Congress, House, "Testimony of Joseph Lash," I.U.P.A., XI, 1939, p. 7084.

1937, the convention received greetings from President Franklin Roosevelt.[11] Joseph Lash then began the attack on the "Oxford Pledge" by denouncing such pledges as valueless. This denunciation was echoed by the chairman of the American Student Union, Joseph Cadden, who was a member of the Communist-line National Student League.[12] Finally after much debate the convention voted for the removal of the "Oxford Pledge" by a vote of 129 for and 39 against.[13] The convention also adopted a series of resolutions which declared the fascist powers to be the aggressors in Spain and asked that the trade embargo be used only against aggressor nations and not Loyalist Spain. Harold Draper, a Socialist, expressed disgust with the resolution. He claimed that such a program would put the United States on the road to war.[14] After the convention ended the Socialists charged that the Young Communist League had been instrumental in the rejection of the "Oxford Pledge" by the American Student Union. It was then announced that Socialists would no longer participate in the American Student Union.[15] James Wechsler also left the American Student Union and took a position writing for The Nation. He was replaced by Lloyd James of the University of Chicago.[16]

One thousand delegates representing 20,000 students attended the 1938 convention of the American Student Union. This convention received

---

[11] New York Times (December 28, 1937), p. 3.

[12] Ibid. (December 29, 1937), p. 10.

[13] Ibid. (December 30, 1937), p. 20.

[14] Ibid.

[15] Ibid. (January 1, 1938), p. 7.

[16] United States Congress, House, "Testimony of Walter Steele," I.U.P.A., I, 1938, p. 583.

greetings from the President of the United States, the mayor of New York and the president of the City College of New York.[17] The convention atmosphere was festive with "a quintet of white-flanneled cheer leaders, a swing band and shaggers doing the Campus Stomp ('... everybody's doing it, ASUing it') and confetti".[18] The delegates suggested that the United States should support the Loyalists and the Soviet Union in Spain, and further they recommended that a revision of the Neutrality Act be made giving the President wide discretionary powers. Finally, they agreed to the concept that the United States should maintain an army and navy for self defense.[19]

At this convention the American Student Union again approved of the United Student Peace Committee, originally set up in 1937 under the leadership of Molly Yard. This organization was affiliated with some seventeen national youth groups including the International Intercollegiate Christian Council, the Committee on Militarism in Education, National Council of Methodist Youth, and the American League for Peace and Democracy. The duties of the peace committee were to supervise the annual student peace strike.[20]

In 1937 the United Student Peace Committee not only called for the annual peace strike on April 22, but also asked the students to fast for

---

[17] New York Times (December 26, 1938), p. 26; Ibid. (December 27, 1938), p. 26.

[18] Bruce Bliven, Jr., "Citizens of Tomorrow," New Republic, XCVII (January 11, 1939), p. 283.

[19] New York Times (December 31, 1938), p. 13.

[20] United States Congress, House, "Testimony of Walter Steele," I.U.P.A., I, 1938, p. 583. The Intercollegiate Christian Council was the coordinating committee for joint activities of the YMCA and YWCA.

peace between 4:00 p.m. until 10:00 p.m. that evening. The committee asked that the money usually spent by the students for supper be given to the committee to be divided among the thirteen organizations involved in the strike.[21] The American Student Union issued a statement that their share of the funds would go to sending food to the people of Spain. It was expected that some one million students from over 500 colleges would join in the demonstration. The strike received support from Senator Robert LaFollette of Wisconsin, who gave a fifteen minute radio address favoring the strike. The governor of Minnesota, Elmer Benson, declared the day of the peace strike as "Peace Day" and encouraged the youth of the state to join in the demonstrations.[22]

As a result of the dropping of the "Oxford Pledge" by the American Student Union, there was a great amount of uncertainty on the future of the peace strike in 1938. The United Student Peace Committee asked that demonstrations for peace be held on April 27, 1938, but the goals of the demonstrations were to be decided by the individual peace groups.[23] The American Student Union favored having the students pledge to fight against fascism. This sparked counter-demonstrations on the day of the peace strike by Socialist groups favoring the "Oxford Pledge".[24] The conflict did not weaken the turnout for the peace strike, for about a million students were involved in the strike.[25] The peace strike of 1939

---

[21]New York Times (April 4, 1937), II, p. 8.

[22]Ibid. (April 18, 1937), II, p. 5.

[23]Ibid. (April 24, 1938), II, p. 4.

[24]Ibid. (April 28, 1938), p. 4.

[25]United States Congress, House, "Testimony of Joseph Lash," I.U.P.A., XI, 1939, p. 7080.

was a rerun of the 1938 strike, except that the United Student Peace Committee decided not to designate the demonstration as a peace strike.[26] The American Student Union through the United Student Peace Committee advocated supporting the Roosevelt administration in its effort to stop fascism. The Socialists again held demonstrations attacking the peace striking as being pro-war.[27]

The American Student Union and other peace groups that had a substantial Communist membership faced a crisis over the German-Soviet Non-Aggression Pact of 1939. This agreement was followed by the German invasion of Poland on September 1, then by a Russian invasion from the east on September 17, 1939. Great Britain and France declared war on Germany, which opened the Second World War in Europe. The Communist Party of America issued a statement which claimed that the Soviet Union had at last been saved from the imperialist powers of Great Britain and France. These two countries were seen as creating an imperialist war, using the invasion of Poland only as an excuse for their aggression. The manifesto then proclaimed that the only stance the United States should take was to avoid involvement in the European war. The Young Communist League followed the Party and declared that this time "the Yanks are not coming".[28]

The American Student Union remained quiet on the approach that it would take on the German-Soviet Non-Aggression Pact. The liberals still

---

[26]Ibid., pp. 7080-7081.

[27]New York Times (April 21, 1939), p. 10.

[28]United States Congress, House, "Exhibit No. 165, Leaflet published by National Committee of the Communist Party of the United States of America," I.U.P.A., Appendix Part 1, 1940, pp. 844-847.

had faith that the Union would take a stand against the actions of the Soviet Union. Joseph Lash, still the executive secretary, denounced both the German-Soviet Non-Aggression Pact and the Russian attack on Finland of November.[29] These developments forced the Communist leaders to start building support in local chapters of the American Student Union for the new Russian policy. Wechsler, now working for The Nation, predicted that if the Union would support the Soviet Union, then the organization would be wrecked.[30] The Harvard Crimson claimed if the Soviet policy was upheld, then the Harvard chapter would withdraw from the Union.[31]

The American Student Union convention opened in December at Madison, Wisconsin, with Lash trying to prevent the complete approval of Soviet policy. The Harvard chapter made a motion to condemn the Soviet attack on Finland, being defeated, 322 to 49.[32] Next the convention supported the ideas of the Young Communist League that the young Americans would not fight in an imperialist inspired European war. It was suggested that a nationwide referendum be taken on the question with all members of the Union participating, but this was voted down at the convention by a vote of 322 to 29.[33] After this, Lash and Yard resigned from the Union and were replaced by Communists.[34]

---

[29]Joseph Lash, Eleanor Roosevelt, A Friend's Memoirs (New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1964), pp. 18-19.

[30]James Wechsler, "Politics on the Campus" The Nation, CXLIX (December 30, 1939), pp. 732-733.

[31]Ibid., p. 733.

[32]New York Times (December 30, 1939), p. 3.

[33]Ibid. (December 31, 1939), p. 11.

[34]Draper, p. 182.

Another Communist organization involved in the student peace movement was the American League Against War and Fascism. In Cleveland, Ohio, January 3 through 5, 1936, the Third United States Congress Against War and Fascism sponsored by the League met, and adopted a ten-point program opposing war, calling for the end of military training in schools, demanding universal disarmament by all nations and condemning fascism.[35] Much discord surfaced among the 2,200 delegates attending the Congress. The Socialists accused the League of being a mere Communist tool, and the isolationists demanded that the League condemn the League of Nations.[36]

At the Fourth Congress, held in Pittsburgh November 26-28, 1937, the meeting was picketed by Catholics, who denounced the Communist tendencies of the League. The Congress was attended by 1,320 delegates representing 806 organizations. The major work at this Congress was to change the name of the League to the American League for Peace and Democracy, and to weaken their anti-war stand. The convention passed resolutions asking the United States government to permit the shipment of arms and munitions to Spain, in order to stop fascist aggression.[37] Also at the Fourth Congress the Communist Party withdrew as an official sponsor, but it was obvious that the Congress followed the Party line.[38]

Until the announcement of the German-Soviet Non-Aggression Pact, the

---

[35]United States Congress, House, "Testimony of Harry Freeman Ward, Chairman of the American League for Peace and Democracy," I.U.P.A., XI, 1940, pp. 6256-6257.

[36]James Wechsler, "American Pacifism Seeks a Policy," The New Republic, LXXXV (January 8, 1936), p. 249.

[37]Robert Morss Lovett, "For Peace and Democracy," The New Republic, XLIII (December 15, 1937), pp. 164-165.

[38]Herbert Solon, "Stalin's Great American Hoax," The American Mercury, XLVIII (December, 1939), p. 398.

League advocated abandonment of the neutrality laws by the United States, and worked toward the defeat of the Ludlow Amendment which would have put the question of war to a national referendum before the United States could participate in any war. After the Pact, the League found fascism not so repulsive, supported the Ludlow Amendment, and agreed with the neutrality laws. This change shocked many within the League, and by the end of 1939, the League's popularity had plummeted.[39]

Another group which contained a large group of Communist members was the American Youth Congress. Waldo McNutt was the national chairman until January of 1936 when William W. Hinckley, a young Florida psychology teacher, took over the position and held it until July of 1939.[40] The Second American Youth Congress lasted from July 5 through July 7, 1935, in Detroit, Michigan. The convention supported a program including proposals advocating anti-war demonstrations, striking against manufacturers of munitions, transferring defense funds to other projects and abolishing military training in the colleges.[41] Some friction arose in the meeting when the delegates from various religious groups expressed anxiety about working with Communist groups, but they remained within the Congress.[42]

At the 1936 convention of the American Youth Congress, Eleanor Roosevelt talked to the delegates about the National Youth Administration.

---

[39]Ibid., pp. 400-402.

[40]United States Congress, House, "Statement of William W. Hinckley, former executive secretary of the American Youth Congress," I.U.P.A., XI, 1940, pp. 7036-7037.

[41]United States Congress, House, "Testimony of Walter Steele," I.U.P.A., I, 1938, p. 612.

[42]United States Congress, House, "Testimony of Oliver Kenneth Goff, a member of the Young Communist League, I.U.P.A., IX, 1939, p. 5623.

The delegates were for the most part hostile to the programs of the National Youth Administration, but Eleanor Roosevelt turned many at the convention into supporters of the programs of the administration. At the end of her speech, she told the delegates that at any time, they could come to the White House to discuss the problems facing youth.[43] This friendship between Mrs. Roosevelt and the American Youth Congress grew and gave the Congress a position of influence in the White House.

The American Youth Congress continued to grow, and in 1937 it claimed participation by 1,007 organizations representing some 1,650,000 youths. During this year, plans were made for the American Youth Congress to host the World Youth Congress. The World Youth Congress came from the Second International Youth Conference for Peace held in Brussels, Belgium in February, 1934. This group had ties with the Communist Party, and at the first meeting of this organization praised the Soviet Union.[44]

The American Youth Congress arranged for the World Youth Congress to be held at Vassar College at Poughkeepsie, New York, from August 15 to August 24, 1938.[45] Some 500 organizations were represented at the meeting, including the Young Communist League, the National Student Federation, the American Student Union, the National Council of Methodist Youth, the YMCA and the YWCA.[46] The delegates were welcomed by the President of Vassar, Henry MacCracken, and the mayor of New York, Fiorello

---

[43]Lash, pp. 3-4.

[44]United States Congress, House, "Testimony of Walter Steele," I.U.P.A., I, p. 614.

[45]Ibid., pp. 614-615.

[46]James Wechsler, "Parliament of Youth," The Nation, CXLVII (August 27, 1938), p. 204; Evelyn Roe, "Another Generation Heard From," The Christian Science Monitor (August 17, 1938), p. 3.

LaGuardia.[47] Mrs. Roosevelt was very enthusiastic about the World Youth Congress and donated one hundred dollars to it.[48] She also gave an address to the Congress and attended several sessions just to listen to the delegates debate the issues before the Congress.[49] Resolutions passed in the Congress condemned aggressive war and proclaimed that youth would not participate in any such war. Boycotting the Congress on the grounds that it was a Communist organization were the youth representatives from Germany and Italy, the Catholic Church and the Boy Scouts of America.[50] The Congress showed that the emphasis in Communist front organizations was changing from being anti-war to being anti-fascist.

The Fifth American Youth Congress was held July 1 through 5, 1939, in New York City. Attending were 1,000 delegates representing 513 organizations, including the American Student Union, National Student Federation, the National Council of Methodist Youth, Young Judea, the Young Presbyterians, YMCA, YWCA, Young Democrats, and Young Republicans.[51] The main battle in the Congress was not over a peace policy but over whether or not the Congress should eject Communist delegates. Murray Plavner, a delegate from the Youth Council for American Democracy, had written a pamphlet entitled, "Is the American Youth Congress a Communist Front?" and now he wanted the Congress to pass a resolution condemning Communism.[52]

---

[48] New York Times (August 10, 1938), p. 17.

[49] Ibid. (August 19, 1938), p. 21; Ibid. (August 21, 1938), p. 11.

[50] "Youth Congress," p. 22.

[51] United States Congress, House, "Statement of William W. Hinckley, former executive secretary of the American Youth Congress, I.U.P.A., XI, 1940, pp. 7039-7040.

[52] New York Times (July 2, 1939), p. 16.

Sixteen members of the greater New York City Council, fifty-six members of the New York State Legislature, and Michael Walsh, Secretary of State for New York, also asked the Congress to condemn Communism.[53] Despite these appeals, the Congress by acclamation rejected the anti-Communism resolution. Instead the convention adopted a resolution that condemned all dictatorships. Even Gilbert Green, the chairman of the Young Communist League, found this resolution acceptable because the government of the Soviet Union was considered to be a democracy and not a dictatorship.[54] Still, Eleanor Roosevelt defended the American Youth Congress from charges that it was a Communist front organization, and she even addressed the convention after it had rejected the anti-Communist resolution. She argued that as a democratic organization the Congress should not limit its membership.[55]

Not only were Communists interested in the student, but pacifist organizations were also concerned with the student attitude toward war. The Committee on Militarism in Education continued in an effort to stop compulsory military training on college campuses by suggesting alternative courses. Their opposition continued through the beginning of the European phase of World War II. In order to achieve their goals, they lobbied in Congress, supported the student anti-war movement, and supported anti-R.O.T.C. activity on campuses around the country.[56]

In addition to the Committee on Militarism in Education, several

---

[53]Ibid. (July 3, 1939), p. 1.

[54]Ibid. (July 4, 1939), p. 1.

[55]Ibid., p. 11.

[56]"Timely Opposition to Militarism in Education," The School Review, LXVII (December, 1939), pp. 723-724.

churches were very much involved in the student peace drive. The churches played a supporting role during the late thirties as their youth organization joined in anti-war projects on college campuses. The churches faced a serious dilemma that hindered them from giving full endorsement to the student peace movement, for some church leaders decided that they could not join with atheistic Communists even in an attempt to end war.[57]

The major effort of the churches was channeled into an attempt to consolidate the various peace groups into one organization in order to avoid duplication. This effort was headed by Dr. Walter Van Kirk, Secretary of the Department of International Justice and Goodwill of the Federal Council of Churches. He formed in 1936 the National Peace Conference, which served as a coordinating organization for some thirty national peace groups including the YMCA, YWCA, the National Student Federation and the Committee on Militarism in Education.[58] One of the first activities of this group was to issue a report on the status of military training in schools and colleges, and another was to analyze the legislative proposals for ending compulsory military training.[59]

Not only were adult peace groups interested in ending the militarism on the college campuses, but the students were equally interested in this project, and at times the two forces joined together on projects. Frustrated by attempts to abolish R.O.T.C. through congressional and legal

---

[57]Allan Hunter, "Pacifists and the 'United Front'," The Christian Century, LIII (January 8, 1936), pp. 47-49.

[58]"Peace Groups Get Together," The Christian Century, LIII (January 1, 1936), p. 22.

[59]"Compulsory Drill," The Survey, LXXII (December, 1936), p. 376.

actions, the students and peace groups turned to the use of the referendum as a method of ending compulsory military training. This movement began in Oregon after an attempt to end forced R.O.T.C. at the University of Oregon failed in 1934, when a 44-44 faculty vote was broken by President C. Valentine Boyer voting in favor of retaining forced R.O.T.C. The next year an attempt to pass a resolution abolishing military training in the state colleges died in the state Senate by a vote of 19 to 8. This defeat led to the formation of the Committee for Peace and Freedom by Charles Paddock, a junior at the University of Oregon. Oswald Garrison Villard, an editor of The Nation and member of the Committee on Militarism in Education, accepted the position of honorary chairman of the organization.[60]

This organization attempted to get a proposal on the Oregon ballot asking for optional military training at the state colleges. If the resolution passed, then compulsory military training would be dropped at the University of Oregon at Eugene, Oregon, and Oregon State Agricultural College at Corvallis, Oregon. Opposition to the petition mounted as the American Legion, the governor of Oregon, and the President of the State Agricultural College attacked the proposal. President George W. Peavy of Oregon State Agricultural College went so far as to forbid the circulation of the referendum petition on that campus.[61]

The students were able to gain more than 20,000 signatures for the petition, thus getting it on the ballot. The results of this vote were

---

[60]"Oregon: Battle-Ground of R.O.T.C.," The Literary Digest, LXXII (November 14, 1936), p. 19.

[61]Ibid.; Richard Neuberger, "Oregon's People Confront the Military Drill Issue," The Christian Century, LIII (August 19, 1936), p. 1111.

watched with interest in the states of Washington, Idaho, California, and Nevada, where similar measures were contemplated.[62] The measure seemed certain of passage, for it was backed by the local American Federation of Labor, the churches, and various peace groups.[63] The people of Oregon, however, unexpectedly voted 212,246 to 131,917 against the proposal. Edwin Johnson, the national secretary of the Committee on Militarism in Education, claimed that churches in Oregon did not support the proposal as strongly as he expected.[64] Other reasons given for the failure were that only $901 were spent in supporting the proposal and that all seven of the proposals on the ballot went down to defeat.[65] This discouraged other attempts to end compulsory military training by use of the ballot.

The most creative and devastating attack on war by the students came about by accident. At Princeton University on March 16, 1936, a group of conservative young Democrats sat eating their evening meal and discussing the Adjusted Payment Compensation Bill passed by Congress over the veto of President Franklin Roosevelt. This bill gave veterans of the First World War a bonus of redeemable nine-year interest-bearing bonds.[66] The conversation turned from gloom to delight when Lewis Gorin, a senior, suggested that the students form the Veterans of Future Wars in order to satirize the greed of the treasury-raiding, bonus-grabbing veteran groups.

---

[62] Ibid.

[63] New York Times (July 5, 1936), p. 11.

[64] Edwin Johnson, "Did the Churches Dodge in Oregon," The Christian Century, LIC (January 15, 1937), pp. 52-53.

[65] "Compulsory Drill in Oregon," The Christian Century, LIII (December 23, 1936), pp. 1709-1710.

[66] New York Times (March 17, 1936), p. 24.

This idea was immediately agreed to by the others at the table.[67]

Robert Barnes, a junior in journalism, saved the group from obscurity by writing an article for the school newspaper that was picked up by The New York Times. Three days after the founding of the Veterans of Future Wars, nineteen schools applied for charters for their local posts. The Veterans adopted a national program calling for a bonus of $1,000 to every male between the ages of 18 and 36 to be paid in 1965. Of course since many of these future veterans would be killed or crippled by the next war, they demanded that the bonus be given to them in 1936 with three percent interest compounded annually and retroactive from the first of June of 1965. The salute of this organization was the Nazi salute, but with the palm turned upward ready to grasp the bonus money. Also the future veterans founded the Future Gold Star Mothers of America, and for these mothers they asked a trip to Europe to visit the future gravesites of their sons. An initiation fee of 25¢ was established for those wishing to become members. Four days after the founding, some thirty posts of the Veterans of Future Wars had been formed.[68] The astonishing growth of the organization seemed to be due to its attack on war rather than to the satire of the veterans bonus.

On March 18, 1936, at Boston University, the first association of Chaplains of Future Wars was founded. The future chaplains claimed they would practice giving inspirational talks to troops as they prepared to kill, cripple and maim in the name of Christ. They also planned to start preaching funeral orations now for those that would not live through

---

[67]Ibid. (March 19, 1936), p. 27.

[68]Ibid. (March 20, 1936), p. 21.

battle, as well as to institute a memorial day for the Future Unknown Soldiers.[69]

The Veterans of Future Wars were attacked by James Van Zandt, the national commander-in-chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, as being communistic and pacifist.[70] Also they came under fire from the Gold Star Mothers of America, so the Veterans of Future Wars changed the name of the ladies auxiliary to the Home Fire Division.[71] On college campuses, students rushed to join the future veterans. Cornell University began the first chapter of Future Munitions Workers. Rensselaer Polytechnic began the Profiteers of Future Wars dedicated to the purpose of securing fat government contracts. Following this action, Sweetbriar College formed the Future Gold Diggers of Future Wars with the intention of sitting on the laps of future profiteers and sipping their champagne.[72] Rutgers University became the home of the Association of Future War Propagandists, who wanted the government to pay them to work on garbling war dispatches for patriotic purposes and creating atrocity stories for the next war. This group started a contest to find a slogan for the next war.[73]

The first test for the Veterans of Future Wars came with the approach of the spring student anti-war strike. Lewis Gorin, the national chairman, hesitated to take a stand on the question, and finally stated that

---

[69]John D. Lee, Jr., "Chaplains of Future Wars," The Christian Century, LIII (April 22, 1936), pp. 603-604.

[70]New York Times (March 22, 1936), p. 19.

[71]Ibid. (March 21, 1936), p. 19.

[72]Ibid. (March 29, 1936), p. 11.

[73]Ibid. (March 21, 1936), p. 19.

the Veterans of Future Wars would not criticize American war preparation, neither would they challenge the right of R.O.T.C. to exist on campus; nor would they endorse the student anti-war strike. This official position was not upheld by the membership of the organization, many of whom participated in the student demonstrations on campuses. Usually the action they took was a march known as the parade of the Future Unknown Soldiers.[74]

During the summer, the membership of the Veterans of Future Wars grew to 50,000. The group began to become more politically active by announcing that it supported the movement toward a proposed national referendum before this country could enter any war.[75] Still, the leadership hesitated in making the Veterans of Future Wars an anti-war organization, and in October of 1936, the national chairman revoked the charters of the 500 posts. The leadership was upset at the shift in the organization from protesting the veteran's bonus to protesting war. Thus, it was announced that the Veterans of Future Wars would engage in no projects until after the national presidential election.[76] In April of 1937, the Veterans of Future Wars was dissolved with a final membership of 60,000 and a debt of 44 cents.[77]

The Veterans of Future Wars showed, humorously, the anti-war sentiment that existed among college students. Yet every effort to end R.O.T.C. or have the United States government adopt a peace policy was

---

[74]James Wechsler, "Treason Among Future Veterans," The Nation, CXLII (May 27, 1936), pp. 672-673.

[75]New York Times (June 1, 1936), p. 6.

[76]Ibid. (October 23, 1936), p. 25.

[77]Ibid. (April 4, 1937), p. 15.

defeated. The students saw war break out, first in Spain and then in all of Europe, and the Communists carefully manipulated the anti-war movement into becoming an anti-fascist movement. The attempts of the Communists after 1939 to change the movement back into an anti-war movement will be discussed in the next chapter along with student attitudes toward the approaching war.

## CHAPTER IV

## WAR TRIUMPHANT, 1940-1941

The years between 1939 and 1941 saw a shift in the attitudes of the young toward war and military training. An example of this can be seen in polls taken by the American Institute of Public Opinion between September of 1939 and August of 1940. The poll asked the question, "Should every able-bodied American boy twenty years old be required to go into the army or navy for one year?" The results follow.

| | Yes, In Favor | No, Oppose |
|---|---|---|
| September, 1939<br>Under 30 Years | 36% | 64% |
| May, 1940<br>Total Under 30 | 44% | 56% |
| June 25, 1940<br>Men 21-25 Years | 52% | 48% |
| July 11, 1940<br>15-20 Years<br>21-29 Years | 67%<br>62% | 33%<br>38% |
| August 15, 1940<br>Men 16-21 Years<br>Men 21-24 Years | 67%<br>63% | 33%<br>37%[1] |

The polls indicate the steady decline of enthusiasm among young people toward the peace movement.

This decline in enthusiasm by youth was most likely due to the

---

[1]Hadley Cantril, ed., Public Opinion, 1935-1946 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1951), p. 459.

deteriorating international situation and the expose of the major youth anti-war groups as being under heavy Communist influence. The programs advocated by the American Student Union and the American Youth Congress became identical after 1939. Membership in the American Student Union dropped to a low of 2,000 students by 1940, and the organization ceased to exist shortly after the United States entered the Second World War.[2]

In February of 1940, the American Youth Congress held a four day citizenship institute in Washington, D.C. More than 4,000 representatives attended this rally. Mrs. Roosevelt found places for the delegates to stay while they were in Washington. Eight of the top officers of the American Youth Congress even stayed in the White House as guests of Mrs. Roosevelt.[3] Not everyone greeted the American Youth Congress delegates with praise. John Hamilton, chairman of the Republican National Committee, refused to let Young Republican Clubs attend the meeting, charging that the Congress was a Communist controlled organization.[4] Young Judea, a Jewish youth organization, was dissolved by its parent organization for not withdrawing from the American Youth Congress.[5]

A small group of delegates led by Murray Plavner came to Washington demanding that the American Youth Congress denounce the Soviet Union. Plavner was supported by Gene Tunney, former heavyweight boxing champion of the world and at that time a director of the Catholic Youth

---

[2]Hal Draper, "The Student Movement of the Thirties," As We Saw The Thirties, Rita Simon, ed. (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1967), pp. 181-182.

[3]New York Times (February 9, 1940), p. 10.

[4]Ibid. (February 5, 1940), p. 1.

[5]Ibid. (February 4, 1940), p. 32.

Organization, the Boy Scouts of America, and the Boys' Clubs of America; Tunney wanted the Congress either to expel the Communist members or to be exposed as a Communist front organization.[6] Archibald Roosevelt, the grandson of President Theodore Roosevelt, attempted to introduce the proposal backed by Plavner's group that would give the delegates a chance to condemn Communism, but he was ruled out of order and with two other delegates was thrown out of the convention hall. However, the delegates did condemn any giving of aid by the United States to Finland. They also demanded that the United States stay out of the imperialist European war.[7]

The high point of the meeting was reached when the delegates made a march on the White House in a drizzling rain. President Roosevelt let the youths stand in the rain for an hour before he came out on the South Portico of the White House to address them. First, he chastised them for the stand they had taken on the Soviet invasion of Finland. He declared that the people of the United States were 98 percent behind the Finns in their efforts to save themselves from Soviet domination. Roosevelt proceeded then to denounce as "twaddle" the suggestion that United States aid to Finland would draw this country into an imperialist war, and he told the youths that they know nothing about United States foreign policy.[8] Despite this reprimand by the President, Mrs. Roosevelt attended the next session of the convention and reaffirmed her support of the American Youth Congress.[9] Also she defended the American Youth

---

[6]Ibid. (February 9, 1940), p. 10.

[7]Ibid.

[8]Ibid. (February 11, 1940), p. 1.

[9]Ibid., p. 45.

Congress for not condemning the Soviet Union.[10]

The national convention of the American Youth Congress in 1940 was held July 3 through 7 at Lake Geneva, Wisconsin. The year before some 500 organizations sent delegates, but now only 177 organizations sent delegates.[11] Plavner turned up at the convention with some forty followers in an effort to have the convention denounce the Communists and to eliminate the Communist organizations from participating in the Congress. His group was not even allowed to attend the meetings of the Congress on the grounds that they had not registered as delegates before a June 24 deadline.[12] Gene Tunney came to Lake Geneva to express his support for Plavner's group. The Congress requested Tunney to make an address to them, but he refused. Instead, he denounced the Congress as being Communistic.[13]

Inside the convention, Franklin Cramer, a delegate from the University of Wisconsin, attempted without success to get a resolution passed condemning Russia as a dictatorship. In its place, the convention passed a resolution condemning all Communist, Fascist or Nazi dictatorships.[14] Joseph Lash attempted to stop the convention from passing an anti-conscription resolution, but he was unable to get enough votes to defeat the resolution.[15] The convention also passed a resolution urging the

---

[10]Ibid. (February 12, 1940), p. 1.

[11]Ibid. (July 3, 1940), p. 13.

[12]Ibid. (July 4, 1940), p. 32.

[13]Ibid. (July 7, 1940), p. 26.

[14]Ibid.

[15]Ibid. (July 8, 1940), p. 2.

strict neutrality of the United States in the European war by a vote of 384 favoring neutrality and 19 against. Another resolution declared that American youth would only fight if this nation was attacked. Then they criticized the Roosevelt administration for lending of war materials to England.[16] Despite these actions by the Congress, Mrs. Roosevelt argued that the Communist students should not be purged from the American Youth Congress. She did, however, attack the pacifist position that the American Youth Congress had adopted.[17]

The first months of 1941 found the American Youth Congress more vigorous in its opposition to war. The Congress claimed that the financiers of Wall Street and the President of the United States were about to push this country into an European war. They attacked the Lend-Lease Bill as a measure that would push the United States into war. The group sponsored rallies to demonstrate to the Roosevelt administration that the people were against the Lend-Lease proposal.[18]

The American Youth Congress held the last student anti-war strike in April of 1941. The American Student Union also supported the strike, but the strike had lost the backing of the YMCA, the National Council of Methodist Youths and other religious groups which did not want to associate themselves with the "communistic" American Youth Congress and American Student Union. Still, the American Youth Congress claimed that 125 colleges and some 500,000 students would participate in the strike. The

---

[16]Ibid. (July 7, 1940), p. 26.

[17]Ibid. (September 17, 1940), p. 1.

[18]United States Congress, House, Committee on Un-American Activities, "Testimony of Reverend Jack McMichael, former chairman of the American Youth Congress," Hearings, Communist Activity Among Youth Groups, 83rd Congress, 2nd Session, 1953, pp. 2712-2719.

purpose of the strike was to keep American troops from being sent to Europe.[19] These actions by the American Youth Congress cost them the support of Mrs. Roosevelt. Early in 1941, she had stated that the foreign policy that the Congress advocated was unrealistic, and she declined an invitation to speak to a meeting of the Congress in Washington.[20]

This whole program of pacifism by the Congress changed when on June 22, 1941, Nazi panzers roared across the German-Russian border and thus ended the 1939 Non-Aggression pact between the two countries. The American Youth Congress called on the United States government to give immediate aid to England, the Soviet Union and China in order that these countries could destroy fascism. They then asked that the Neutrality Act be repealed at once and if necessary an American Expeditionary Force be assembled and sent to fight in Europe.[21]

The fall of the American Student Union and the American Youth Congress left a void in campus leadership. An attempt to fill this void was made by the International Student Service. This organization was originally organized in 1920 for the purpose of raising relief funds for starving European students, and in 1923 the purpose was changed to helping refugee students. After 1939 the executive committee decided that it would attempt to provide leadership for the youth movement.[22] In

---

[19] New York Times (April 23, 1941), p. 23.

[20] Ibid. (January 31, 1941), p. 12.

[21] United States Congress, House, Special Committee on Un-American Activities, "Statement of James B. Matthews," Hearings, Investigation of Un-American Propaganda Activities in the United States; hereinafter referred to as I.U.P.A., XIV, 1944, p. 10286.

[22] United States Congress, House, "Testimony of Joseph Lash," I.U.P.A., VI, 1942, pp. 2802-2803.

November of 1940, Joseph Lash became the general secretary of the organization. Before joining the International Student Service, Lash had attempted to interest the YMCA and YWCA in taking over the leadership of the youth movement, but neither of these groups was interested in the proposition.

The reason that Lash joined the International Student Service was to create an anti-Communist youth movement as opposed to the youth movement created by the American Youth Congress and the American Student Union.[23] Eleanor Roosevelt, though never condemning the American Youth Congress, gave her full support to the International Student Service. She agreed to accept a position on the executive board of the International Student Service.[24] Further, she made available the Roosevelt home on Campobello Island to the International Student Service to use for their American Summer Student Leadership Institute.[25]

In January of 1941, the International Student Service merged with Work Camps for Democrats, which believed in solving community problems by sending students to summer camps for the purpose of helping the community. At the December, 1940, convention of the group, a merger was attempted with the National Student Federation of America. The Federation withdrew from the American Youth Congress, but refused to merge with the International Student Service. The Federation officers felt that the International Student Service was too closely connected to the Roosevelt

---

[23]Ibid., p. 2805.

[24]New York Times (July 22, 1940), p. 26.

[25]Ibid. (May 4, 1941), p. 45.

Administration.[26] It was not until January 2, 1942, that the two organizations merged.[27] After the invasion of Russia by German forces, the American Student Union and American Youth Congress proposed a merger with the International Student Service, but noting his past experience with the Communist groups, Lash rejected the offer.[28]

After the decision by the American League for Peace and Democracy to support the Communist position on the German-Russian Non-Aggression Pact of 1939, the League started losing influence. The question of whether or not to condemn the Russian invasion of Finland finally destroyed the League. The executive committee debated over the question of denouncing Russia for invading Finland. The solution that the committee finally reached satisfied no one. It was decided to call for an arms embargo against Russia, but at the same time, the committee declared that Russia was not to be placed in the same category with Germany, Italy or Japan. The executive committee soon realized that a more forthright decision on its relationship with the Soviet Union was needed. Unable to reach agreement, the executive committee dissolved the League in February of 1940.[29]

Even though the national organization was defunct, some local chapters struggled on until June of 1940, when the American Peace Mobilization rose from the ashes of the League and absorbed their local chapters. The

---

[26]Ibid. (December 31, 1940), p. 1.

[27]Ibid. (January 2, 1942), p. 21.

[28]United States Congress, House, "Testimony of Joseph Lash," I.U.P.A., VI, 1942, p. 2804.

[29]Alson J. Smith, "Death of a League," The New Republic, CII (March 18, 1940), pp. 373-374; United States Congress, House, "Testimony of Hazel Huffman, Brooklyn, New York," I.U.P.A., XIV, 1941, p. 8392.

American Peace Mobilization was founded by Israel Amter, the New York State chairman of the Communist Party, and Charles Krumbein, the secretary of the Communist Party of the United States. The American Peace Mobilization had the support of the Communist Party, the Young Communist League, the American Student Union and the American Youth Congress. The program adopted by the group was the usual litany of the Communist Party. They proclaimed the need of the United States to stay out of the European war. Further, they attacked the Selective Service Act as an unnecessary war-provoking action, and they found Lend-Lease to be an evil to be avoided.[30]

As the German troops crossed the Russian border, the American Peace Mobilization was picketing the White House in protest against the lend-lease program. This picketing immediately halted and the American Peace Mobilization announced that it was going to reevaluate its program. Three weeks later, it advocated that the U.S. should give all possible aid to the Soviet Union in an effort to defeat fascism. The name of the American Peace Mobilization was changed to the American People's Mobilization, and their program was for all-out effort by the United States in giving aid to the Soviet Union to stop fascism.[31]

Unlike the Communist groups, the churches and peace organizations continued to fight against militarism. The Committee on Militarism in Education continued to push for the eradication of compulsory R.O.T.C. on campus and in secondary schools, but the cause was lost due to the onrush of world events. The actions of the Communists had helped to discredit

---

[30]United States Congress, House, "Testimony of Peter DeGuadia, Baltimore, Maryland," I.U.P.A., XVII, 1944, pp. 10382-10384.

[31]Ibid.

the whole peace movement. The Committee on Militarism in Education also faced the problem of being identified with the isolationists. Another problem that the Committee failed to overcome was a revision of their arguments against compulsory military training. In a speech before the 1939 conference of the World Federation of Education Associations by Edwin Johnson, secretary of the Committee on Militarism in Education, he used data which was from ten to thirty years out of date.[32] This outdated material he used to support his arguments against compulsory military training in colleges. The group was plagued by financial problems which limited the projects the Committee could take on. The efforts of the Committee to end military training ended with the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor.

The churches faced many of the same problems that annoyed the Committee on Militarism in Education. Unlike the Committee, however, the churches were torn by internal strife. The National Peace Conference committed itself in 1940 to a program that attempted to keep the United States out of war.[33] The Japanese raid on Pearl Harbor obviously meant the end for this program. The entrance of the United States into the war did not end the debate over a war policy in the Student Christian Movement. From December 27, 1941 to January 3, 1942, the quadrennial convention met a Miami University in Oxford, Ohio.[34] The sympathizers with the Soviet Union introduced a resolution that would give uncritical approval

---

[32]Edwin Johnson, "School Military Training Reconsidered," School and Society, LI (March 2, 1940), pp. 261-268.

[33]"Five-Point Program for Peace," The Christian Century, LVII (May 22, 1940), pp. 660-661.

[34]"Youth Views," The Survey Midmonthly, LXXCIII (March, 1942), p. 82.

to the government war policy. The pacifists supported a resolution passed that would condemn war. An impasse arose between the two groups. The delegates issued a statement which gave the membership the option of either supporting or not supporting the government. The rationale behind this declaration was that the question of war could not be answered by one simple solution.[35]

One group that held firm to pacifist beliefs, despite all pressures, was the National Council of Methodist Youth. Over 800 of its members attended a meeting at Winona Lake, Indiana in August of 1940. The Methodist Church, the previous year, had affirmed its stand against war and military training.[36] This group, following the peace policy of the church, opposed conscription and favored the right of young people to become conscientious objectors. At one point during the meeting, a garbled news dispatch was read to the delegates that falsely reported the Selective Service Bill had been defeated by the House of Representatives. The meeting broke into cheers, parades and singing. The convention was brought back to the reality of the situation when it was announced that the report on the defeat of conscription was false.[37]

The delegates voted to withdraw the National Council of Methodist Youth from any participation in the American Youth Congress.[38] Another

---

[35]Robert Andrus, "Pressure Groups Plague Students," The Christian Century, LIX (January 14, 1942), p. 63.

[36]John Langdale, Alfred Smith, and T. Leroy Hooper, eds., Doctrines and Discipline of the Methodist Church (New York: The Methodist Publishing House, 1939), pp. 698-699.

[37]Harold Fey, "Youth Hail Rumor of Draft Defeat," The Christian Century, LVII (September 11, 1940), p. 1124.

[38]New York Times (September 1, 1940), p. 13.

crisis that the meeting faced was the impending dismantlement of the organization. Owen Geer and Blaine Kirkpatrick, leaders and founders of the organization, had been dismissed from their posts by the Methodist Board of Education. This seemed to be a step toward the dissolution of the organization. Already, the southern branch of the reunited Methodist Church had refused to permit its youth to join the National Council of Methodist Youth on the grounds that the organization was too radical.[39]

The National Council of Methodist Youth was dissolved and replaced by the National Methodist Student Conference. Despite the reorganization, the group still favored pacifism in a meeting in January of 1942.[40] Another meeting in September of 1942 by the newly formed Methodist Youth Fellowship, an offspring of the National Methodist Student Conference, supported the position of the conscientious objectors and endorsed nonparticipation in the war effort.[41] Thus, the Methodist youth organizations remained faithful in their belief in pacifism.

The dissention that had spread in church groups appeared to do so in colleges in 1940. The organized students were not eager to become involved in what they believed to be an European war, and there was the cynical feeling on campus that going to war was only throwing one's life away in a futile effort. Yet the students also worried about the threat of fascism and favored halting it. Unfortunately, they also felt that any decision concerning the question of war or peace was beyond their

---

[39]Fey, p. 1124.

[40]T. T. Brumbaugh, "1,200 Methodist Students Meet," The Christian Century, LIX (January 14, 1942), p. 62.

[41]Lindsay Reilly, "Urge Methodists to Stand Fast," The Christian Century, LIX (September 16, 1942), pp. 1132-1133.

ability to control.[42]

By early 1941, the thought on most campuses tended toward isolationism, but college students were worrying about how to defend America in the war torn world. By the fall of 1941, the isolationist position on campus was deteriorating. At Princeton University, 82 percent of the freshman class declared their willingness to fight overseas, and 89 percent felt that it was more important to beat Hitler than stay out of the European war. Students at the University of Kansas, the University of Iowa, the University of Missouri, the University of Minnesota, Stanford University and Cornell University all supported the efforts of the Roosevelt Administration in helping England.[43] The attack on Pearl Harbor found the university student willing to give full support to the government war effort. Pear Harbor destroyed what remained of popular support for the fragile student peace movement.

In reviewing the student peace movement, several distinct phases are evident. The first phase lasted from the early twenties till the early thirties. During this period, the goal of the peace movement was limited to eliminating compulsory R.O.T.C. from the campus. This was the most successful phase, for often college students were able successfully to cooperate with state legislatures and college administrators in ending compulsory R.O.T.C.

The second phase found the Communist groups actively supporting the

---

[42]Irwin Ross, "College Students and the War," The New Republic, CIII (July 15, 1940), pp. 79-80; Thomas Kepler, "Will Colleges Present Arms?", The Christian Century, LCII (September 4, 1940), p. 1074; Charles Seymour, "War's Impact on the Campus," The New York Times Magazine, (September 29, 1940), pp. 3; 15.

[43]"Switch," Time, XXXVIII (October 13, 1941), pp. 68-69.

various peace groups. This hurt the movement, for the Communists were able to dominate the movement because of their willingness to attend the meetings and work on day-to-day organizational activity. The movement also made the mistake of broadening its attack from just attempting to rid the campus of militarism to advocating that the United States government limit its armament program and renounce war as a legitimate extension of foreign policy. The results of this division of effort were to weaken the strength of the movement; and because of this, the movement received a certain amount of notoriety, but if failed to produce any results of substance. Groups such as the Committee on Militarism in Education fought for bills to eliminate compulsory R.O.T.C., but the students were holding rallies asking the United States to renounce war.

The third phase of the movement lasted from the formation of the American Student Union in 1935 until the outbreak of the European war in 1939. The Communists used their domination of the movement to change the purpose of the movement from being an anti-war effort to becoming anti-fascist. This resulted in the alienation of such groups as pacifists and Socialists from the movement. These two groups were not able to form groups that could challenge the leadership of the Communists. The college students must also be blamed for the transformation of the movement, for many campus leaders of the youth movement were all too willing to condemn war with one breath and then demand the end to fascist aggression by any means possible. The failure of the peace movement to produce any concrete results led to a situation where many students did not look on the movement as capable of keeping the United States out of a future war. The Veterans of Future Wars became a parody on the student peace movement. Like the movement, it rose rapidly, then made outrageous demands on the

government and made faltering attempts to be taken seriously. Then it fell apart due to internal strife and the changing attitude of the country.

The German-Soviet Non-Aggression Pact of 1939 caused the Communists to transform their carefully cultivated anti-fascist movement into becoming a pure pacifist organization. The major organizations of the student peace movement, the American Student Union and the American Youth Congress, showed to everyone that they were under complete domination of the Communists. Many students left the peace movement, and the rise of the International Student Service showed the attempt by some to create a democratic anti-fascist organization.

After the outbreak of the European war, the campus remained a stronghold for isolationist sentiment, but there was no organization that was able to galvanize the campus into taking action. Perhaps the reason for this situation can be found in the fact that many students felt that they could do nothing to stop the involvement of the United States in the war.

When war finally came, it did not happen the way the peace organizations had predicted. The attack on Pearl Harbor almost qualified as an invasion of the United States, and the students had always said they would fight if the country was invaded. Also the student body had perceived fascism as an evil to be contained in Europe if not destroyed. Thus, in the end the student peace movement was out of place, out of step and out of time.

# CHAPTER V

## EPILOGUE

Despite the failure of this first student peace movement, it laid the foundation for future student protest. The Student League for Industrial Democracy was destined to evolve into the Students for a Democratic Society. The Communist-led American Student Union and American Youth Congress were to perish with the forties. American youth were never again to have such close connections to the Communist Party of America. The student revolt in the 1960's was to be strongly anti-capitalistic, but the various radical groups had no strong tie with the Communist Party of America.

Only to a limited extent is Seymour Lipset and George Schaflanders' assertion in their book, Passion and Politics: Student Activism in America, correct that the student peace movement of the 1930's was an auxiliary of the adult peace movement. Adult groups like the Committee on Militarism in Education were very deeply involved in the anti-R.O.T.C. campaign, but actions as the Oregon referendum were initiated by the students and then supported by adult peace groups. The student peace movement of the twenties and thirties was not a pure youth movement, but rather a joint adult and student peace movement.

The tactics used by the students in the first peace movement were taken up and amplified by the student demonstrators of the sixties. Nationwide student strikes were used in both movements along with marches

on Washington, D.C. The conferences for peace used by the peace groups in the thirties were to be transformed into the teach-ins of the sixties. Both peace movements adopted the tactics of non-violence to achieve their goals and sought to correct the evil of war by working within the governmental structure of the United States. In the end both peace movements broke down into splinter groups with diverse programs and goals. Neither period of student revolt produced a student movement that had sustained leadership and goals.

As for what became of the leadership of the first peace movement, Joseph Lash, an active leader in the American Student Union, the American Youth Congress and the International Student Service, became the author of a successful two volume biography of Eleanor Roosevelt. James Wechsler, a leader of the National Student League and the American Student Union, has become a successful journalist and columnist for The Evening Star in Washington, D.C. Harold Draper, a member of the Student's League for Industrial Democracy and the American Student Union, became a part-time professor at the University of California at Berkeley and was active in the free speech movement at that university in the sixties. These are just a few examples of what happened to the leadership of the first peace movement, but it should illustrate the type of people involved in this movement.

What happened to the average member of these peace groups? One of the local chapters of the American Student Union was established at the University of Wyoming. What happended to the students that joined this one chapter seems to be typical. David Hitchcock, an officer of that chapter of the American Student Union, became a successful lawyer in Laramie, Wyoming. Walter Johnson, a member of the American Student Union,

became an engineer on the Union Pacific Railroad. Burton Deloney, a student leader at the University of Wyoming, active in both the American Student Union and the Veterans of Future Wars volunteered for the Army in 1943 and was killed in December of 1944 during Hitler's last offensive in the Ardennes region of Europe.

## SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY


Altback, Philip and Lipset, Seymour (eds.). Students in Revolt. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1969.

This book contains essays dealing with the student revolt in the 1960's and only gives limited background of the student movement in the 1920's and 1930's.

Browder, Earl. The People's Front. New York: International Publishers, 1938.

The work contains Browder's speeches on various subjects when he was the leader of the Communist Party of the United States of America. It is useful in understanding the official Communist Party view on the peace movement in the United States.

Cantril, Hadley (ed.). Public Opinion, 1935-1946. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1951.

This volume contains various public opinion polls on the question of compulsory military training. It is useful only to a limited extent since the earliest poll only goes back to 1935.

Coale, et al. vs. Pearson, et al. 290 U. S. (Knaebel) 597 (1933).

This gives the Supreme Court decision not to hear the case. It does not go into the arguments presented by the defendents and prosecutors on the right of colleges to require compulsory military training.

Conlin, Joseph. American Anti-War Movements. London: The Glencoe Press, 1968.

This is useful for the anti-war movement of the 1960's, but of little value for the 1920's or 1930's.

Curti, Merle. Peace or War: The American Struggle, 1636-1936. Boston: J. S. Canmer, 1936.

Good pacifist book on the struggle against war. Concerned mainly with adult peace groups and contains little on the student peace movement.

Eddy, George Sherwood. Eighty Adventurous Years: An Autobiography. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1955.

This tells of Eddy and his pacifist work within the YMCA.

Ekirch, Arthur. The Civilian and the Military. New York: Oxford University Press, 1966.
Gives a good, but broad outline of the relationship between colleges and the military. Contains interesting footnotes that are helpful for further research on the subject of anti-R.O.T.C. activity.

Hamilton, et al. vs. Regents of the University of California, et al. 293 U. S. (Knaebel) 245 (1934).
This is a very detailed account of the arguments used by the defenders and prosecutors on the right of the University of California to enforce compulsory military training.

Langdale, John, Hooper, T. Leroy and Smith, Alfred (eds.). Doctrine and Discipline of the Methodist Church. New York: The Methodist Publishing House, 1939.
This states the Methodist Church position on war.

Lash, Joseph. Eleanor Roosevelt; A Friend's Memoir. New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1964.
This tells of the disillusionment of Joseph Lash with the American Youth Congress and the American Student Union. It is one of the better accounts of the student peace movement from 1939 through 1941. It also goes into detail about the involvement of Eleanor Roosevelt with the American Youth Congress. The book also describes the attempt by Lash and Mrs. Roosevelt to form the International Student Service as an alternative student movement to the Communist youth movement.

Lipset, Seymour and Schaflander, Gerald. Passion and Politics: Student Activism in America. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1971.
Concentrates on the student movement of the 1960's and makes some questionable generalizations on the student movement of the 1920's and 1930's.

Luce, Philip. The New Left. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1966.
Gives a limited history of the Students for a Democratic Society. Also discussed the anti-capitalist attitude of both the student movement of the sixties and thirties.

Nagel, Julian (ed.). Student Power. London: Merlin, 1969.
Essays on the world student movement in the sixties with limited and not too useful information on earlier student movements.

Newsweek. 1934-1942.
This magazine gives conservative interpretation of the student peace movement.

New York Times. 1924-1942.
Excellent reporting of the various peace groups and their activities.

Petterson, Patti. "Student Organizations and the Anti-War Movement in America, 1900-1960," American Studies. XIII (Spring, 1970), 131-143.

A rather poor article dealing with anti-war movements. It attempts to cover too large a period in too limited a space.

School and Society. 1919-1941.

Gives good account of anti-R.O.T.C. activities in colleges during this time period.

Simon, Rita (ed.). As We Saw The Thirties. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1967.

The book contains the article by Hal Draper on the student movement of the thirties. Draper gives the Socialist view of the founding of the American Student Union by the Socialist League for Industrial Democracy and the National Student League. He also gives a good account of the collapse of the American Student Union.

Solow, Herbert. "Stalin's Great American Hoax," The American Mercury. XLVIII (December, 1939), 394-402.

A conservative view of the American League for Peace and Democracy.

"Survey of College Students," Gallup Opinion Index. No. 37 (July, 1968), 31-40.

Good profile of the student revolt in the 1960's.

The Christian Century. 1932-1941.

Excellent source for pacifist activities of the churches.

The Christian Science Monitor. 1938-1941.

Good accounts of the American Youth Congress and the World Youth Congress.

The Literary Digest. 1930-1941.

In the early thirties this magazine gave sympathetic reporting to the peace groups. Also it conducted a peace poll among college students.

The Nation. 1918-1941.

This magazine followed the peace movement closely with articles by James Wechsler and other members of the American Student Union, the American Youth Congress and the National Student League. It gives a liberal interpretation of the peace movement.

The New Republic. 1930-1941.

It views the peace movement from the same point of view as The Nation. It gives a very thorough account of the liberal peace groups.

The School Review. 1929-1939.

Only partially helpful on the activities of anti-R.O.T.C. groups on the college campus.

The Survey. 1925-1941.
This magazine follows closely the pacifist activities of the various church groups.

Thomas, David. "Compulsory Military Training in American Colleges: 1. The System Attacked," Current History. XXIV (April, 1926), 27-31.
A good summary of arguments used in the early twenties against compulsory military training.

Time. 1926-1941.
This magazine gives a moderate to conservative view of the peace groups.

Wade, Raymond (ed.). Journal of the Twenty-Ninth Delegated General Conference Held in Springfield, Massachusetts, May 1-May 29, 1924. New York: The Methodist Book Concern, 1924.
This contains the attack on war by the Methodist Church.

Wechsler, James. Revolt on the Campus. New York: Covici-Friede Publishers, 1935.
This gives the best view of the student revolt from 1930 until the founding of the American Student Union in 1935. At the time the book was written, Wechsler was a member of the National Student League and so the book displays a bias in favor of this group.

U. S. Congress, House, Committee on Military Affairs. Hearings on Abolishment of Compulsory Military Training at Schools and Colleges. 69 Congress, 1st Session, 1926.
Good information from the testimony of organizations that worked against R.O.T.C. in the early twenties. Of particular interest is the testimony of Reverend John Sayre, who was the chairman of the Committee on Militarism in Education.

U. S. Congress, House, Committee on Un-American Activities. Hearings on Communist Activity Among Youth Groups. 83 Congress, 2nd Session, 1953.
These hearings contain much information on the various peace groups. An invaluable source for information on Communist youth organizations.

U. S. Congress, House, Special Committee on Un-American Activities (Dies Committee) Public Hearings, Vols. 1-17, 1938-1943.
These hearings contain testimony from the leaders of the American Youth Congress, the American League Against War and Fascism, and the American Student Union.

U. S. Congressional Record. 1926-1941.
In these years, the Congressional Record contains much information on bills and amendments that would have abolished compulsory military training on the college campus. It also contains Senate and House debate on this question.

# APPENDIX

## PARTIAL LISTING OF SCHOOLS PARTICIPATING IN ANTI-WAR STRIKES FOR 1935

Partial listing of schools for 1935 student anti-war strike and students participating.[1]

New England

| | |
|---|---|
| Amherst | 250 |
| Bennington | 200 |
| Brown | 1,300 |
| Clark | 100 |
| Colby | 500 |
| Conn. College for Women | 400 |
| Dartmouth | 500 |
| Emerson | 250 |
| Harvard | 600 |
| M.I.T. | 150 |
| Mass. State | 43 |
| Mt. Holyoke | 100 |
| New Hampshire | 1,000 |
| Radcliffe | 300 |
| Simmons | 700 |
| Smith | 800 |
| Tufts | 300 |
| Wesleyan | 400 |
| Yale | 500 |

Middle Atlantic

| | |
|---|---|
| American U. | 500 |
| Barnard | 400 |
| Brooklyn College (with Long Island U and Seth Low) | 6,000 |
| Bryn Mawr | 500 |
| Buffalo | 400 |
| Carnegie Tech. | 450 |
| C.C.N.Y. | 3,500 |
| Colgate | 1,000 |
| Columbia | 3,500 |
| Cornell | 2,500 |
| George Washington U. | 1,200 |
| Gourcher (with Johns Hopkins and Morgan) | 2,000 |
| Haverford | 150 |
| Howard | 600 |
| Hunter | 2,200 |
| Lafayette | 1,000 |
| New Jersey Coll. (with Rutgers) | 1,000 |
| New York University | 2,000 |
| Penn. State | 1,500 |
| U. of Penn. | 3,000 |

---

[1]James Wechsler, Revolt on Campus (New York: Covici-Friede Publishers, 1935), pp. 179-180.

| | |
|---|---|
| Pittsburgh | 800 |
| Princeton | 1,000 |
| St. Lawrence | 400 |
| Swarthmore | 500 |
| Syracuse | 1,000 |
| Temple | 2,500 |
| Vassar | Entire Student Body |
| Willson | 500 |

South

| | |
|---|---|
| Berea | 1,500 |
| Chattanooga | 200 |
| College of the Ozarks | 800 |
| Emory | 250 |
| Florida State (with Rollins and Tampa) | 1,000 |
| Louisville | 350 |
| Mercer | 100 |
| Morehouse | 100 |
| Vanderbilt (with Peabody, Fisk and Scarritt) | 250 |
| North Carolina | 1,000 |
| Southwestern | 200 |
| Tennessee | 100 |
| Texas U. | 1,500 |
| Texas Christian U. | 1,600 |
| Tulane, Louisiana | 500 |
| Virginia | 1,000 |
| West Virgina | 90 |

Middle West

| | |
|---|---|
| Butler | 200 |
| Central | 500 |
| Chicago | 3,500 |
| De Pauw | 1,000 |
| Drake | 300 |
| Eden | 100 |
| Hamline | 500 |
| Illinois | 300 |
| Iowa | 250 |
| Illinois Wesleyan | 500 |
| Lewis Institute | 500 |
| Michigan State | 50 |
| Michigan | 1,000 |
| Michigan State (with Wisconsin Extension) | 2,500 |
| Minnesota | 3,000 |
| Missouri | 800 |
| Northwestern | 1,200 |
| People's Junior College | 750 |
| Washington U. | 400 |
| Wayne | 500 |
| Wisconsin | 2,000 |
| Wright Junior College | 50 |

## Ohio

| | |
|---|---|
| Akron | 250 |
| Antioch | 350 |
| Denison | 600 |
| Fenn | 200 |
| Marietta | 175 |
| Miami | 500 |
| Muskingum | 500 |
| Oberlin | 1,200 |
| Ohio State | 400 |
| Ohio | 1,200 |
| Toledo | 600 |
| Western Reserve | 2,000 |
| Wittenberg | 700 |

## Rocky Mountains

| | |
|---|---|
| Baker | 38 |
| Colorado U. | 500 |
| Dakota Wesleyan | 400 |
| Denver | 800 |
| Friends University | 300 |
| Idaho U. (Southern and Moscow Branches) | 1,100 |
| Kansas State | 500 |
| Kansas University | 1,000 |
| Montana | 500 |
| Nebraska | 500 |
| North Dakota State Teachers College | 400 |
| North Dakota U. | No Estimate |
| Phillips | 200 |
| Salina | 300 |
| Wyoming U. | 750 |

## Pacific Coast

| | |
|---|---|
| California Tech. | 400 |
| U. of California (Berkeley) | 4,000 |
| U.C.L.A. | 1,000 |
| Linfield | 200 |
| Los Angeles J.C. | 3,000 |
| Pacific College | 600 |
| Oregon U. | 1,000 |
| Pasadena J.C. | 500 |
| Reed | 300 |
| San Diego State | 500 |
| San Jose | 500 |
| San Mateo | 800 |
| Stanford | 1,500 |
| Washington U. | 500 |
| Whittier | 500 |

VITA

John Charles Paige

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Arts

Thesis: THE AMERICAN UNIVERSITY AND THE STUDENT PEACE MOVEMENT, 1919-1941

Major Field: History

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Cheyenne, Wyoming, April 23, 1949, the son of Mr. and Mrs. C. R. Paige.

Education: Graduated from Saint Mary's High School, Cheyenne, Wyoming in May, 1967, received Bachelor of Arts degree in History from University of Wyoming in 1971; enrolled in master's program at Oklahoma State University, 1971-73; completed requirements for the Master of Arts degree at Oklahoma State University in July, 1973.