



## Abba Hillel Silver Collection Digitization Project

Featuring collections from the Western Reserve Historical Society and  
The Jacob Rader Marcus Center of the American Jewish Archives

### **MS-4787: Abba Hillel Silver Papers, 1902-1989.**

Series I: General Correspondence, 1914-1969, undated.

Sub-series A: Alphabetical, 1914-1965, undated.

---

Reel  
25

Box  
9

Folder  
569

Committee on Militarism in Education (national and Ohio),  
regarding compulsory military training in colleges, 1934-1940.

# COMMITTEE ON MILITARISM IN EDUCATION

2929 BROADWAY, NEW YORK CITY

393

## EXECUTIVE BOARD

ROSWELL P. BARNES	E. C. LINDEMAN
LESLIE BLANCHARD	VIRGIL E. LOWDER
MRS. J. HENRY CALLISTER	MRS. MARY G. SCHONBERG
INEZ M. CAVERT	NORMAN THOMAS
MRS. J. MALCOLM FORBES	WELLINGTON H. TINKER
WILLIAM B. HARVEY	WALTER W. VAN KIRK
KENNETH WALSER	

## OFFICERS

GEORGE A. COE	HARRY A. OVERSTREET
Chairman	Vice-Chairman
TUCKER P. SMITH	JOHN NEVIN SATRE
Chairman, Executive Board	Vice-Chairman
ALVIN C. GODDARD	EDWIN C. JOHNSON
Treasurer	Secretary

November 9, 1934

## URGENT AND STRICTLY PERSONAL

TO: Bishop James C. Baker, San Francisco; Bishop Benjamin Brewster, Portland, Maine; Rev. S. Parkes Cadman, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Rev. Samuel M. Cavert, New York City; Rev. Edmund B. Chaffee; Rev. Robert C. Dexter, Boston, Mass.; Rev. Merle N. English, Chicago, Ill.; Rev. Harry Emerson Fosdick, New York City; Rev. Hubert C. Herring, New York City; Bishop Francis J. McConnell, New York City; Rev. Charles Clayton Morrison, Chicago, Ill.; Rev. Reinhold Niebuhr, New York City; Rev. George L. Paine, Boston, Mass.; Rt. Rev. Edward L. Parsons, San Francisco, Calif.; Rt. Rev. William J. Scarlett, St. Louis, Mo.; Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver, Cleveland, Ohio; Rev. Ralph W. Sockman, New York City; Rev. Ernest F. Tittle, Evanston, Ill.; Rev. Robert Leonard Tucker, Columbus, Ohio; Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, New York City.

Dear Friend:

This is a personal and urgent request and may require action as soon as November 12th. It is mimeographed only because our office is short on stenographic help.

On October 17 and 18 the U. S. Supreme Court heard argument in the Hamilton-Reynolds vs. University of California conscientious objector case. The Court's decision is expected to be rendered soon, probably on November 12. Whichever way it goes it will be of nationwide significance to the military training problem.

We are writing to ask that you consider the possibility of making a statement to the press following the announcement of the Supreme Court's ruling in this California case. If the decision goes the way we hope it will, your statement can be a laudation of both the Court and the Constitution. If, however, the decision goes against Hamilton and Reynolds and sustains the University of California's suspension of sincere religious conscientious objectors to compulsory R. O. T. C. courses, your statement will be the more urgently needed by our common cause--the fight against war and militarism--though, naturally, we hesitate to suggest what it should contain or how critical it should be. We think it fair to say, however, that in either case your statement should be a vigorous reaffirmation of our peace faith and will.

The R. O. T. C. not only challenges the morality of civilization by its jungle-man ethics, but it thrusts a type of training and an attitude of mind into the college atmosphere which is thoroughly incompatible with the spirit of democracy and of science. The spirit of free cooperation, which is the basis of democracy, and the spirit of emancipated curiosity, which is the basis of science, are both alike imperiled by the military mind which makes unthinking obedience the *summum bonum* in the hierarchy of virtues.—Reinhold Niebuhr.



Confidentially, the tentative plans of our organization--in case the Constitution is interpreted to offer no relief to pacifist students such as Hamilton and Reynolds--includes the promotion of a legislative program which will seek the passage of a Congressional Act categorically exempting such students from compulsory military training.

The California case presents a clear issue to the Supreme Court; it is not clouded by any irrelevancies. At no point in the trial did counsel for the University attack the character or motives of Hamilton and Reynolds; their scholastic ability, their good standing in the Methodist Episcopal Church, and the sincerity of their pacifist convictions have been conceded as facts from the beginning. The only question before the Court is: May religious conscientious objectors to compulsory military training in peacetime rely upon the religious or civil right guarantees of the Constitution for protection? Never before has any high court ruled upon this question. (One basic difference between the present case and the MacIntosh case is that Hamilton and Reynolds are seeking Constitutional sanction for a peacetime privilege or right, whereas Professor MacIntosh sought sanction for a privilege or right to be exercised in wartime.) The Hamilton-Reynolds case, you see, will be a real test for the Constitution itself, for it will reveal the capacity of that instrument--as interpreted by the present Court--to adapt itself to the anti-militarist conscience which we have seen emerging in the religious life of post-War America, and which we ourselves have nourished by our common labor.

A few more words about procedure: Your statement ought to be short and to the point. You are not expected to speak as a representative of our organization; you will speak as an individual. Our hope is that the statements will be carried by both the Associated Press and the United Press chains. Whether the statements can be handled more effectively through our office, or whether they should be transmitted by you directly to our press contacts, is a detail of procedure upon which we have not as yet received conclusive advice. You will be advised on this point by wire on the day the Court's decision is rendered.

For the present we are interested in your prompt reply to one question: Are you willing to prepare a statement for the press in connection with this decision? If so, please let us know by return mail. Then on the day the Court's decision is rendered you will hear either from us or from a newspaper man whom we shall refer to you. Of course you will reserve for yourself the right to withhold your statement if circumstances not now foreseen should attend the Court's ruling.

*will -  
day letter  
collect.*

Anticipating your affirmative reply, we remain

Ever faithfully yours,

*John Nevin Sayre*  
JOHN NEVIN SAYRE

*Edwin C. Johnson*  
EDWIN C. JOHNSON.

P. S. The mimeographed enclosures may be of interest and value to you.



### SUPREME COURT HEARS R. O. T. C. RESISTANCE CASE

Formal argument in a case whose outcome promises to have far-reaching implications for compulsory military training--which prevails in 90 colleges and universities and 28 civil secondary schools in United States--was presented before the U. S. Supreme Court on October 17 and 18. The case involved two student conscientious objectors, Albert Hamilton and Alonzo Reynolds, Jr., and the University of California at Los Angeles, and reached the Supreme Court on an appeal from a decision rendered on January 8 last by California Supreme Court which sustained the University's suspension of the students because of their refusal to attend military classes.

Mr. John Beardsley of Los Angeles, counsel for the students, contended that the R. O. T. C. is an integral part of the Federal military establishment and that compulsory membership and service in the Federal military establishment in time of peace amounts to an abridgement of the privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States, and thus violates the 14th Amendment. In contending that freedom from enforced military service in time of peace is an immunity and privilege of United States citizens, Mr. Beardsley held that without specific authorization by Act of Congress not even the Federal government has power to compel service in any branch of the Federal military establishment. He also contended that military training imposed upon conscientious objectors, such as Hamilton and Reynolds, was violative of freedom of religion as guaranteed by the 1st Amendment, and that compulsory military training is contrary to the spirit if not the letter of the Kellogg Pact.

Mr. John U. Calkins, Jr., of San Francisco, serving as counsel for the Regents of the University of California, filed a brief in opposition to Mr. Beardsley's in which he argued: That the Supreme Court had no jurisdiction in the case since the military training requirement is not a statute but merely a scholastic regulation; that Hamilton and Reynolds as citizens of the United States did not have a right to attend the University of California; and that they have suffered no invasion of any right of religious freedom since they were merely forbidden to continue as students unless they complied with University regulations. Mr. Calkins also contended that the R. O. T. C. was not a part of the military forces of the United States, and that compulsory military training was not violative of the Kellogg Pact since the Pact did not outlaw defensive war and since it permitted the use of armed defense other than war.

The Supreme Court is expected to render its decision in the case on November 12th.



### FOR A FREE CONSCIENCE

Before the U. S. Supreme Court is an appeal of two student conscientious objectors who were suspended from the University of California because they refused to drill under the student R. O. T. C.

This case differs from one brought on similar grounds last year by a University of Maryland student. The high court refused to take Federal jurisdiction in that case, but it was asked only to interpret a Maryland statute.

Counsel for the California students appeals on a higher ground, that in refusing education without military drill the University of California is denying religious freedom as guaranteed by the Constitution. It is interesting that their attorney is John Beardsley, who in 1931 argued the case of Yetta Stromberg, convicted under the California "red flag law." In ruling against California then the U. S. Supreme Court, for the first time, invalidated a state law in order to protect the constitutional principle of free speech. Now Mr. Beardsley is asking the high court to void a university ruling to protect freedom of conscience.

Public opinion is with these students. Backing them are many church organizations, including their own Methodist denomination. In the last 10 years, 65 institutions of learning dropped military training and 14 made it an elective course.

Goose-step education is not education.

-- Washington Daily News,  
October 18, 1934



COLIE CT

1207-A

CLASS OF SERVICE DESIRED	
DOMESTIC	CABLE
TELEGRAM	FULL RATE
DAY LETTER	DEFERRED
NIGHT MESSAGE	NIGHT LETTER
NIGHT LETTER	WEEK END LETTER

Patrons should check class of service desired; otherwise message will be transmitted as a full-rate communication.

# WESTERN UNION

CHECK
ACCT'G INFMN.
TIME FILED

NEWCOMB CARLTON, PRESIDENT

J. C. WILLEVER, FIRST VICE-PRESIDENT

Send the following message, subject to the terms on back hereof, which are hereby agreed to

November 14, 1934

19

To COMMITTEE ON MILITARISM IN EDUCATION

Street and No. 2929 Broadway, N.Y.

Place

I SHALL BE PLEASED TO PREPARE A STATEMENT FOR THE PRESS IN CONNECTION WITH  
THE DECISIONS OF THE SUPREME COURT

A H. Silver

Sender's address  
for reference

THE QUICKEST, SUREST AND SAFEST WAY TO SEND MONEY  
IS BY TELEGRAPH OR CABLE

Sender's telephone  
number



# COMMITTEE ON MILITARISM IN EDUCATION

2929 BROADWAY, NEW YORK CITY



## EXECUTIVE BOARD

ROSWELL P. BARNES	E. C. LINDEMAN
LESLIE BLANCHARD	VIRGIL E. LOWDER
MRS. J. HENRY CALLISTER	MRS. MARY G. SCHONBERG
INEZ M. CAVERT	NORMAN THOMAS
MRS. J. MALCOLM FORBES	WELLINGTON H. TINKER
WILLIAM B. HARVEY	WALTER W. VAN KIRK
KENNETH WALSER	

## OFFICERS

GEORGE A. COE	HARRY A. OVERSTREET
Chairman	Vice-Chairman
TUCKER P. SMITH	JOHN NEVIN SAYRE
Chairman, Executive Board	Vice-Chairman
ALVIN C. GODDARD	EDWIN C. JOHNSON
Treasurer	Secretary

November 16, 1934

Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver  
Euclid Ave. & 105 St. N. E.  
Cleveland, Ohio

Dear Rabbi Silver:

Thank you very much for your prompt reply to our recent letter. We had many good reasons to believe the Supreme Court would render its decision in the California conscientious objector case last Monday. It did not do so, however. We must now look forward to the decision next Monday, November 19th, or on a decision day soon thereafter.

As indicated in our earlier letter, we hope circumstances will permit your giving a statement to the press in comment upon the Court's decision in this case when it is handed down. Affirmative replies have been received from several of the parties to whom we wrote.

I have three suggestions to offer for making the release of your statement more effective:

First: Give your statement to the local press contacts through whom you ordinarily release your newspaper publicity;

Second: Inquire of your local press contacts whether or not they can put your statement on the AP and UP wires. If they cannot do so themselves, they may be able and willing to give you the addresses of the nearest AP and UP bureaus, in which case I would suggest that you send copies of your statement directly to them either by day letter wire or by special delivery mail;

Third: If you are unable to get copies of your statement into the hands of AP and UP representatives in your area, please send copies of your statement by day letter wire to the following parties:

Mr. Theodore Koop, Associated Press  
383 Madison Avenue  
New York City

Mr. Herbert Little, Scripps-Howard Press Association  
1322 New York Avenue  
Washington, D. C.



November 16, 1934

We should be happy to receive a copy of whatever statement you release to the press, if you care to send it to us.

With renewed appreciation for your continuing interest and support, I remain

Sincerely yours,

*Samuel H. Hays*  
Secretary.

ECJ.MD





# COMMITTEE ON MILITARISM IN EDUCATION

2929 BROADWAY, NEW YORK CITY

393

## EXECUTIVE BOARD

ROSSELL P. BARNES	E. C. LINDEMAN
LESLIE BLANCHARD	VIRGIL E. LOWDER
MRS. J. HENRY CALLISTER	MRS. MARY G. SCHONBERG
INEZ M. CAVERT	NORMAN THOMAS
MRS. J. MALCOLM FORBES	WELLINGTON H. TINKER
WILLIAM B. HARVEY	WALTER W. VAN KIRK
KENNETH WALSER	

## OFFICERS

GEORGE A. COE	HARRY A. OVERSTREET
<i>Chairman</i>	<i>Vice-Chairman</i>
TUCKER P. SMITH	JOHN NEVIN SAYRE
<i>Chairman, Executive Board</i>	<i>Vice-Chairman</i>
ALVIN C. GODDARD	EDWIN C. JOHNSON
<i>Treasurer</i>	<i>Secretary</i>

## NATIONAL COUNCIL

WILL W. ALEXANDER  
REV. W. RUSSELL BOWIE  
HOWELL HAMILTON BROACH  
JOHN BROPHY  
BAYARD H. CHRISTY  
J. ELWOOD COX  
ALBERT F. COYLE  
MRS. J. SERGEANT CRAM  
PROF. JEROME DAVIS  
JAMES H. DILLARD  
SHERWOOD EDDY  
REV. NOBLE S. ELDERKIN  
PROF. CHARLES ELLWOOD  
ZONA GALE  
LINDLEY V. GORDON  
REV. JOEL HAYDEN  
PROF. CARLTON J. H. HAYES  
PRES. JOHN M. HENRY  
REV. JOHN HERRING  
PROF. MANLEY O. HUDSON  
HANNAH CLOTHIER HULL  
PROF. RUFUS JONES  
JAMES WELDON JOHNSON  
FREDERICK J. LIBBY  
PROF. ROBERT MORSS LOVETT  
PROF. HALFORD E. LUCCOCK  
REV. FREDERICK LYNCH  
JAMES H. MAURER  
PROF. ALEXANDER MEIKLEJOHN  
BISHOP FRANCIS J. MCCONNELL  
MRS. JOHN F. MOORS  
ORIE O. MILLER  
PRES. ARTHUR E. MORGAN  
PRES. S. K. MOSIMAN  
A. J. MUSTE  
PROF. REINHOLD NIEBUHR  
FRANK OLMSTEAD  
PRES. BROMLEY OXNAM  
KIRBY PAGE  
PRES. MARION PARK  
RT. REV. EDWARD L. PARSONS  
CARL PATTERSON  
PROF. IRA M. PRICE  
JUSTICE JAMES HOGE RICKS  
PROF. W. CARSON RYAN  
RT. REV. WILLIAM J. SCARLETT  
HELEN SEABURY  
MARY SEABURY  
J. HENRY SCATTERGOOD  
REV. CHARLES M. SHELDON  
RABBI ABBA HILLEL SILVER  
KATHERINE V. SILVERTHORN  
REV. T. GUTHRIE SPEERS  
REV. ERNEST F. TITTLE  
DEAN HENRY P. VAN DUSEN  
OSWALD G. VILLARD  
RABBI STEPHEN S. WISE  
PROF. LUTHER A. WEIGLE  
PRES. MARY E. WOOLLEY  
WILLIAM ALLEN WHITE

July 27, 1935.

Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver,  
Euclid Ave. & 105th St., N. E.,  
Cleveland, Ohio.

Dear Rabbi Silver:

The enclosed statements describe the present work of our Committee and the life-or-death financial crisis we are in.

I am giving a month's vacation to the effort to solve our financial problem, but my sacrifice is nothing compared to the sacrifice which our devoted Secretary, Edwin Johnson has made and is making to do the Committee's work on insufficient salary payments. There are also the sacrifices of the boys who lose diplomas or have to leave their chosen university because they refuse to train to kill.

Our Committee has no financial "angel" who can save things at this time, but if each member of the Committee and other former contributors will make a sacrifice to give in the present emergency, I believe we can win through.

Won't you help and get others to help? We can supply you with statements like the enclosed, for sending to friends, if you will let us know how many you can use.

Yours cordially,

*John Nevin Sayre*  
Vice-Chairman.

Encl.  
JNS:AK



# Committee on Militarism in Education—Pioneer

BY AGATHA VARELA



EDWIN JOHNSON

The Committee on Militarism in Education is facing the greatest challenge in its history. With the War Department Appropriation Bill for 1936 reaching the unprecedented peace time total of \$401,998,179, a million dollar increase is provided for new ROTC units (probably 113) in schools and colleges. It is expected that most of the new units will be established in public high schools with probably two-thirds operating on a compulsory rather than on an elective basis. This will mean, according to the CME calculations, that

from 30,000 to 60,000 students will be added to the 148,000 already subjected to military training financed and administered by the War Department.

Consequently the CME is engaged in an active opposition campaign. All interested in the organization are asked to report to headquarters any local signs of the establishment of new ROTC units and to organize groups of influential local leaders to combat any move toward the establishment of such ROTC units in their communities.

## CME Fills Vital Need

These are the most immediate concerns of the CME, but they form only a small part of its whole ambitious program. The organization, whose distinguished chairman is Professor George A. Coe, came into being nine years ago solely because of the acute need for concentration on this phase of the peace movement. Almost single-handed, it still carries on its ambitious work. If the CME were to go out of existence tomorrow, another similar organization would rise to take its place, because the work is so vital that it cannot be ignored. Some idea of the odds against which it works may be gained from the fact that annually Congress appropriates about four million dollars for the ROTC, exclusive of the cost of officers' salaries assigned to duty, and of materials and equipment apportioned from the regular War Department stock. In all, about three hundred schools and colleges in the country have some form of military training subsidized by the War Department. To fight this octopus-like foe, the CME must rely upon a budget of less than ten thousand dollars annually.

## CME an Active Group

The CME is one of the most picturesque members of the whole peace movement. Even in its more opulent moments, it still resembles very closely its description in the May 1933 issue of *Harper's Magazine*: "There is that comparative ragamuffin, the Committee on Mili-

tarism in Education, which consists, for working purposes, of two young men in a dilapidated back room furnished with chairs that must be sat on carefully lest they fall apart: budget, \$8,000, and they're lucky if they get it: luncheons, if any, fifty cent ones, Dutch treat. Yet all over the country the military propagandists are constantly harassed by this Committee and unquestionably would like to put a bounty on the heads of the two young men."

## Organization Formulates Basic Beliefs

When the CME was founded in 1925, its working program was drawn up on the basis of several definite beliefs. The first was that "The Committee favors the abolition of all compulsory military training in civil educational institutions. It is believed that compulsory military training is un-American, un-democratic, unnecessary for national defense and a step toward militarism. Second: the Committee favors the abolition of all military training in public high schools and withdrawal of Federal aid from private schools of such rank giving military training. . . . Third: the Committee opposes the sales methods of the military training enthusiasts who recommend military drill as physical training, character training, training for citizenship, etc., and who try to popularize it through the use of honorary girl officers, snappy uniforms, subsidies to students, honors, prizes, displays, reviews, etc. Fourth: the Committee is opposed to the Federal subsidizing and War Department control of military training in civil educational institutions as opening the way to centralized bureaucratic interference with the freedom and integrity of educational authority in the individual school, college or university. Fifth: the Committee favors genuine physical education for all students. It believes . . . that it will better prepare our youth for the eventualities of life than military training. Sixth: the Committee advocates the establishment of high school and college courses on the causes of war and methods of international cooperation."

Countless studies of the subject have been made in an effort to determine the actual character-building and citizenship-training value of military training. All impartial reports, including findings by the American Physical Education Association, the National Education Association, and the World Federation of Teachers, reveal that the claims of the militarists are greatly exaggerated. The NEA report states that "the ideals of the kind of obedience and of general conduct aimed at by military exercises are best represented by the word 'martinet' which these exercises long ago contributed to our educational vocabulary—ideals which every teacher who aims at real character-development seeks to avoid. Those who favor military drill maintain that it is the most effective means of developing patriotic feeling. But, if we look beneath the surface, we find that military patriotism may be no deeper and no more lasting than military obedience."

## Combats Militarizing of CCC

A recently developed part of the organization's work has to do with combatting the militarizing of CCC



camps. Last winter the CME took the lead in organizing opposition to the War Department-inspired bills designed to add military drill to the CCC program. In a petition to President Roosevelt, signed by more than 150 prominent educators, churchmen, publicists and others, a powerful protest was voiced. The petition declared: "During the critical early days of your Administration it may have been necessary to rely upon War Department personnel and organization to launch successfully the CCC project. But with the passing of the more serious phase of the crisis, it seems to us, the administration and control of the CCC might well be returned and strictly limited to civilian leadership while, on the other hand, the War Department should be relieved of occupation with such a non-military function so that its personnel may devote their full time to such responsibilities of technical military defense as may ordinarily rest upon them. If changes in the character of the CCC are to be made, it seems to us, they should be in the direction of building it up into a highly trained force of forestry professionals, possibly under the joint jurisdiction of the Division of Forestry of the Department of Agriculture and the National Park Service of the Department of Interior, and entirely free from every taint or suggestion of military control or administration."

An important phase of the work of the CME is its research activities. Its detailed studies of the problems of military training and the latest developments form a large part of the ammunition of local groups working in various parts of the country.

#### **Advises Groups and Individuals**

The CME is in contact with organized groups and individuals in all parts of the country, fighting the whole issue of military training. Letters continually pour into the New York office from individuals rebelling against compulsory military training in schools and colleges, and asking help from the CME. Here is a typical letter from a college freshman: "Saw your article on military training in the *Buffalo Times*, and am writing for literature and suggestions. Please send two sets, one for me and another for a friend. Would it be possible to get a list of teachers who are opposed to militarism so that I could govern my studies accordingly? I have a living to make after awhile and do not wish to carry such dead wood in my education."

The CME sponsors the cause of such conscientious objectors, and at several colleges has achieved notable results in gaining exemption for such students. At other universities and colleges ROTC units have been abolished altogether. During 1934 such a development took place at De Pauw University, while at New York University Arts College and at the University of Minnesota, action was taken to abolish compulsory military drill.

#### **Steps in the CME Development**

The steps leading up to the present situation, in which the CME is a factor to be reckoned with, have been many and tedious, for the organization has had to build up a whole background of education for its position before it was able to function effectively. During the first phase of its career, its chief work was to expose the philosophy of brutal militarism which was being propagated through the ROTC. So effective was the work of the Committee that much of the "realistic militarism" was deleted from military manuals, bayonet practice was

abolished, and military advocates shifted their tack to popularizing and "sugar-coating" military drill.

The second step was to reveal the fake militarism being propagated through the ROTC. The literature of the CME during this period showed up the devices used to make military training more attractive to students, such as smart uniforms, military balls, prizes and awards, cadet pay, etc.

Third, because of the number of cases in various parts of the country in which conscientious objectors to military training were suspended or otherwise penalized, the CME made it its chief work to sponsor their cause and to get just action for them and to have their educational rights and privileges restored. In two cases court action was undertaken in defense of suspended conscientious ROTC resisters, with the CME providing leadership in raising the necessary funds.

#### **Embarks on Legislative Phase**

Following the adverse ruling by the U. S. Supreme Court in the case of *Hamilton and Reynolds vs. the University of California*, the campaign against militarism in education moved forward to its fourth and most recent phase—its legislative phase.

The Supreme Court's decision showed conclusively that it must be by State and National legislation and through the action of regents in tax-supported institutions, rather than through the courts, that exemption from compulsory military training must be obtained. The Morrill Act, establishing the land grant colleges, has been interpreted by both the Attorney General of the United States and former Secretary of Interior Work as permitting the drill to be either compulsory or optional, while the War Department has often pointed out that the National Defense Act places responsibility for the matter upon local authorities.

Meanwhile Congressional opposition to voting funds for compulsory military training grows more vigorous. During the debate in the 74th Congress on Appropriations for the War Department, Representative Marcantonio of New York introduced in the House an amendment to withhold Federal funds from tax-supported colleges where military training is compulsory, in an attempt to make it unnecessary for "young men who are seeking a higher education to goose-step through the campus and mentally goose-step in the classroom."

Representative O'Malley of Wisconsin, speaking for the amendment, said "the building up of a militaristic machine, the creation of a militaristically inclined class of citizenry in this country, starting with the attempt to mould growing minds into the idea that war is inevitable and must always come, is the surest way to start a war."

Senator Frazier of North Dakota offered a similar amendment in the Senate. In the debate on this issue, the North Dakota Senator presented statistics showing that it costs the Government more to maintain an ROTC unit in an institution where military training is compulsory than in an institution where such training is voluntary.

Today, the CME is sponsoring a bill drafted by Kenneth Walser, a New York attorney who serves on the Executive Board of the CME, which it expects soon to have introduced concurrently in the House and Senate. The bill provides for an amendment to the Defense Act which would abolish and prohibit compulsion in military training units maintained by Federal funds.



Committee on Militarism in Education

2929 Broadway

New York City

Date.....193

I desire to participate in your work by contributing to its budget.

I enclose .....dollars herewith.

I pledge .....dollars payable

Name.....

Address.....

City.....

State.....

☐ On the other side I suggest names and addresses of persons who may be interested or willing to help.



Rev. Dr. Alvin C. Goddard, *Treasurer*

COMMITTEE ON MILITARISM IN EDUCATION

2929 Broadway

New York City



### C. M. E. FACES THE DEAD LINE

A crisis confronts the Committee on Militarism in Education which calls for immediate action. Nine years ago when the C. M. E. was first organized, President Arthur E. Morgan wrote, "The battle for war or peace is being fought today in our schools and colleges". Last June The Christian Century in an editorial commenting on the school year just closed, said "It has been made memorable for educators as the year in which the issue of peace has become central to the life of the campus."

Throughout the nine years between these two statements the Committee on Militarism in Education has been the unique agency to which students, faculty members, peace organizations, churches and citizens have turned for accurate information, source material, and experienced advice in carrying on their opposition to compulsory drill and militarism in high school and university. It has also initiated state wide and national legislative campaigns and assisted in carrying the issue of conscience versus militarism right up to the Supreme Court of the United States.

But the double difficulty of the economic depression and increase of militarism throughout the world has in the last three years placed the Committee in a position where it can no longer continue its work unless financial reinforcements are brought to it soon. Is the battle too unequal to be worth waging? Well, even in such a discouraging time of war preparation as the last twelve months, some notable victories for peace have been won in our field:

1. University of Minnesota announced that beginning next fall it will no longer require students to take military training. This is the second "land grant" institution in the country to make the course optional.
2. DePauw University in Indiana began the year with the abolition of all military drill.
3. New York University (College of Arts and Sciences) announced the abolition of the compulsory feature of military training to begin in the fall of 1935.
4. University of New Hampshire set a precedent in exempting six students from military training on grounds of conscientious objection.
5. Similar action was taken by Michigan State College for one student.
6. Bill H. R. 5593, initiated by the War Department to add two months to the enlistment period of Civilian Conservation Corps "for the purpose of intensive military training" has been blocked since February, and we hope permanently defeated, by a petition to President Roosevelt signed by over 150 well-known



citizens and sent to 500 newspapers. The C. M. E. did the entire work of drawing up petition, securing signatures and handling publicity.

Summarizing incompletely the score of our side since 1920, sixty-seven educational institutions have abolished War Department military training, while since 1923 thirteen others have changed it from a compulsory to elective basis. The other side have scored their victories too; but the point is that our effort is not hopeless, however difficult. Continuation of the work of the C. M. E. should contribute to further results in the local field. It would also enable the C. M. E. to carry forward its important Federal legislative program. This program, upon which much preliminary work has already been done, embraces the promotion of an amendment to Section 40 of the National Defense Act which would abolish compulsion in the R. O. T. C.

Just at this juncture, when the recent flood of military appropriations has put into the hands of the War Department \$1,000,000 for new R. O. T. C. units, the Committee on Militarism in Education is faced with the most serious financial crisis in its history. The Committee was forced two years ago to reduce its staff to one Secretary and one stenographer whose salaries are respectively only \$2,400 and \$1,430, but the continued falling off of contributions due to the depression and the impossibility of our reduced staff carrying the Committee's work and at the same time raising its annual budget of \$10,000, has resulted in an accumulation of bills to the printer and bills for salary which will sink us unless they are met. To clear up everything and keep the work going with vigour \$5,000 is needed before December 31.

And before the college year begins in September the Committee must be in a position to inform its Secretary whether it can regularly pay his salary or not. If this assurance cannot be given the Committee must disband. It is the unanimous conviction of our Executive Board that the Committee could not get another Secretary as experienced and able as Mr. Johnson at anything like as low a salary. Consequently the life of the Committee now hangs on the response in gifts and pledges which contributors will make this summer.

What will you do? Won't you reply at once on the enclosed card? And get others to aid?

GEORGE A COE, Chairman.



# BREAKING THE WAR HABIT

PUBLISHED BY

COMMITTEE ON MILITARISM IN EDUCATION

2929 BROADWAY, NEW YORK CITY

VOL. V, No. 6

FEBRUARY 15, 1937

TWENTY-FIVE CENTS PER YEAR

## NORTH DAKOTA ENDS COMPULSORY DRILL

Compulsory military training has been abolished in North Dakota. The action resulted from the enactment of a bill which passed the North Dakota House on January 28 by a vote of 59 to 46, the Senate on February 9 by a vote of 28 to 20, and was signed by Governor William A. Langer on Monday, February 15th. Drafted as a measure "for-bidding compulsory military training and tactics in State-supported educational institutions," the new law will have the effect of ending compulsory enrollment in the R. O. T. C. units at North Dakota Agricultural College (a land grant institution) and at the University of North Dakota.

By its adoption of this measure North Dakota becomes the third State to shift military training in its land grant and State institutions from a compulsory to a voluntary enrollment basis. In 1923 the shift was made at the University of Wisconsin by act of the Wisconsin Legislature; a similar change was made at the University of Minnesota in 1934 by decision of the University's Board of Regents.

In addition to the land grant institutions which have already made the change, at least thirteen other colleges and universities, since 1923, have shifted their R. O. T. C. units from a compulsory to voluntary enrollment basis, or have abolished them entirely. To date the list reads as follows:

University of Wisconsin, 1923  
Pomona College, 1924  
Boston University, 1926  
College of the City of New York, 1926  
De Pauw University, 1927  
Georgetown University, 1927  
California Institute of Technology, 1929  
Northwestern University (Dental College), 1929  
Emory University, 1930  
University of Cincinnati, 1931  
Rose Polytechnic Institute, 1932  
University of Utah, 1933  
University of Minnesota, 1934  
New York University, 1935  
North Dakota Agricultural College, 1937  
University of North Dakota, 1937

During the same period, according to our information, no institution of higher learning has shifted military training from a voluntary to a compulsory enrollment basis. The accumulating evidence suggests that there is a slow but steady tide running against compulsory drill.

### *Long Crusade Leads To Victory*

The North Dakota change did not come about without a bitter fight. Years of crusading effort on the part of the North Dakota Farmers Union have been devoted to the issue, much to the unceasing dismay of the American Legion and other reactionary groups. The North Dakota Agricultural College chapter of Scabbard and Blade, honorary military society, opposed the voluntary drill proposal with all its might, and was none too scrupulous in so doing. Colonel J. D. Easton, head of the R. O. T. C. unit at N. D. A. C., was quoted in *The Spectrum*, student newspaper, as saying that he would recommend that the War Department discontinue the R. O. T. C. unit entirely if the voluntary enrollment bill were adopted by the Legislature. Dr. C. S. Putnam, head of the Gold Star Band at N. D. A. C., participated in the circulation of false rumors by stating that "if the Legislature should decide to remove compulsory drill, there will be no band." Presumably, his point was that the enactment of the proposed bill would cause the War Department to "crack down" on the Agricultural College by withholding appropriations for the band.

### *Scabbard & Blade "Rabble-rousing"*

Student members of Scabbard and Blade, taking their cue from Colonel Easton and Dr. Putnam, spread unsubstantiated reports that the State would suffer loss of Federal funds if the proposed measure became law, and supplemented these falsehoods with a flood of "Red-scare" propaganda. Following a Scabbard and Blade demonstration against the pending bill, the undergraduate editor of *The Spectrum* described the affair as a "rabble-rousing convocation . . . pre-arranged to bring out mob sentiment in support of the adherents of compulsory drill." The convocation hall was covered with signs and placards making personal attacks on faculty members supporting the voluntary drill proposal, and on Mr. C. W. Fine, sponsor of the measure in the North Dakota Senate. Other signs carried slogans urging "Keep the College out of the Red," and suggesting the choice was between the "Gold Star Band or Red Flag." The student editor criticized the sponsors of the meeting for the "decidedly shabby treatment" given the supporters of the proposed bill—they "were heckled in a disgraceful manner"—and said that



"the sophomoric mud-slinging directed at faculty and student members was despicable."

The super-patriotic Scabbard and Blade boys evidently overplayed their hand; their efforts turned out to be a boomerang. Two student supporters of the bill, who had been hissed and booed at the convocation, carried a first-hand report of the event to Senator Fine and his Senate Committee on Education, and the Committee was undoubtedly impressed. Possibly the Committee concluded that the Scabbard and Blade boys had only revealed themselves for what they are, incipient fascists, and decided that the time had come to place some kind of a damper on the forces suspected of cultivating their fascist mentality. In any event, the Senate received a favorable Committee report on the bill, and then, after extended debate, adopted the measure by a vote of 28 to 20. Six days later Governor Langer's signature made the measure law.

### Those Deserving Credit

Credit for the North Dakota victory must go not only to Senator Fine and Mr. William Godwin, Majority Floor Leader of the House, but also to the other progressive Farmers Union Senators and Representatives; to Mr. Morris Erickson, Secretary of the North Dakota Farmers Union; to the State College Local No. 265 of the American Federation of Teachers; and to the student members of the College Farmers Union Local at N. D. A. C.

Now that Wisconsin, Minnesota and North Dakota have made the change, which State will be next?

## M. I. T. TO EXEMPT DRILL OBJECTORS

Beginning next September, for a trial period of two years, student objectors to compulsory military training at Massachusetts Institute of Technology will be allowed opportunity to substitute alternative courses for the military training requirements, according to a recent decision of the M. I. T. faculty which was made public on January 11th. The exemption and alternative choice, it is understood, will be limited to students whose objections to R. O. T. C. work are based on "sincere religious or moral grounds," and the proposed alternatives will include "such studies as international law, history of arbitration, diplomacy, or possibly an independent course chosen with the approval of a (faculty) committee of specialists."

By special dispensation the new plan will be retroactive in the case of Kenneth Arnold, M. I. T. certificate graduate of '36, who forfeited his academic degree because of his refusal, on grounds of religious conscience, to complete the required military courses. Arnold will be allowed to get his degree by completing a special program of work, including a special examination to be outlined by President Compton's faculty committee.

Military training has been compulsory at M. I. T. since the establishment of the Institute more than seventy years ago. According to *The Tech*, the recent faculty decision came as a "distinct surprise" to campus leaders who have agitated for many years for some modification in the compulsory drill policy. Nonetheless the student editor sounded a sensible

## MASSACHUSETTS LEGISLATIVE DRIVE UNDER WAY

Encouraging progress is being made by the Massachusetts Committee Against Compulsory Military Training in mobilizing public support for its bill which was recently filed in the Massachusetts House of Representatives by Charles H. Morrill of Haverhill. Numbered House Bill No. 1082, the proposed measure would amend Section 3 of Chapter 71 of the General Laws, so as to read as follows:

*Section 3.* The exercises in the public schools may include calisthenics, gymnastics and military drill; but no pupil shall be required to take part in any military exercise or course of military drill or military training without the written consent of his parent or guardian, nor shall any military drill or military training be given during regular school hours; neither shall any student in any college, university or institute within the commonwealth (excepting essentially military schools) be required to enroll in any course of military drill or military science or any other military subject unless he voluntarily elects to do so, and no pupil or student shall be deprived of his diploma or degree, or be otherwise penalized, for not taking military drill or military training where the same may be offered.

Leaders of the Massachusetts campaign declare that more than fifty educational, cultural, religious, youth and labor groups are supporting their proposed bill. A hearing on the measure, before the Joint Committee on Education of the Massachusetts Senate and House, is scheduled to be held on February 23rd.

warning: "The only catch in the new attitude taken by the faculty seems to be that it may be difficult to pick out just the ones who are 'conscientious' in their objection." In other words, the editor foresees that the new policy may present certain administrative difficulties. It is not unreasonable to fear that these difficulties may prove so impossible that the M. I. T. authorities will feel justified in swinging back to a clean-cut, hard-boiled policy of compulsory drill for all students, with exemptions for none, and summary suspension for those who don't like it. This very thing has happened at Ohio State University. M.I.T. owes it to itself, as well as to the students and to the general public to which it has undeniable responsibilities, to guard carefully against such blunders as have besmirched Ohio State's reactionary record since 1934.

*Breaking The War Habit*, news bulletin published six times during each school year (October 1st, November 15th, January 1st, February 15th, April 1st, and May 15th) by the

COMMITTEE ON MILITARISM IN EDUCATION

2929 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

OFFICERS AND EXECUTIVE BOARD MEMBERS: George A. Coe, Chairman; Tucker P. Smith, Chairman, Executive Board; Harry A. Overstreet, John Nevin Sayre, Vice-Chairmen; Oswald Garrison Villard, Treasurer; Edwin C. Johnson, Secretary; Dorothy Shoemaker, Associate Secretary; Roswell P. Barnes, Mrs. J. Henry Callister, Mrs. J. Malcolm Forbes, E. C. Lindeman, Virgil E. Lowder, Mrs. Marion M. Miller, Helen Morton, Selden Rodman, Alfred Schmalz, Norman Thomas, Wellington H. Tinker, Kenneth Walser and L. Hollingsworth Wood.

Subscription: 25 cents per year

Vol. V

89

No. 6



## MORE "EDUCATIONAL NAZI-ISM" AT OHIO STATE

The *Columbus Citizen* on January 5, 1937, published a photograph showing Dr. George W. Rightmire, President of Ohio State University, among others, participating in a tree-planting ceremony on the campus of his University. The photograph, interestingly enough, was entitled "Another 'Peace Tree' Starts Growing."

But the realism of Dr. Rightmire's devotion to peace is pathetically less humorous than tragic, for the ironic part is that the tree planting took place on the same day that President Rightmire sent rather blunt notices to two student conscientious objectors, Merrill Barnebey and Robert Pinches, stating that they could not remain students at the University unless they would compromise their religious convictions by continuing to participate in the warfare techniques taught in the campus R. O. T. C. At the same time, the University administration made itself the victim of obvious self-condemnation, insofar as its educational standards are concerned. For by enforcing its reactionary military regulations it turned out of its doors the student who last year received the Danforth Award, based on outstanding mental, physical, spiritual and social attributes. This award is the most distinctive and valued prize for Freshman Agricultural students.

### **Arbitrary Denial of Religious Freedom**

In this incident we also see the way in which compulsory military training denies any reality to the American constitutional right to freedom of religion and conscience. Here are two students whose sincerity, whose honesty, whose religious beliefs and practices are not even challenged by those opposing them. They are members in good standing of the Methodist Episcopal Church under whose ecclesiastical law and pronouncements they have taken their stand. The Board of Bishops of their church has, just within the last few weeks, made a pronouncement which is in direct support of their position. And yet they have been expelled from their own state university for being good Methodists, for being sincere, honest, and intelligently courageous in their Christian convictions. The seriousness of the situation as a concern of the Methodist Episcopal Church is suggested by the words of Charles F. Boss, Executive Secretary of the World Peace Commission of the Methodist Episcopal Church, who has said the church will never rest until it frees youth from the conscription of conscience.

### **Pastors Pledge "Virtual Boycott"**

Furthermore, the Ohio Pastors' Convention, the annual conference of the Ohio Council of Churches, indicated the attitude of the churches of Ohio in passing a resolution pledging themselves to what the newspapers have interpreted as a "virtual boycott of the University." Their resolution follows: "We state our deep concern over conditions at Ohio State University. By repeatedly coercing Christian conscience and enforcing military training upon its students it violates the rights of religious freedom. The administration and the Board of Trustees refuse to make military training optional or to allow students to take alternate courses. It, therefore, leaves us no

alternative. We shall do all in our power, as religious leaders, to influence our young people to attend other educational institutions where freedom of conscience is allowed."

### **University Administration Adamant**

The University Administration seemingly has adopted an attitude of unreasonable stubbornness as an alternative to, or perhaps as a cloak for, the bungling way in which it has attempted to deal with this situation in the past. Those who know the situation in Ohio will recall that the stubborn attitude of the Administration in enforcing compulsory military training has been the source of constant turmoil on the O. S. U. campus ever since the World War. Three years ago the University suspended eight student conscientious objectors to compulsory military training—an action described by a leading newspaper as "educational Nazi-ism." (See story in *Breaking the War Habit*, Feb. 15, 1934.) It is obviously a poor excuse for the Administration to blame "outside agitation" for the difficulties incurred by its own mistakes and its unyielding refusal to face facts.

Ohio churchmen should not be alone in their concern for this situation. Farmers and workers who are unable to pay the added expense of private university training in such subjects as agriculture and mechanical arts which are offered at no other state school in Ohio, are beginning to see the unfairness of this "peacetime military conscription" at Ohio State University which falls upon their sons because they are forced by economic circumstances to attend this school.

The history of the Ohio State situation, and the inflexible attitude of the University Administration, serve to make it clear that the future struggle against compulsory military training in Ohio will be a bitter contest against a hostile university organization. It would seem that nothing less than the passage of a measure like the Nye-Kvale Amendment to the National Defense Act, or a State legislative proposal such as that which has just been adopted in North Dakota, or a state-wide initiative campaign for a constitutional amendment, will provide a satisfactory solution for the Ohio situation.

## NYE-KVALE BILLS REINTRODUCED

Senator Nye and Congressman Kvale, sponsors of the Nye-Kvale Amendment which reached the point of hearings before a Senate subcommittee during the closing days of the 74th Congress, recently reintroduced their proposed bills in the present Congress. Senator Nye's bill is now numbered S. 367, while Mr. Kvale's is H. R. 3800.

It is understood that the Senate sub-committee which conducted hearings on the Nye-Kvale Amendment last June, is preparing a report on the measure, and that the report will soon be considered by the Senate Military Affairs Committee, of which Senator Morris Sheppard, of Texas, is chairman. Our friends are advised to write their Senators to urge favorable action on the bill when it is reported out by Senator Sheppard's Committee.



## CALIFORNIA FACES ISSUE AGAIN

The issue of militarism in education is before the present session of the California Legislature in two different forms. First, it is presented in the form of Assembly Bills Nos. 328 and 340, introduced by Mr. John B. Pelletier and Mr. Ben Rosenthal, respectively. The Pelletier-Rosenthal bills are identical, and propose a law stating: "No student or pupil in any of the universities or colleges of this State shall be obliged to enroll in a course of military training and no university or college in this State shall require a compulsory course in military training." Their bills have been referred to the House Committee on Education. They deserve the support of all citizens who are devoted to the genuine interests of peace and democracy.

Two other measures before the Legislature, Assembly Bill 1238 and Senate Bill 508, raise the issue of militarism in education in a new and dangerous form. These bills, the one sponsored by seventeen, the other by fifteen endorsers, propose extensive amendments to the California School Code so as to authorize the inclusion of R. O. T. C. courses in the State's teacher-training institutions. These proposed bills are absolutely pernicious in design, representing as they do an attempt on the part of the military and their friends in the Legislature to amend the laws having to do with teacher-training institutions so as to provide a secure legal foothold for the R. O. T. C. Once the foothold is provided, it may be expected that the militarists will put up a clamor for the actual installation of military training units in the teacher-training institutions, and then the California school system will be more thoroughly militarized than any other in the country.

Our friends in California, therefore, are faced with a two-fold duty:

- (1) **Fight Assembly Bill 1238 and Senate Bill 508;**
- (2) **Support Assembly Bills 328 and 340 sponsored by Messrs. Pelletier and Rosenthal.**

## WASHINGTON LEGISLATURE GETS ANTI-COMPULSORY DRILL BILL

Under the sponsorship of Mr. Michael B. Smith of Seattle, a bill to abolish compulsory military training at the University of Washington and Washington State College has been introduced in the Washington Legislature. Reverend J. Warren Hastings and Reverend E. A. Fridell, both of Seattle, are among those supporting the measure. Mr. Fridell has pointed out that "the National Defense Act authorizes the establishing of units where military training shall be given in a 'two years' elective or compulsory course'. If we follow the correct wording of the law, we discover that the word 'elective' comes first, indicating no intention of favoring compulsion. The Old World autocracies follow the compulsory plan for students. To imitate them is out of place in America and will only lead to their kind of despotism and chaos. I favor voluntary military training."

## NEW BOOKS

**TRAINING FOR PEACE.** By Richard B. Gregg. J. B. Lippincott Co., Philadelphia. 1937. 40 pp. 25¢.

This booklet is a supplement to Mr. Gregg's earlier volume, *The Power of Non-violence*. The supplement, like the book, is a creative achievement of truly great importance. Unlike many who believe themselves committed to the goal of achieving peace by peaceful means, Mr. Gregg does not fail to realize the revolutionary implications of the pacifist position. He has a full understanding of the meaning of pacifism for both the individual and society. On the basis of that understanding he has sought in the present booklet to outline a practical program of training for peace workers. The result is a remarkable product, and it deserves to be the everready handbook of all who mean business.

**WE CAN DEFEND AMERICA.** By General Johnson Hagood. Doubleday, Doran & Co., Garden City, N. Y. 1937. 321 pp. \$2.50.

This highly provocative book is one of the most important discussions of the national defense problem of the United States to be published since the close of the World War. It's superficial at some points, illogical at others; and the chapter on the R. O. T. C. isn't satisfactory at all. But nevertheless we urge peace people to read it. The book deserves a wide reading, not because everything it says is right or wise, but because it bears upon a field in which the reckless use of undefined terms, irrational fears and phobias, and just ordinary wishful thinking have conspired to make sane thought almost impossible.

**KILL OR CURE?** By Muriel Lester. Cokesbury Press, Nashville, Tennessee. 135 pp. \$1.00.

The question that the title raises is readily answered by a reading of the brief but vivid anecdotes which are contained in Miss Lester's book. The book ends with a colorful biography of "the Jane Addams" of England, written by Stanley A. Hunter.

**HELL OR HEAVEN:** By Louis Ludlow. Stratford Company, Boston, Massachusetts, 1937. 208 pp. \$2.00.

Congressman Ludlow has gained wide fame for his sponsorship of a proposed peace amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which is now before Congress. The amendment specifies that except in the event of invasion or attack, "the authority of Congress to declare war shall not become effective until confirmed by a majority of all votes cast thereon in a nation-wide referendum," and also provides for the immediate conscription of "war properties" upon declaration of war. Mr. Ludlow's book deserves wide reading, not only because it offers a persuasive statement in support of his proposed amendment, but also because it is possessed of a most contagious moral indignation against war and all that it means. On certain minor points of the amendment reservations are in order; but these do not invalidate the main idea, which is the very democratic one of giving the war-making power to "the masses who have to fight and die and endure the unspeakable horrors and agony of war."

**NEW DIRECTIONS:** Edited by Warren Bower. J. B. Lippincott Co., Philadelphia, Pa., 1937. 548 pp.

Instructors of college classes in English Composition will welcome this volume of essays on the general theme "The Student in a Changing World." On the entirely reasonable assumption that "a study of the present and the future will furnish a class in English composition with the best possible motivation for writing," Professor Bower has included in his volume a series of contemporary articles and essays on a variety of vital topics: education, science, public housing, soil conservation and related matters, literature and the arts. A section on "the thoughts of youth" includes an article on the military training problem. Each essay is followed by specific and highly stimulating suggestions for individual study and writing.



March 3, 1938

Mr. Edwin C. Johnson, Secretary,  
Committee on Militarism in Education,  
2329 Broadway,  
New York, N.Y.

My dear Mr. Johnson:

Let me thank you for your kind letter of March 1. I wish I could attend the Conference on World Economic Cooperation which is to be held in Washington. Unfortunately my commitments are such that it will not be possible for me to get away.

With best wishes, I remain

Very cordially yours,

AHS:BK



# COMMITTEE ON MILITARISM IN EDUCATION

2929 BROADWAY, NEW YORK CITY

393

## EXECUTIVE BOARD

ROSWELL P. BARNES	SELDEN RODMAN
MRS. J. HENRY CALLISTER	ALFRED SCHMALZ
MRS. J. MALCOLM FORBES	NORMAN THOMAS
E. C. LINDEMAN	WELLINGTON H. TINKER
MRS. MARION M. MILLER	KENNETH WALSER
HELEN MORTON	L. HOLLINGSWORTH WOOD

## OFFICERS

GEORGE A. COE	HARRY A. OVERSTREET
<i>Chairman</i>	<i>Vice-Chairman</i>
TUCKER P. SMITH	JOHN NEVIN SAYRE
<i>Chairman, Executive Board</i>	<i>Vice-Chairman</i>
OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD	VIRGIL E. LOWDER
<i>Treasurer</i>	<i>Assistant Treasurer</i>
EDWIN C. JOHNSON	DOROTHY SHOEMAKER
<i>Secretary</i>	<i>Associate Secretary</i>

April 20, 1937.

## NATIONAL COUNCIL

WILL W. ALEXANDER  
DEAN LESLIE BLANCHARD  
REV. W. RUSSELL BOWIE  
HOWELL HAMILTON BROACH  
JOHN BROPHY  
INEZ. M. CAVERT  
BAYARD H. CHRISTY  
ALBERT F. COYLE  
MRS. J. SERGEANT CRAM  
PROF. JEROME DAVIS  
JAMES H. DILLARD  
SHERWOOD EDDY  
REV. NOBLE S. ELDERKIN  
PROF. CHARLES ELLWOOD  
ZONA GALE  
REV. ALVIN C. GODDARD  
LINLEY V. GORDON  
REV. JOEL HAYDEN  
PROF. CARLTON J. H. HAYES  
PRES. JOHN M. HENRY  
REV. JOHN HERRING  
PROF. MANLEY O. HUDSON  
HANNAH CLOTHIER HULL  
PROF. RUFUS JONES  
JAMES WELDON JOHNSON  
FREDERICK J. LIBBY  
PROF. ROBERT MORSS LOVETT  
PROF. HALFORD E. LUCCOCK  
JAMES H. MAURER  
PROF. ALEXANDER MEIKLEJOHN  
BISHOP FRANCIS J. MCCONNELL  
MRS. JOHN F. MOORS  
ORIE O. MILLER  
PRES. ARTHUR E. MORGAN  
PRES. S. K. MOSINAN  
A. J. MUSTE  
PROF. REINHOLD NIEBUHR  
FRANK OLMSTEAD  
BISHOP BROMLEY OXNAM  
KIRBY PAGE  
PRES. MARION PARK  
RT. REV. EDWARD L. PARSONS  
CARL PATTERSON  
PROF. IRA M. PRICE  
JUSTICE JAMES HOGE RICKS  
PROF. W. CARSON RYAN  
RT. REV. WILLIAM J. SCARLETT  
HELEN SEABURY  
MARY SEABURY  
J. HENRY SCATTERGOOD  
REV. CHARLES M. SHELDON  
RABBI ABRA HILLEL SILVER  
KATHERINE V. SILVERTHORN  
REV. T. GUTHRIE SPEERS  
REV. ERNEST F. TITTLE  
DEAN HENRY P. VAN DUSEN  
RICHARD WELLING  
RABBI STEPHEN S. WISE  
PROF. LUTHER A. WEIGLE  
PRES. MARY E. WOOLLEY  
WILLIAM ALLEN WHITE

Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver,  
The Temple,  
East 105th Street at Ansel Road,  
Cleveland, Ohio.

My dear Rabbi Silver:

Would it be possible for you to attend a conference in Columbus, Ohio, next Wednesday, April 28th?

The conference has been called by Rev. Dr. Charles F. Boss, Jr., Executive Secretary of the World Peace Commission of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and its purpose is to outline a Statewide program with reference to the military training situation which has developed at Ohio State University. As you know, at Ohio State University compulsory military training is imposed on all students for two years with exemptions for none, not even for Quakers, Mennonites, etc., and students conscientiously opposed to such training are denied their opportunity for higher education unless they compromise their convictions with the military requirement.

The conference will be held at the Student Center of the Indianola Methodist Episcopal Church in Columbus. It will get under way about ten or ten-thirty, and will carry on into the middle of the afternoon.

I hope very much that you will find it possible to join in the conference, and that you will write Rev. Dr. Robert Leonard Tucker of the Indianola Methodist Episcopal Church at Columbus, advising him whether or not we may expect you to be present.

Sincerely yours,

*Edwin C. Johnson*  
Edwin C. Johnson.

ECJ:K  
BS&AU  
12646



# Committee on Militarism in Education

2929 BROADWAY, NEW YORK CITY

Telephone: UNiversity 4-3420



## EXECUTIVE BOARD

BENJAMIN R. ANDREWS	E. C. LINDEMAN
ROSWELL P. BARNES	HELEN MORTON
MRS. J. HENRY CALLISTER	ALFRED SCHMALZ
MERLE E. CURTI	NORMAN THOMAS
MRS. J. MALCOLM FORBES	KENNETH WALSER
HARRY N. HOLMES	L. HOLLINGSWORTH WOOD

## OFFICERS

WILLIAM H. KILPATRICK <i>Chairman</i>	OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD <i>Treasurer</i>
GEORGE A. COE <i>Vice-Chairman</i>	JOHN NEVIN SAYRE <i>Assistant Treasurer</i>
HARRY A. OVERSTREET <i>Vice-Chairman</i>	EDWIN C. JOHNSON <i>Secretary</i>

June 28, 1940

My dear Rabbi Silver:

Won't you please give the enclosed Declaration Against Conscription a careful reading, and then advise us whether or not we may have permission to include your name among those endorsing it?

Our hope is to receive endorsements from well over one hundred American leaders before we release the text of the Declaration to the press. After that copies of it will be mailed to Members of Congress and other officials in Washington.

The Declaration has been read and endorsed by several people here, including <sup>John Dewey</sup> Oswald Garrison Villard, John Haynes Holmes and John Nevin Sayre. All of us earnestly hope that the strength of your own endorsement will be added to it.

Because it is urgent that we move ahead on this matter without delay, may I ask that you send us your reply by return mail?

Faithfully yours,

Secretary



CONFIDENTIAL: Not for publication  
until released with list of endorsers.

### A DECLARATION AGAINST CONSCRIPTION

The American people are today being deluged by propaganda for military conscription in peacetime. Sincere and distinguished as many of the proponents of conscription may be, and plausible as many of their contentions may seem, we, the undersigned, urge the American people and their representatives in Congress to deliberate with sober caution before permitting such an unprecedented innovation to become a part of our national life.

In our judgment military conscription in peacetime smacks of totalitarianism, and we are convinced that its adoption would be highly dangerous to the spirit and traditions of American democracy. The reasons upon which we support this conviction are as follows:

First, the essential idea underlying military conscription is the major premise of every dictatorship and all totalitarianism. It is the assumption that the individual citizen is but a pawn in the hands of unlimited state power. Conscription has always been abhorrent to free men because it is, in effect, a seizure of a man's body, time, and service by force and under threat of heavy penalty. For generations millions of Europeans have fled their native countries and become loyal and devoted American citizens in order to enjoy, among other things, our freedom from conscription. Universal military service has been and is today the chief weapon by which dictators suppress free conscience among their people, inculcate them with the false ideals of chauvinistic nationalism, and indoctrinate them with belief in the superiority of brute force over morals and ideas. The adoption of conscription among Americans will be the opening wedge for the totalitarian dogma that individual citizens are pawns of the state from birth until death, without any rights which those in positions of power are bound to respect. Americans must not delude themselves with the belief that their democracy will remain unscathed if we adopt the essentially anti-democratic processes which have worked such havoc abroad.

Second, we consider that peacetime conscription is in itself a flagrant negation of democracy. We reject as transparent sophistry the contention that conscription under the name of "selective service" is democratic and that voluntary military service is undemocratic. The "equality" that conscription makes for is akin to the "equality" which prevails among regimented galley slaves. It is no more democratic than any other form of involuntary servitude. Our American conception of democracy signifies vastly more than mere equality, for it also includes the great concepts of liberty and freedom for the individual. Furthermore, we deny that conscription can be justified by the assertion that it prevails in such democracies as England, Sweden and Switzerland. The conditions we face in United States are in many respects widely different from and not comparable to those prevailing in European nations. For this reason valid conceptions of American democracy and military service must be derived from American history and tradition, not from contemporary European practices. In our view, peacetime conscription and American democracy are quite incompatible.



Third, the adoption of military conscription in peacetime would be a radical departure from historic American tradition. Never before in American history has it been thought necessary to resort to peacetime conscription for purposes of defense. This fact has been one of the truly glorious traditions of our American democracy; in common with most Americans we take profound pride in it, and we deny that the time has now come to abandon this feature of our national life because of the events in Europe, the gravity of which we well recognize. We are confident that the defense purposes enumerated in the Constitution—"to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections, and repel invasion"—can still be met and effectively discharged without resort to peacetime conscription. As ardently concerned for the safety of our beloved Republic as any advocate of universal service can possibly be, we reject the suggestion that to preserve American democracy we must embrace the worst feature of the totalitarian regimes. We deny that free Americans must now, in the name of freedom, submit to peacetime conscription and thereby become regimented vassals of the national state.

Finally, we oppose conscription because of the disruption it will cause in our American way of life, and also because we question its necessity and wisdom as a defense measure. The military regimentation of the entire manpower of our nation will inevitably result in widespread dislocation in business, industry, agriculture and higher education; and it may prove unnecessary and ineffectual from a military standpoint. Conscription would have been unnecessary in 1917 if we had been raising a force for the defense of our territory rather than an army of five million men for service in Europe. Today the asserted need is for substantial expansion in our army, navy and air corps. If the personnel need is for highly trained permanent forces sufficient in number to man expertly the new weapons as they are produced, we contend this need can best be met by voluntary enlistments under pay schedules sufficiently attractive to induce the required numbers to enroll. By such a procedure it may well be that the required enlistments could be obtained before the new weapons themselves are ready. This solution for the asserted need would seem to us to be vastly preferable to the alternative of organizing huge forces of partially trained civilians. It would be free of totalitarian semblance, as it would be in keeping with our democratic traditions and conceptions. Moreover, it would be based on a recognition of the military lesson being taught on European battlefields--that comparatively small forces of highly trained soldier-mechanics, properly equipped, can defeat many times their number of partially trained civilian conscripts regardless of how courageous the latter may be.

For these reasons, and for others, we appeal to all our fellow Americans who have a zealous regard for the preservation of their democratic institutions to identify themselves with the cause represented in this declaration,



THIS SIDE OF CARD IS FOR ADDRESS



WRHS



Mr. Edwin C. Johnson

2929 Broadway

New York, N. Y.



You may include my name among those endorsing the  
Declaration Against Conscription.

Signed

Address



(If you desire a copy of the Declaration as printed  
with the list of endorsers, please enter check mark  
here: ☐ ).



July 2, 1940

Mr. Edwin C. Johnson  
2929 Broadway  
New York City

My dear Mr. Johnson:

Permit me to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of June 28th. While I am apposed to conscription in peace time, I do not feel free to sign the "Declaration Against Conscription" which you enclosed, for I do not endorse many of the arguments contained in it. I do not believe that peace time conscription will necessarily make of Americans "regimented vassals of the national state" or "galley slaves". I believe that the arguments that it is not now necessary, that it is not in keeping with our tradition, and that it will unnecessarily cause wide-spread dislocation in the life of the people, are quite adequate for a strong presentation of the case against conscription. If the declaration is revised to eliminate what to me appears to be objectionable arguments, I should be very happy to sign it.

With all good wishes, I remain

Very sincerely yours,

AHS:RB



RABBI LEE J. LEVINGER, PH. D.  
DIRECTOR

SARA BOMBERG  
DIRECTOR, STUDENT ACTIVITIES

THE B'NAI B'RITH  
**Hillel Foundation**

AT THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY  
46 - 16TH AVENUE  
COLUMBUS, OHIO  
PHONE - UN. 4457

MARTIN RUBIN  
PRESIDENT, STUDENT COUNCIL

BERT MARKS  
PRESIDENT, HILLEL PLAYERS

March 3d

Dear Abba:

You have undoubtedly noticed that two bills have been introduced into the Ohio legislature to abolish the compulsory military training at Ohio State University. The present situation is this: these bills are before the Reference Committee to be assigned to special committees for consideration. If they go to the Military Affairs Committee, they are doomed. If they go to the committee on Schools ~~and Education~~, they have a fine chance of being reported out to the House. Even if the House does not pass them, and the matter is still doubtful, there will then be public hearings and a chance for educational work for the future.

I am informed that one of the members of the reference committee is William M. Boyd, 14907 Sylvia Ave., Cleveland. It will be of great service to the cause if you can reach him in Cleveland on Monday, or here on Tuesday, when the legislature reconvenes, urging him that he vote to submit these bills to the committee on schools.

Best regards,

