

Subgroup 6

Series 8

1e.



A D D R E S S

T H E   S U P E R F L U O U S   G E N E R A T I O N

By

Herman Frank Swartz, M.Sc., D. D.  
President, Pacific School of Religion  
Berkeley, California

Delivered at

Graduation Exercises

June 4, 1934

Sixty-fifth Annual Commencement

Oregon State College



### The Speaker

Dr. Herman Frank Swartz

Sc.B. with Honors (1891), M.Sc. (1893), Pennsylvania College;  
student Union Theological Seminary and Columbia University;  
D.D. (1915), Fargo College; special work in social sciences  
at universities of Berlin, Paris, Rome, and London.

Dr. Swartz, President of the Pacific School of Religion at Berkeley, California, since 1922, was recommended as a convocation or commencement speaker by friends of the institution and prominent Pacific Coast leaders. His fellow townsman, Dr. Chester Rowell, editor of the San Francisco Chronicle, during his visit on the campus in February, recommended him highly. Dr. Monroe E. Deutsch, vice-president and provost of the University of California, wrote:

"We know Dr. Swartz extremely well and think very highly of him. He has spoken frequently upon our campus, and he is known intimately to me. He is an extremely able speaker, very fluent and full of common sense. Not only is he a clergyman and an administrator, but has played a large part in our community life. He has recently been elected President of our Berkeley Chamber of Commerce, and just a day or two ago was made a member of the Park Commission."

Dr. Swartz's purpose in his address is indicated in a letter dated May 5, 1934:

"My mind is working along the question of the moral and spiritual resources required of the youth now coming forth from the colleges and entering an economic world which has almost no place for them. I had jotted down as the title of the address 'The Unwanted Generation,' but I am a little afraid of this title as it says more than the truth in the direction of the pessimistic. I am therefore hoping to find a title sufficiently arresting, but much more nearly truthful."

Except for incidental illustrations given extemporaneously, Dr. Swartz confined his address to the manuscript herewith presented.



## THE SUPERFLUOUS GENERATION

---  
Herman Frank Swartz  
---

This great company is here to testify to our admiration and our affection for you, young men and women of the graduating class. There can never -- there must never -- be any doubt in your minds regarding this. Furthermore we whole-heartedly congratulate you upon the years of faithful and able work which bring you to this notable day.

You are now facing the future. Here our congratulations cease and our anxiety begins. You are about to discover that you are a "superfluous generation" in this economic world. All men admire you, many are sympathetic with your aspirations, but unless a social miracle occurs, you are in for a long and bitter disillusionment.

Our National Commissioner of Education has recently written to a number of educational administrators reminding us that 2,000,000 young men and women come out this year from college and high schools, ready for jobs, and that they face a horde of 10,000,000 who are already unemployed and clamoring for every available chance for honest work. Let us not be deceived. The world is just as good and as lovely as it ever was. Nature is marvelously bountiful, the mountains and the plains are rich in beauty, the heart of man is warm with friendship, and the Divine goodness is as wide as the sea. These are life's highest values, but man must also labor and eat. It is the social-economic body which is seriously sick, and you are about to suffer because of this grave malady. I would be a treacherous friend were I to speak smooth words of promise.

It is to be your life work not only to make your living but, more important, to make the social structure in which you can honorably and surely make a living for yourself and for your future family. You are entitled to marry and to rear children, and they should never be brought face to face with such a destructive arrest as you are meeting.

I doubt if you want to hear from any of us who sit on this platform our instruction as to what you are to do to correct this gigantic evil. We your elders have been in charge of things for some time and we have only succeeded in bringing you into this awful confusion. I for one propose to be sufficiently modest to seek to work with you and not to try to "boss" you. A year ago even the leaders of "big business" were in this modest frame of mind, and I still am.

We your elders have only one thing more considerable than you possess -- that is experience. Experience is not wisdom, it is only memory. It is, however, a valuable material to be used by wisdom, and this in some small way I desire now to contribute. It may serve to show how we have come into this impasse.



We may therefore surely say that these economic crises of depression with all their catastrophes inhere in the capital-credit-wage system which has been our economic organization growing up with the industrial revolution. There have been bad times all too often before, due to famine, plague, and war, but only for a century or so have we suffered the contradiction of sudden mass impoverishment in the midst of overabundance. This is part of what we have called "modern civilization" or maybe, "progress". I have said it inheres in our system of capital-credit-wage, and this is why.

Now-a-days we do not produce for the use of our own households, but for the market. A multitude of participants share in the progress. As it goes along, all the items of cost of every kind, whether or not socially useful, must be added together to make the final selling price. If the article cannot be sold at this price its production soon ceases. It may be sold cheaper by reducing the costs, but not by pricing it below the costs. This is just not done in a profit motivated society.

Since the process of production takes time, the costs of it have to be carried through this period by some body who is willing to make the outlays, waiting for his repayment until the consumer finally settles the account. This of course is the contribution to the transaction made by credit. The provider of credit has paid for the materials, the labor, the rent, the taxes, and everything else that had to be met at once, and he is finally reimbursed by the consumer's payment. Credit is therefore essential -- it is the elastic member of the organization.

When the process is completed, theoretically each person who has contributed to any part of it receives a return, reckoned in the medium of exchange, equivalent to the value which he added to the whole. Therefore all these participants have in hand cash enough to enable them, collectively, to purchase all that they have produced. Consequently, in a balanced economic society, the members of it should be able to buy up for their own use all which they have produced. We would thus find the economic system a truly reversible engine, the one and only sure fire perpetual motion machine in all the universe. But this sounds too good to be true. It is not true and there is where our grief arises. This operation, like all other means of transmuting energy, suffers losses along the way. The economic losses may be prodigious at times, such as the destruction of a world war. Big or little, loss always claims its share in the price tag, and unlike all the other sharers, Old Man Loss, never shows up with cash as a buyer of the product to whose cost he is a contributor.

Consequently all the producers taken together are never fully able to buy back all goods which they have actually made. Thus a portion which many would like to buy, and which the last holder desperately wants to sell, remains on the shelves or in the storehouse. This creates a back pressure on production, causing manufacturers to cut down on their schedules. Less production means in turn less employment, this means reduced wages and this further lowers general purchasing power, which leaves still more stock unsold, which now establishes the vicious circle.



About this time credit discovers its peril and suddenly demands -- credit is a psychological affair -- payment. This puts Timken bearings under the "decensus inferno" and down we go in a panic. Our first return to consciousness following the smash-up permits us to see the immense quantity of goods on hand which everybody desires to use and which too few can buy. Men are starving and shivering in the streets while the elevators burst with wheat offered at prices ruinously low, yet not moving to market, and the gins are piled high with bales of cotton with no buyers. There is a superfluity of all fruits of production in the face of pitiable want. There is too much of everything, except purchasers.

Now begins a wild scramble to get out from under. Our system assumes that the person who holds title to the goods when the crash comes must take the loss. For these last four bitter years everyone has been trying to shove the loss on to someone else. Every seller has been trying every conceivable scheme to push the loss on to the next man by the illusive process of putting the price of his stuff up through centralized control, by subsidy, by processing tax, by code, or what have you. Meanwhile we have sought to re-establish our wealth by non production, certainly the last word in fatuity if the method is made general. We have also tried to count ourselves richer by cutting in half our measure of wealth. And so it goes, while the standard of living slowly and surely drops, and the capital savings of the nation are being consumed in non-productive consumption -- truly eating our own fat.

Left to itself our disease is self limiting. When this unpurchasable pseudo-surplus is finally used up or destroyed by one method or another, the channels are freed for fresh production with profits all along the line. Happy days are here again, everybody hastens to buy while prices are still low so as to make an extra profit on the rise, and we're off. The faster we go the sooner we stop again and the harder the crash. It is a glorious system when it works, but when it crashes it is hell.

Today, however, we are not primarily interested in profits nor in products, but in producers. When products are unsold, producers are discharged. We recently had 15,000,000 involuntarily unemployed. In my county for a while one person in every eight met on our streets was not only unemployed, but living on public funds. Thanks to prodigious civic expenditures the circulation seems to be starting again, but some of us are not sure whether the hitherto unconsumed surplus is sufficiently absorbed to clear the way for the new period of activity. I do know that there are still about 10,000,000 unemployed, and that you young people are a portion of 2,000,000 more who are becoming industrially of age this year. Most of you are destined to find no work economically rewarding for many months to come. Today you are being ceremoniously fired from a job of the most interesting and profitable kind with desperately few chances for the next piece of work. You will not starve, but a meal ticket is not a satisfactory substitute for a job - and you know it.

Now what are we going to do about it? I am not here to enlist you with glowing promises for a campaign of reconstruction. I have no right, in all conscience, to announce myself as a self appointed leader. With all of my generation, I shared in creating the debacle; I am today chastened and modest.



Nevertheless there are some things I know and some resolutions I am prepared to make. First let us not lose our heads. Confusion worse confounded is no solution. A mad and milling mob wins no victories. Hatred, bitterness, and invective are as destructive as blundering ignorance. You have had these years of college. You have learned to look clearly upon reality and to reach calm judgments. I pray you, do not belie your diploma which testifies to your mental command of reality. The people of America sincerely want to emerge from this desert. They want to come out as a united people. This is why they are looking with eager hope to you. This is also why they are so heartily supporting President Roosevelt in his tireless efforts to explore a pathway to a better America. Let us all show the same poise and courage!

Second, let us remember that barring a great disaster, such as a world war, we will automatically emerge sooner or later. Pray that wise political and industrial leadership may make it sooner. Therefore we do not have to correct this colossal, complicated evil between now and next election day. That were revolution, and revolution involves too high a price to pay, and it never does the job well at that. Fortunately you who are to be the leaders are now young. You have time running with you, not against you. Take time. Ancient Israel took forty years to pass from slavery to freedom, and that was much too fast for them.

Third, be suspicious of perfected systems handed to you in a book, or personified in a masterful man. Principles and values may thus best be exemplified but not going social organizations. These are made up of living units. We do not live in a book, but in a society. All evolution, from the unicellular creature to man, shows that competent organization comes only from infinite adjustment, experiment, and balance.

In particular I counsel you to examine with cool judgment the two systems which are now being enthusiastically offered to replace this imperfect scheme of things which we now suffer.

Of these two systems, Communism offers the most drastic change. It also gives some evidence of its ability to eliminate the cycle which produces the ghastly superfluity from which industrialism periodically suffers.

Whether we like it or not, millions of able men and women will not consent to go on forever without employment, when a competing system which reasonably solves this problem is in effective operation before their very eyes. We were fools to ignore this open fact.

Furthermore, there are millions of our most promising youth whose education has shown them that ownership and profit are not the inspiring goals that our pioneer ancestors esteemed them to be. You young people have discovered that the world's really great men have generally ignored them. Who remembers for their property possessions such men as Aristotle and Plato, Paul and Thomas Aquinas, Jeremiah or Jesus, Homer or Shakespeare, Galileo or Pasteur, Bach or Schubert, Joan of Arc or Florence Nightingale. Why prolong the list, but just note how hard it would be to include in it Hetty Green and the Wendels of New York.



The war and the depression, both of them products of capitalistic industrialism, have served to convert great companies of you to the ancient doctrine that a man's life consisteth not in the multitude of the things which he possesseth. For a long time this religious orthodoxy has been social heresy, but how many of you accept it and mean it. I believe it is this doctrine which makes you and not the "communist agitators" the peril to our present system. Because of such considerations, many of the best of you feel a deep attraction to communism. If enough of you decide that this country should adopt it, it will come, for we who now are in control will sometime die of old age and the land will then be yours.

Recognizing all this, I counsel you to view this system with a critical eye.

First of all, theoretical communism is not now the operating program in Russia. That party in Russia has been compelled to make many and great concessions. Their leaders promise the elimination of these concessions as they are able to complete the revolution, but historians are slow to agree with the communistic prophets. Revolutions have a way of begetting counter-revolutions. Theoretical communism has no place for economic tolerance. Freedom is the one thing it cannot endure, but history has never shown us 180,000,000 people all regimented to march long in step with one drum corps. The enthusiasm of novelty only lasts for a brief day, while the urge for freedom is stronger than the desire for security. The strongest human beings take absurd risks, and enough of them win to keep the whole race advancing.

Also it is true that western civilization has rarely made its greatest permanent advances through sudden and violent revolution, for all such revolutions are followed by a kick back which undoes much of their change, leaving a net result which could more easily and happily have been accomplished by wise evolution. In sum, such strong measures are the first resource of the weak and the last recourse of the strong.

The other inviting system appears under various guises but it is generally labelled "Fascism". On the theory that the best of all governments is a benevolent despotism it abolishes parliaments, all political opposition, freedom of speech and press in the realm of politics, and educational liberty. Under this scheme of things Italy has obviously gained in tranquility and good order. Such a dictatorship when it is firmly placed can approximate a planned economy, and thus hoping to eliminate the industrial cycle, assure profits, and give every man a job. Fascism makes magnificent claims in behalf of the working man. I maintain that these claims have not yet been adequately audited. Frankly I doubt them. Italian Fascism is surely not run for the chief benefit of the laboring and professional part of the population. (This is also certainly true in Germany and Austria.) Dictator Mussolini appears at this distance to be rather the friendly guardian of ownership who, with loud protestations of interest for the laborer, carefully takes his policy from the representatives of ownership. Italy is a sort of glorified Detroit, meaning well -- but second best -- by the laborers provided they do as they are told by the owners of property. Thus far Fascism has been verbose in its promises to the multitudes but the countries thus ruled have not escaped the night period of the cycle, while on the other hand, during these dark



days, ownership has found itself much more secure. It is therefore no accident that our chief advocates of Fascism are the propertied members of our society and their spokesmen. For just this reason, if for no other, the graduates of such a school as this may well remain skeptical.

In both these proposed systems we confront the issue of security versus freedom. Mussolini has shouted "Freedom is a rotten carcass." The dangers of freedom are open and manifest. Just now they are terrible. It is a paradox to say that the dangers of security may be even greater, but they are.

The story of the whole progress of life tells us that freedom is the highest good, because life itself is the supreme freedom. The clam in his shell is secure, but the fish having refused the shell goes through the seas protected chiefly by his freedom and speed. Poor shell-less, hairless, claw-less man stumbles along on his two feet, but he has a free imagination which literally has given him wings to outrun the winds. Although the dangers of human flight are prompt and complete, many men do fly, and even the most timid of us at least ride on wheels. In this company I need make no plea for freedom of thought and will. But you ask, is there not a legitimate place for security? There indeed is such a place and it is of high importance, but, and note this well, be sure it is security rather than tranquility you are getting.

### III. Bank vault and "securities" in it.

In the peaceful safety of such "security" every precious value may easily be lost.

This long dissertation on Communism and Fascism is offered because so many assume that these are the only methods of permanently mastering the terrible social distortion which makes you now a superfluous generation. Of these methods Fascism does not correct the evil, although like Pepsodent it has one merit, it is well advertised. The other, Communism, may correct this malady, but at much too great a cost in terms of other precious values.

There are yet other ways of progress. Must we destroy our intellectual and spiritual personality to keep our bellies full of corned beef and cabbage? In any event we can attempt to move steadily forward by the Anglo-Saxon process of trial and error.

For example, why not consider the resources of insurance? Property interests long ago discovered and adopted the benefits of sound insurance. By its means the contingencies of business are spread, so as to rest on a much wider base of support both in time and in number of cases. Insurance can easily be made economically sound (see the present value of old line insurance company stocks), and socially invaluable. Why not insure against unemployment? The reasons against such protection in America are three. First, we have never done it, and being backward people in matters of social invention, we are afraid of its novelty. Yet in other countries 35,000,000 workers are thus protected. Second, the propertied classes fear that they may have to help pay the premiums. But we may pertinently ask them who is



going to pay the taxes to liquidate the billions we are now expending for relief. In any event the man who works would willingly pay a large part of his premiums. And third, men who are insured against unemployment cannot quite so easily be domineered over by their employers. A fourth reason may be added, namely that until recently a large part of American agriculturists have not viewed with sympathetic cooperation the problems of the industrial community. Here the depression is having one good effect. It is helping the farmer who is making no money and the industrial worker who is long out of a job to establish a real bond of sympathy.

It is my purpose, however, to abstain strictly from all tempting inclination to tell you, trained and able youth, what course to follow. There is invention in your minds and determination in your hearts. All I seek to do is to make you pause before you trade your birthright of freedom for even a whole kettle full of pottage.

There remains still one other consideration which must be frankly mentioned, although a discussion of it is charged with deep emotional difficulties. Maybe we can approach it in this way.

It is a commonplace of political knowledge that unemployed populations in past generations have re-established themselves in large measure by migrations. Today unfortunately the world is largely closed to mass movements by any large group. There remains, however, a parallel possibility, namely military action. It is no accident that the more military rulers of men have generally argued for a high birth rate even in the face of lowered standards of living. We all know that the great armies of history have largely been composed of young men of just your age. When economic employment has been difficult to find, and vast numbers of foot-free young men have been easily available, the time has been ripe to declaim about "national aspirations" and "manifest destiny". The keen competition for a place in the sun has given drive to such promptings. Then the stage is set for war. In 1913-14 the industrial nations of Europe were bursting with populations of youth while business was on the decline. Everybody was aggrieved by everybody else, while at the same time vast armies of men for the field and of women for the factory could be summoned overnight. It was then the whole structure blew up.

Now in your day, young men and women, the train is again laid. All nations, ours included, are in a mad rivalry of armament. Conferences for limitation collapse. France wails for security, Russia marches a million men in review past the Kremlin, Japan wants the naval restrictions lifted, and we send our vast fleet to New York on a publicity cruise, while Congress votes fabulous sums for ships. We all are frantically preparing for collective suicide, while each nation hopes that it may "beat the game". We were "winners" in the last war, to the extent of not less than eleven billion dollars of bad debts, which alone would be enough to pay every unemployed person in our land \$4.00 for every working day for a whole year, and what is more significant, this great flow of wealth would at the same time start the nation on a flowing tide of constructive activity. I bid you therefore be vigilant for the symptoms of war. Your rulers, political and industrial, will personally be very sorry to see you sacrificed, but economically you are to them superfluous and they can easily afford to burn you up to accomplish a program of business expansion.



Today, however, nobody is willing to profess a war of aggression and conquest. Even many British declare that the Boer war was a campaign of "self defense." Now-a-days all wars are called "defensive" by all parties. When our next war threatens it probably will be for the defense of the freedom of the seas. How we must "defend" the dear old sea! Of course what we mean to do is to maintain our right to supply all belligerents with whatever we can sell them at a handsome profit. Have you seen some of the recent articles on the armament business? Today you are not able to see any soundly convincing reason, other than perhaps the love of adventure, why you should be willing to hang your disjointed members on a barbed wire entanglement for any such cause. And what is more, you have no desire to plunge your bayonets through the bowels of some English, German, or French boy because he also happens to be a member of a generation which is economically superfluous. If you get caught in this sort of a slaughter it will be because of three things. First, you have missed the main value in your education and you are still too easily deceived. Second, the defense reactions of fear have been played upon, and third, you may find it takes less bravery to step into the war than to resist the clever clamor of those who want you to do their fighting.

I am not a philosophical pacifist. There are few indeed among us who would not fight to the bitter end in genuine defense. How would it do to say, "Millions for defense, but not one cent for aggression" and then in order to validate this principle, be ever ready to stand firm at our national boundaries to resist all invasion while refusing absolutely to set foot on foreign soil with weapons in hand.

--- end ---



COLONEL PATTERSON

Interview with Colonel Patterson June 25:

The Colonel sought a conference, and at this conference presented reasons which seemed to him to have a bearing upon a decision which had been made by the President to the effect that the Colonel should terminate his period of service at the institution, as Commandant of Cadets, and should request the War Department for a transfer.

The reasons advanced by Colonel Patterson were largely of a personal nature. First, he indicated that his daughter had one year in which to complete the Corvallis High School; second, that Mrs. Patterson was in poor health and would be likely to suffer because of the transfer; third, that he did not wish to have any adverse material attached to his service record.

At the conclusion of the interview indicated, the Colonel was given to understand that the matter would be held open for a few days and that if he cared to call again final decision would be made. He appeared under above date and repeated the arguments above indicated. At the conclusion of the interview, he was informed that there appeared to be no good reason for modifying the decision previously arrived at.

As a matter of information, it should be stated here that the inspector from the Ninth Corps Area informed the President that he had arranged with Colonel Patterson to submit his request for transfer to the War Department within ten days from the time of the inspector's visit (June 20, 1934).

It should also be understood in this connection that <sup>it</sup> was agreed in conference with the inspector that no matters should be submitted to General Craig with reference to the Colonel other than those connected with his (Col. Patterson's) criticisms in letters to the President, copies of which went to the Chancellor and Members of the State Board of Higher Education, as well as to General Craig, and one published in the Gazette-Times, copies of which are on file.

G. W. Peavy.



HEADQUARTERS RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS,  
OREGON STATE AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE,

Corvallis, Oregon,

June 6, 1934.

The President,  
Oregon State Agricultural College,  
Corvallis, Oregon.

Dear Mr. President:

Some time ago, at a staff conference, you stressed the desirability of all faculty members attending the exercises incident to graduation; I went further by ordering all of my officers to attend the Commencement exercises--this as a matter of co-operation with you.

X As a result of some of the remarks of the speaker on that occasion, Dr. Herman Frank Swartz, all of the officers of the Military Department feel that they were gratuitously insulted, demeaned and belittled by him. To my mind, no blame for this attaches to you; I do feel, however, and so do they, that the basic responsibility rests squarely with those who selected and recommended that speaker.

In relating the following unfortunate and ill-advised incidents, I am meeting this issue along the lines so often recommended by the Chancellor--fairly, squarely and courageously.

In the course of his talk, Dr. Swartz stated, in effect, that those in uniform would use the youth of the country to pay off its debts--use them as cannon fodder. That charge was made, apparently, to intimidate members of the graduating class in particular and it is not a statement of fact.

Dr. Swartz also stated that he does not know why there is anyone in the uniform of his country, unless it be to make the ladies fonder of him. We resent that insult to the uniform of our country, a uniform which has been worn proudly and honorably. The American people are proud of their Army, and have a right to be proud of it (and its uniform) for it is rich in traditions and in deeds well done. I deplore his taking advantage of the college commencement exercises to go out of his way to emit that insult, which was thrown into the teeth of myself and seven other Regular Army officers, four splendid Advanced ROTC students (the Color Guard) and the ROTC Band--all present in uniform, the officers on the rostrum, the Color Guard in prominent front seats, and the Band in the gallery just above him. His insult was also thrown at many of our graduating ROTC students, present in cap and gown, at many other ROTC students in the audience in civilian clothes, and at numerous patriotic people present, one of whom told me that he left the hall in disgust. Frankly, the only reason why I did not leave the hall was my consideration for Chancellor Kerr, for President Peavy, and for the Commencement exercises being held by the college. I fear, had this been an ordinary convocation, I would have left in disgust and, had I done so, I imagine I would not have been alone.

When Dr. Swartz advised those present never to put a foot outside of this country in its defense, he advocated disobedience to constituted authority, disloyalty and mutiny and rebellion. He ignored the fact that the late President Wilson, who was re-elected in 1916 on the slogan, "He Kept Us Out of War", later found it necessary to send millions of men out of the country in its defense. He was also ignorant of the fact that from the time of the



Revolutionary War to and including the Civil War, one of the great weaknesses of the country was a militia which would not go beyond the territorial boundaries of its respective States, and some weak-spined Governors who took no action--or else he ignored those lessons, the lessons which made it advisable to invoke a Selective Service Act for the World War. He also ignored the fact that every citizen of our representative form of government has a reciprocal duty of service for protection. He tried to negate our teachings of patriotism, citizenship, and service for State, Country and others. His advice to never put a foot outside of this country in its defense, is equivalent to advising a not more than 50% Americanism or performance of a citizen's duty to his country in time of need. He went so far that he would not have surprised me much more had he insulted our National Flag which was near the speaker's table.

After enshrouding the graduating class in gloom, he made the scurrilous suggestion that our battleships be renamed and, as new names for them, suggested, among others, Monroe Doctrine, Munitions and Bill Collector, and stated that, with that done, when the fleet returns to the Pacific, we will know why it is here. That was another gratuitous insult to a sister service--the Navy--which has written some of the most glorious pages of our history, and it is another insult which we resent.

While I am meeting this issue, and so that you may have a complete picture of the feelings of the personnel of the Military Department, I will make the following statements.

The fact that Fred R. Morrow gave the invocation was an irritation.

Under date of February 22, 1934 (Washington's Birthday) Mr. Morrow, signing himself as "College Pastor", sent out from Westminster House, a letter to managers of fraternity houses, transmitting a pamphlet entitled, "The Horror of It." His letter was, in parts, facetious and it was, without doubt, an attempt to engender bitterness and to stir up discord. For lack of space I will omit reference to the artifices employed in those cuts in that pamphlet; suffice it to say they are published for subversive purposes and by a subversive organization.

I conferred with you a comparatively short time ago re Mr. Morrow's activities in this matter and in connection with the formation of a student chapter of the League for Industrial Democracy at the Westminster House. You informed me that Mr. Morrow is not paid by the college or by the State and that he has no official connection with the college. I complained then that his signing his name as, "Student Pastor" or as "College Pastor" undoubtedly conveys to some students the idea that he is a member of the faculty or that he has an official connection with the college. On the program for the Commencement exercises he is described as "College and University Pastor."

About the middle of April, this year, it appears that a student chapter of the League for Industrial Democracy was formed at Westminster House. It is preposterous to presume that that was done without Mr. Morrow's knowledge, consent, acquiescence or permission; without it those students and the visiting agitator could not have used the Westminster House for that purpose. In fact, in an article in the Barometer of May 11, 1934, Mr. Morrow is reported as having said that the visiting agitator, Monroe Sweetland, asked for permission to use the house for his organizational purposes. The "Red Network", 1934, states, among other things, that the League for Industrial Democracy is very closely



interlocked with the American Civil Liberties Union (a subversive organization) and that it formed the Federation of Unemployment Workers' Leagues of America all over the United States, under joint communist, socialist, I.W.W., and proletarian party (communist) control. A quite complete description of that organization may be found in my article in the Barometer of May 16, 1934.

In the issue of the Barometer of May 11, 1934, there was published what purports to be an interview with Mr. Morrow, in which he stated, among other things, that the two projects proposed (by the L.I.D. organizer, Monroe Sweetland) were not carried out and that the students who attended the first meeting withdrew their instructions. Sunday, June 3, 1934, Don Saunders, who stated that he is the head of the student chapter of the L.I.D., told me that the organization still exists, that it did not disband, but is keeping quiet until things blow over--has, in the meantime, gone into the cyclone cellar--and intends to emerge therefrom again.

Last Sunday, (June 3d) I was informed by a very reliable, high ranking faculty member that Don Saunders had tried to circulate a petition in the local Methodist Church, a petition against National Defense, ROTC., etc., and that the pastor of that church, Mr. Milligan, would not let him circulate it there. My informant said that when that permission was refused him, Saunders said that he would circulate that petition on the campus during the exercises incident to commencement. I talked to Saunders and he admitted that he was trying to circulate that petition, and stated that he expected to get about twenty signatures to it, and, when pressed as to whom he expected would sign it, replied, or admitted, that they would be the members of the student chapter of the L.I.D. When a student asked him if Mr. Morrow had any connection with that petition, or was encouraging it, Saunders declined to either affirm or deny that he was in any way connected with it. I asked Saunders if he knows a student on the University Campus named Campbell. He said he does, and that Campbell is one of his warmest personal friends. Campbell, it appears, is the leader of a group of about twenty-five militant students on that campus, sixteen of whom are said to be women. It is understood that it was that organization which made the disgraceful exhibition there last Army Day. Saunders, I understand, lived in Eugene, then attended the University there and was graduated from it, and has been taking work in chemistry on this campus. I suspect, (and so does the before referred to faculty member) that Saunders is either working willingly for Campbell, or is being made use of by Campbell, to secure signatures of Corvallis townspeople, and students of this college, to that petition, and then to turn the petition over to Campbell to be attached, I suspect, to a petition which, it is believed, Campbell will send in from the University, next fall, to the State Board of Higher Education, petitioning it for the removal of the compulsory enrollment feature. At any rate, pursuant to a resolution, an investigation of certain activities is being made by the local American Legion Post.

This Department feels keenly that it was made a target of by Dr. Swartz. To have a Commencement speaker take advantage of that occasion and go out of his way to try to nullify in a few moments the wholesome instruction given by this Department for four years, is extremely discouraging. The head of any other school on the campus would also resent such action and would feel as we do if a visiting speaker attempted to undermine or attack his



school and its instruction for the purpose, I believe, of making converts to his own beliefs. It is only right and fair that I appeal to you for the same consideration, courtesies and protection from gratuitous insult and embarrassment that is accorded the other schools on this campus; otherwise this school should be abolished. Numerous adverse comments, and much condemnation, of Dr. Swartz' remarks have reached me. Had his talk been extemporaneous, he might have stumbled upon something ill-advised, but his talk was, apparently, well thought out and carefully prepared, as he read it from manuscript. He must, therefore, have uttered the matters to which we object with malice aforethought and with the design of making converts and of spreading propaganda and of arousing feelings of ill-will and of stirring up discord and of inciting controversies. The splendid counter-attack of the Chancellor when, in no uncertain words he stressed the necessity for service, constructive service, to State and country and bid the graduates go forth in a spirit of optimism, was a brilliant ray of sunshine. As far as Dr. Swartz is concerned, the damage is done. The whole thing is very unfortunate. We feel his insults keenly and we resent them.

We want to co-operate with you and with the college, in a harmonious, whole-souled way--and we have always done that fully, but in view of this unfortunate experience, I must ask you for an assurance that it will not be repeated; otherwise, how can co-operation to the extent of attending and participating in college assemblies be expected?

My suggested remedy is that those who select and recommend speakers for assemblies here in future, guarantee us against embarrassment, belittlement and insult, by suggesting to speakers that they avoid controversial subjects, or that they not talk on certain matters, and, then, that that committee be held to a rigid responsibility for its actions.

This unfortunate incident also came at a time when the communists were making a house to house delivery in Eugene (Sunday, June 3, 1934) of mimeographed dodgers stating, among other things, in connection with the Longshoremen's strike, that, "Relief is needed NOW. The Oregon Radical Club--a group of militant U. of O. students, have sent a truck load of food to Portland." It also happened but about six months after Miss Jeannette Rankin made a very Red, vitriolic talk on this campus at the annual dinner of the American Association of University Women. It is also unfortunate that this incident occurred at a State supported institution--one which, in addition, is the recipient of a generous share of Federal Funds.

Regretting this whole occurrence, deploring it, and feeling keenly embarrassed by it, I am,

Very sincerely,

*W. H. Patterson*  
W. H. Patterson,  
Colonel, Infantry,  
P.M.S. & T.

Copies to:

The Chancellor  
Corps Area headquarters  
File.



HEADQUARTERS RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS  
OREGON STATE AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE

Corvallis, Oregon  
June 6, 1934.

The President,  
Oregon State Agricultural College,  
Corvallis, Oregon.

Dear Mr. President:

Some time ago, at a staff conference, you stressed the desirability of all faculty members attending the exercises incident to graduation; I went further by ordering all of my officers to attend the Commencement exercises -- this as a matter of cooperation with you.

As a result of some of the remarks of the speaker on that occasion, Dr. Herman Frank Swartz, all of the officers of the Military Department feel that they were gratuitously insulted, demeaned and belittled by him. To my mind, no blame for this attaches to you; I do feel, however, and so do they, that the basic responsibility rests squarely with those who selected and recommended that speaker.

In relating the following unfortunate and ill-advised incidents, I am meeting this issue along the lines so often recommended by the Chancellor -- fairly, squarely and courageously.

In the course of his talk, Dr. Swartz stated, in effect, that those in uniform would use the youth of the country to pay off its debts -- use them as cannon fodder. That charge was made, apparently, to intimidate members of the graduating class in particular, and it is not a statement of fact.

Dr. Swartz also stated that he does not know why there is anyone in the uniform of his country, unless it be to make the ladies fonder of him. We resent that insult to the uniform of our country, a uniform which has been worn proudly and honorably. The American people are proud of their Army, and have a right to be proud of it (and its uniform) for it is rich in traditions and in deeds well done. I deplore his taking advantage of the college commencement exercises to go out of his way to emit that insult, which was thrown into the teeth of myself and seven other Regular Army officers, four splendid Advanced ROTC students (the Color Guard) and the ROTC Band -- all present in uniform, the officers on the rostrum, the Color Guard in prominent front seats, and the Band in the gallery just above him. His insult was also thrown at many of our graduating ROTC students, present in cap and gown, at many other ROTC students in the audience in civilian clothes, and at numerous patriotic people present, one of whom told me that he left the hall in disgust. Frankly, the only reason why I did not leave the hall was my consideration for Chancellor Kerr, for President Peavy, and for the Commencement exercises being held by the college. I fear, had this been an ordinary convocation, I would have left in disgust, and, had I done so, I imagine I would not have been alone.



When Dr. Swartz advised those present never to put a foot outside of this country in its defense, he advocated disobedience to constituted authority, disloyalty and mutiny and rebellion. He ignored the fact that the late President Wilson, who was reelected in 1916 on the slogan, "He Kept Us Out of War," later found it necessary to send millions of men out of the country in its defense. He was also ignorant of the fact that from the time of the Revolutionary War to and including the Civil War, one of the great weaknesses of the country was a militia which would not go beyond the territorial boundaries of its respective States, and some weak-spined Governors who took no action -- or else he ignored those lessons, the lessons which made it advisable to invoke a Selective Service Act for the World War. He also ignored the fact that every citizen of our representative form of government has a reciprocal duty of service for protection. He tried to negate our teachings of patriotism, citizenship, and service for State, Country and others. His advice to never put a foot outside of this country in its defense, is equivalent to advising a not more than 50% Americanism or performance of a citizen's duty to his country in time of need. He went so far that he would not have surprised me much more had he insulted our National Flag which was near the speaker's table.

After enshrouding the graduating class in gloom, he made the scurrilous suggestion that our battleships be renamed and, as new names for them, suggested among others, Monroe Doctrine, Munitions and Bill Collector, and stated that, with that done, when the fleet returns to the Pacific, we will know why it is here. That was another gratuitous insult to a sister service -- the Navy -- which has written some of the most glorious pages of our history, and it is another insult which we resent.

While I am meeting this issue, and so that you may have a complete picture of the feelings of the personnel of the Military Department, I will make the following statements.

The fact that Fred R. Morrow gave the invocation was an irritation.

Under date of February 22, 1934 (Washington's Birthday) Mr. Morrow, signing himself as "College Pastor," sent out from Westminster House, a letter to managers of fraternity houses, transmitting a pamphlet entitled, "The Horror of It." His letter was, in parts, facetious and it was, without doubt, an attempt to engender bitterness and to stir up discord. For lack of space I will omit reference to the artifices employed in those cuts in that pamphlet; suffice it to say they are published for subversive purposes and by a subversive organization.

I conferred with you a comparatively short time ago re Mr. Morrow's activities in this matter and in connection with the formation of a student chapter of the League for Industrial Democracy at the Westminster House. You informed me that Mr. Morrow is not paid by the College or by the State and that he has no official connection with the College. I complained then that his signing his name as, "Student Pastor" or as "College Pastor" undoubtedly conveys to some students the idea that he is a member of the faculty or that he has an official connection with the College. On the program



for the Commencement exercises, he is described as "College and University Pastor."

About the middle of April, this year, it appears that a student chapter of the League for Industrial Democracy was formed at Westminster House. It is preposterous to presume that that was done without Mr. Morrow's knowledge, consent, acquiescence or permission; without it those students and the visiting agitator could not have used the Westminster House for that purpose. In fact, in an article in the Barometer of May 11, 1934, Mr. Morrow is reported as having said that the visiting agitator, Monroe Sweetland, asked for permission to use the house for his organizational purposes. The "Red Network," 1934, states, among other things, that the League for Industrial Democracy is very closely interlocked with the American Civil Liberties Union (a subversive organization) and that it formed the Federation of Unemployment Workers' Leagues of America all over the United States, under joint communist, socialist, I.W.W., and proletarian party (communist) control. A quite complete description of that organization may be found in my article in the Barometer of May 16, 1934.

In the issue of the Barometer of May 11, 1934, there was published what purports to be an interview with Mr. Morrow, in which he stated, among other things, that the two projects proposed (by the L.I.D. organizer, Monroe Sweetland) were not carried out and that the students who attended the first meeting withdrew their instructions. Sunday, June 3, 1934, Don Saunders, who stated that he is the head of the student chapter of the L.I.D., told me that the organization still exists, that it did not disband, but is keeping quiet until things blow over -- has, in the meantime, gone into the cyclone cellar--and intends to emerge therefrom again.

Last Sunday, (June 3) I was informed by a very reliable, high-ranking faculty member that Don Saunders had tried to circulate a petition in the local Methodist Church, a petition against National Defense, ROTC., etc., and that the pastor of that church, Mr. Milligan, would not let him circulate it there. My informant said that when that permission was refused him, Saunders said that he would circulate that petition on the campus during the exercises incident to commencement. I talked to Saunders and he admitted that he was trying to circulate that petition, and stated that he expected to get about twenty signatures to it, and, when pressed as to whom he expected would sign it, replied, or admitted, that they would be the members of the student chapter of the L. I. D. When a student asked him if Mr. Morrow had any connection with that petition, or was encouraging it, Saunders declined to either affirm or deny that he was in any way connected with it. I asked Saunders if he knows a student on the University Campus named Campbell. He said he does, and that Campbell is one of his warmest personal friends. Campbell, it appears, is the leader of a group of about twenty-five militant students on that campus, sixteen of whom are said to be women. It is understood that it was that organization which made the disgraceful exhibition there last Army Day. Saunders, I understand, lived in Eugene, then attended the University there and was graduated from it, and has been taking work in chemistry on this campus. I suspect, (and so does the before referred to faculty member) that Saunders is either working willingly for Campbell, or is being made use of by Campbell, to secure signatures of Corvallis townspeople, and students of this college, to that petition, and then to turn the petition over to Campbell to be attached, I suspect, to a petition which, it is believed, Campbell will send in from the University



next fall, to the State Board of Higher Education, petitioning it for the removal of the compulsory enrollment feature. At any rate, pursuant to a resolution, an investigation of certain activities is being made by the local American Legion Post.

This Department feels keenly that it was made a target of by Dr. Swartz. To have a Commencement speaker take advantage of that occasion and go out of his way to try to nullify in a few moments the wholesome instruction given by this Department for four years, is extremely discouraging. The head of any other school on the campus would also resent such action and would feel as we do if a visiting speaker attempted to undermine or attack his school and its instruction for the purpose, I believe, of making converts to his own beliefs. It is only right and fair that I appeal to you for the same consideration, courtesies and protection from gratuitous insult and embarrassment that is accorded the other schools on this campus; otherwise this school should be abolished. Numerous adverse comments, and much condemnation, of Dr. Swartz' remarks have reached me. Had his talk been extemporaneous, he might have stumbled upon something ill-advised, but his talk was, apparently, well thought out and carefully prepared, as he read it from manuscript. He must, therefore, have uttered the matters to which we object with malice aforethought and with the design of making converts and of spreading propaganda and of arousing feelings of ill-will and of stirring up discord and of inciting controversies. The splendid counter-attack of the Chancellor when, in no uncertain words he stressed the necessity for service, constructive service, to State and country and bid the graduates go forth in a spirit of optimism, was a brilliant ray of sunshine. As far as Dr. Swartz is concerned, the damage is done. The whole thing is very unfortunate. We feel his insults keenly and we resent them.

We want to cooperate with you and with the college, in a harmonious, whole-souled way--and we have always done that fully, but in view of this unfortunate experience, I must ask you for an assurance that it will not be repeated; otherwise, how can cooperation to the extent of attending and participating in college assemblies be expected?

My suggested remedy is that those who select and recommend speakers for assemblies here in future, guarantee us against embarrassment, belittlement and insult, by suggesting to speakers that they avoid controversial subjects, or that they not talk on certain matters, and, then, that that committee be held to a rigid responsibility for its actions.

This unfortunate incident also came at a time when the communists were making a house to house delivery in Eugene (Sunday, June 3, 1934) of mimeographed dodgers stating, among other things, in connection with the Longshoremen's strike, that, "Relief is needed NOW. The Oregon Radical Club--a group of militant U. of O. students, have sent a truck load of food to Portland." It also happened but about six months after Miss Jeannette Rankin made a very Red, vitriolic talk on this campus at the annual dinner of the American Association of University Women. It is also unfortunate that this incident occurred at a State supported institution--one which, in addition, is the recipient of a generous share of Federal Funds.

Regretting this whole occurrence, deploring it, and feeling keenly embarrassed by it, I am

Very sincerely,

(SIGNED) W. H. Patterson,  
Colonel, Infantry,  
P.M.S. & T.

Copies to -  
The Chancellor  
Corps Area Headquarters  
File



June 8, 1934.

Colonel W. H. Patterson,  
Commandant of Cadets,  
Oregon State College.

Dear Colonel Patterson:

This will acknowledge the receipt of your letter  
of June 6. The matters contained in your communica-  
tion will receive such attention as they may appear  
to merit, in due time.

Very truly yours,

President.

B



CONFIDENTIAL

June 8, 1934

General Malin Craig,  
The Presidio,  
San Francisco, California.

My dear General Craig:

There are certain matters in connection with the Military organization on the campus at Oregon State College which I think should receive early consideration by your department. I am therefore requesting that at your early convenience you send to this campus an inspector, on a confidential mission to my office. I will furnish him with certain information now in my possession, and any other data, in view of the situation which I will outline to him, which he may desire to have.

Since I deem this a matter of considerable importance, both to your organization and to the institution, I am asking that attention be given to it at a reasonably early date. Naturally, I should be greatly pleased and honored if you could come personally. I am assuming, however, that your duties are such that this would not be feasible.

With best wishes,

Yours very sincerely,

President.

B



HEADQUARTERS NINTH CORPS AREA  
Office of the Commanding General  
Presidio of San Francisco, Calif.

Ore. State College  
RECEIVED  
14 1934  
Office of President

CONFIDENTIAL

June 11, 1934.

Dr. Geo. W. Peavy, President,  
Oregon State Agricultural College,  
Corvallis, Oregon.


My dear Doctor Peavy:

In General Craig's absence on an inspection trip I am acknowledging receipt of your letter of the 8th instant and in compliance with your request contained therein, I have this date, issued orders directing Lieutenant Colonel A. B. Kaempfer, Inspector General's Department, of this headquarters, to proceed to your institution for the purpose of investigating the matters you mention.

Lieutenant Colonel Kaempfer should reach Corvallis on or about June 15th.

Thanking you for promptly bringing this situation to the attention of this headquarters, I am

Yours very sincerely,

  
E. S. HARTSHORN,  
Colonel, Gen. Staff,  
Chief of Staff.



HEADQUARTERS NINTH CORPS AREA  
Office of the Commanding General  
Presidio of San Francisco, Calif.

CONFIDENTIAL

June 11, 1934.

Dr. Geo. W. Peavy, President,  
Oregon State Agricultural College,  
Corvallis, Oregon.

My dear Doctor Peavy:

In General Craig's absence on an inspection trip I am acknowledging receipt of your letter of the 8th instant and in compliance with your request contained therein, I have this date, issued orders directing Lieutenant Colonel A. E. Knempfer, Inspector General's Department, of this headquarters, to proceed to your institution for the purpose of investigating the matters you mention.

Lieutenant Colonel Knempfer should reach Corvallis on or about June 15th.

Thanking you for promptly bringing this situation to the attention of this headquarters, I am

Yours very sincerely,

E. B. HARTSHORN,  
Colonel, Gen. Staff,  
Chief of Staff.



6-14-34

*Used as a reference only Not  
submitted to Col. Kammeyer*

CONFIDENTIAL MEMORANDUM RELATIVE TO COLONEL PATTERSON

*P.M.P.*

1. Colonel Patterson holds the position in Oregon State College of Professor of Military Science and Tactics. Serving in this capacity he receives from the College a base salary of \$1200 per year. As an employee of the institution, he is responsible to the President of it in the same sense and to the same degree as is any other member of the College staff.
2. A copy of the letter written to the President of the institution is submitted for information. In this letter Colonel Patterson asks assurance that certain things be not repeated, and states that the Military Department be guaranteed against embarrassment, belittlement, and insult. Obviously, Colonel Patterson has the right of any member of the staff to present a case to the President for consideration. He is not, however, in the position of demanding guarantees for anything.

In carrying the discussion of the commencement address of Dr. Swartz over the head of the President, to the Chancellor, he was to that extent insubordinate. If he objected to matter in the address, it was his obligation to present his case to the President. If he objected to any action or decision of the President, he would then be justified in appealing his case to the Chancellor, and through the Chancellor to the State Board of Higher Education. In sending copies of his letter to the President, as it is alleged, to members of the State Board of Higher Education, he has created a decidedly embarrassing situation for the President, and has brought disrepute to the College.

3. Repeated reports have come from faculty women indicating that the attitude of Colonel Patterson toward them has been crude, boorish, and offensive.
4. He has mingled with student and faculty groups with his breath decidedly strong with the fumes of liquor.
5. Major Bowley has made of the Horse Show a decided success. Colonel Patterson criticized Major Bowley severely for "trying to grab off all the glory," claiming much of the credit for himself.
6. It is alleged that Colonel Patterson has to a considerable degree lost the respect of the members of the staff. Certain ones feel very definitely that the situation of the Military Department on this campus would be vastly improved by a change in the position of Commandant of Cadets.

G. W. Peavy



lieved to know that it was actually caused by the "stupidity" of the present generation and that the Eugene graduates are now turned loose in the world to run things so that hereafter no depression may be expected in their lifetime. "Thank God for it — at last our eyes are open," one said. We think the thanks are given in the wrong direction and that the Eugene graduates and teachers are the ones to whom thanks should be given.

"War is so futile, so stupid, yet men thru the propagandized press, stirring patriotic music, are persuaded to go. Take the profits out of war and it shall die." Apparently pacifism not only permeates the university itself but has trickled down thru the high school where smarm Aleck students sneer at patriotic music and adopt the term of communists to the effect that war is conducted for profit. We have not read as much history perhaps as the Eugene high school prodigies but our understanding has been that the Revolution had very little profit in it for George Washington or any of the others who conducted it and that neither Abe Lincoln or General Grant made very much out of the Civil war nor did any member of Congress nor Woodrow Wilson who was responsible for getting us into the World war. The talk about profits is a silly bit of communistic propaganda, but no sillier than the talk about "propagandized press" whatever that is. The talk about profits in war is a bit of propaganda of the communists who point out the fact that those who sold munitions made money on the transaction. Of course they did. So did those who sold boots and saddles but if there were no profit in either transaction the munitions and the boots and saddles would have been furnished the soldiers just the same.

Should a war break out tomorrow these same silly youngsters would rise nobly to the occasion but unlike their fellow citizens who believe in preparedness and have taken training in the R.O.T.C., these poor misguided saps would be forced into uniform wholly unprepared and unfit and would suffer accordingly.

We think the school board in Eugene should find out whether this sort of stuff, and a lot more that we have no space to mention, is being encouraged by the high school faculty.

receptacles for this kind of matter. A few fines of \$300 will do more to spread the news of the illegality of this procedure than has hitherto been accomplished by having carriers gather up the junk and bring it to the post office.

#### SOME SILLY GRADUATES

G. T. 6-11-34

One of the silliest commencement exercises we ever heard of was conducted last week in a Eugene high school where four or five graduating students undertook to tell the world how it ought to be turned up side down. They urged the adoption of a lot of silly socialistic nonsense which would indicate that their four years in high school had been worse than wasted. They demanded to know "why high schools and hospitals were closed, while expensive roads were being built." If the Eugene high school graduating exercises were typical of such exercises throughout the state more schools ought to be closed.

One of the graduates, imbued, no doubt, with the spirit of Bolshevism which dominates the university, demanded that we have "international patriotism," whatever that is, and said the younger generation "is thru with national paternalism." If that is true then the young fools should not have been given their diplomas but should have been given a good hard spanking and a meeting of the school board should have been called and the teachers who generated that kind of junk for four years should have been fired.

A questionnaire brought out the information that 72 per cent of the Eugene graduating class was strong for studies in "social science because such studies made them think." Apparently these studies did not make them think much harder than a chipmunk would for they stated in their orations that they could not understand "why libraries close and \$11,000 fences are being built around golf courses."

"Our industrial stupidity is certainly outstanding. And this era of social, political, and economic stupidity which is characteristic of this generation resulted in the crash of 1929." Economists who have been impressed with the idea that the crash and the depression were matters beyond human control as a result of forces let loose by the war would be greatly re-

1934 Commencement - Dr. Swartz

#### ACADEMIC FREEDOM

In commenting on this newspaper's censure of the speaker at the recent Oregon State college commencement and its suggestion that the board of higher education ascertain for disciplinary purposes the faculty members who were responsible for hiring him, the Eugene News holds no brief for the speaker but asserts that his sponsors should be held blameless. It bases its position on the theory of academic freedom. Academic freedom, it seems, must be preserved even at the price of disloyalty. Including in its comment, this newspaper and the Corvallis Gazette-Times, it says:

However, if the two editors believe that the college and the university should be higher educational institutions in fact as well as in name, they had no right to attack the person or persons who hired the speaker. After spending four or more years in an institution of higher learning, the students ought to be adult enough to draw their own conclusions from the commencement speaker, if he is sufficiently interesting to hold their attention. The students are supposed, at least during their upper class years, to do considerable independent thinking and study. If, at the close of their college careers they are unable to pick the sound and usable ideas out of their commencement address, they have either wasted their time, or their alma mater has failed them. In the latter case the fault would probably lie with persons who reason that the school should teach what its supporters think it ought to teach.

The above paragraph breathes the spirit of the doctrine of academic free-

dom education. It is well enough for students to search Communism, Fascism, Hitlerism, pacifism and all the other isms for a complete understanding of them. That is academic freedom. But academic freedom ceases when teachers and commencement speakers become propagandists for any of them.

Were the recent Oregon State college incident an exception to the common practice, no fault could be found with the faculty for its choice. But it is not an isolated case. It seems that both college and university commencements invariably select commencement speakers of extreme radical views. Such continued evidence of sympathy with radicalism had led some of us to wonder whether our great educational institutions are in reality true abiding places of academic freedom or whether they are hothouses for radicalism.

Library Department - Herald - 6/9/34



# Eugene MORNING News

Published by the Eugene News Publishing Co., Eugene, Ore.  
 RICHARD C. HORN . . . . . Manager  
 JOHN W. ANDERSON . . . . . Managing Editor  
 Office: 79 West Eighth Avenue Eugene, Oregon Telephone 614

Entered as second-class matter September 9, 1931, at the postoffice in Eugene, Oregon, under the Act of March 3, 1879

PUBLISHED DAILY EXCEPT MONDAY



## SUBSCRIPTION RATES

By carrier, \$4.00 per year, paid in advance. By mail, outside the city of Eugene, in Oregon, \$3.00 per year; outside the state, \$4.00 per year. By the month, 40c.

Represented nationally by  
 M. C. MOGENSEN and CO., Inc.,

San Francisco, New York, Detroit, Seattle, Chicago, Portland, Los Angeles

## CENSORSHIP FOR COMMENCEMENT SPEAKERS

Commencement and baccalaureate speakers at the University and the State college will have to watch their words hereafter or things dire may happen to the persons by whom they are chosen. Presumably it will be proper for the speakers to be great minds and true prophets so long as they let the army and navy alone and keep clear of the sacred subjects of preparedness and armaments. Speakers may hold forth at length on the desirability of peace and the horrors of war but they will have to keep to generalities and voice no treasonable thought concerning materials from which wars are made. In brief, the speakers may speak their minds frankly so long as they offend no preparedness advocate.

The foregoing are our own drafts of thought boundaries for graduation speakers. We sketched them at reading editorials in the Corvallis Gazette-Times and the Albany Democrat-Herald attacking the persons responsible for choosing commencement speakers at the two institutions of higher learning. A speaker at the recent college commencement was one who showed himself too prominently on the armament parapet and consequently drew the fire. Albany paper spoke of the speech as "an insult diatribe against the United States army and navy and the ROTC." That paper joined the Gazette-Times calling on the state board of higher education to look into the matter of the selection of its commencement speakers. The Democrat-Herald said, "It (the state board) should ascertain who are the culprits who are hiring them. And, if necessary, it should look into records of those who are responsible and fire them from the schools. . . . It is shameful that the contributions of state and federal governments to education should be turned by pacifists to contribute to the downfall of their donors."

The last sentence neatly expresses the problem which is always arising to plague mentally honest educators. It also neatly expresses the great fallacy that governments are creatures separate and distinct from the people and overshadowing them. It is surprising that men of the intelligence of the editors of the Albany and Corvallis papers should stand vigorously for either preparedness or adequate military defenses. But it is surprising that they should fall into the error of believing governments superior in authority to the people who make them.

We are forced to depend on the Gazette-Times' editorial for an account of the Corvallis commencement address. From that report we would judge that the speaker was guilty of a clumsy and considerably biased piece of work. For one thing he coined sarcastic names for American battleships, "Munitions," "Monroe Doctrine," "Bill Collector," etc. The report would lead to the belief that the speaker did in fact offer insult to the army and the navy, neither of which is responsible for campaigns for huge armaments. However, the listeners at the college commencement were undoubtedly intelligent enough to sort the bias and insult from the fact and well-founded theory in the address. The listeners were quite capable of resenting unjust remarks concerning the army and navy. And the two newspapers had a perfect right to criticize the speaker as severely as they saw fit.

However, if the two editors believe that the college and the University should be higher educational institutions in fact as well as in name, they had no right to attack the person or persons who hired the speaker. After spending four or more years in an institution of higher learning, the students ought to be adult enough to draw their own conclusions from the commencement speaker if he is sufficiently interesting to hold their attention. The students are supposed, at least during their upper class years, to do considerable independent thinking and study. If, at the close of their college careers they are unable to pick the sound and usable ideas out of their commencement address, they have either wasted their time or their alma mater has failed them. In the latter case the fault would probably lie with persons who reason that the school should teach what its supporters think it ought to teach.

\* \* \*

Any person who believes in the American form of government must also believe that the will of the voting people is sovereign. In that statement we take into consideration the fact that the American form is republican and not pure democracy. Besides having constitutional privilege of electing men to govern them, the people also have the privilege of paying the tax bills. Thus it would seem that the people and not the state and federal governments are the actual supporters of the state institutions of higher learning—even in the matter of the R.O.T.C. Now, if the editors of the Albany and Corvallis papers can produce an edict from the sovereign voters demanding censoring of commencement speakers, they will have firm ground to stand on. If not, the schools will have to struggle along as in the past, enjoying some measure of intellectual liberty through operation of the American system. For the persons who choose commencement speakers are appointed by appointees of the people's elected representatives and consequently, by a round-about process, are themselves representatives of the people.

## SOME INTERESTING FIGURES.

IN his recent address to the alumni of the State College, higher education's Chancellor W. J. Kerr gave praise to the state's plan of unified control and predicted for it a long and increasingly effective future. As the chancellor, presumably, is soon to retire, the statement may be accepted as in a measure a statement of accomplishments.

Though it has been necessary to make drastic economies in all departments, instructional activities have been spared as much as possible, the chancellor points out. Administrative expense has been most heavily pared. Instructional costs have been reduced only 36.7; in administration 42.7 per cent has been saved. Administrative costs which were \$278,539.48 prior to unification are only \$159,475.87 now.

Possibly the biggest item of administrative saving was when the elaborate secretarial office in Salem was closed, though during the difficult period of developing the unified plan this office under E. E. Lindsey did much excellent work, digging into institutional records, correlating facts which the board had to have.

But we wonder if the board is yet through with the problem of reducing overhead. Where once a president and a few deans sufficed to run each school, it now requires a small army of titled functionaries. In addition to the chancellor, each school has its president and an executive secretary, and a dean of personnel, and deans of men and deans of women, and deans of schools and deans of lower division. The last board meeting, with appropriate salary gestures, elevated the publicity chief to the office of "assistant to the chancellor," and recently the staff was augmented by a grand comptroller.

This type of development is not confined to Oregon. In recent years it has been the trend in education everywhere. It would be interesting to have a study of the number of persons engaged in teaching and non-teaching activities now and the number so employed before. Nor do the dollar savings lead us away from the fact that in the Oregon system there has been a deplorable slashing of teaching pay and a deplorable overloading of teaching hours.

**RE** illustrating to change and "ganization in public-supported institutions, which has been very costly. The Eugene Register-Guard wonders if the reductions in administrative costs in this state have been adequate and observes:

"Where once a president and a few deans sufficed to run each school, it now requires a small army of titled functionaries. In addition to the chancellor, each school has its president and an executive secretary, and a dean of personnel, and deans of men and deans of women, and deans of schools and deans of lower division. The last board meeting, with appropriate salary gestures, elevated the publicity chief to the office of 'assistant to the chancellor,' and recently the staff was augmented by a grand comptroller."

"This type of development is not confined to Oregon. In recent years it has been the trend in education everywhere. It would be interesting to have a study of the number of persons engaged in teaching and non-teaching activities now and the number so employed before. Nor do the dollar savings lead us away from the fact that in the Oregon system there has been a deplorable slashing of teaching pay and a deplorable overloading of teaching hours."

This is along lines which The Statesman has emphasized from the beginning of this consolidation set-up. We opposed the establishment of an elaborate overhead organization in Salem; and have pointed out the extra costs of the chancellor-president system. Oregon is by no means alone in over-supply of top sergeants and educational staff colonels. But with our poverty and our persistence in supporting a bevy of schools, there is even greater necessity here for rigid paring down of educational overhead.

Eugene Register-Guard 6/10/34

Oregon Statesman - 6/12/34

al  
n-  
d-  
go  
g  
r-



# Eugene MORNING News

Published by the Eugene News Publishing Co., Eugene, Ore.  
RICHARD C. HORN - - - - - Manager  
JOHN W. ANDERSON - - - - - Managing Editor  
Office: 79 West Eighth Avenue Eugene, Oregon Telephone 614

Entered as second-class matter September 9, 1931, at the postoffice in Eugene, Oregon, under the Act of March 3, 1879

PUBLISHED DAILY EXCEPT MONDAY



## SUBSCRIPTION RATES

By carrier, \$4.00 per year, paid in advance. By mail, outside the city of Eugene, in Oregon, \$3.00 per year; outside the state, \$4.00 per year. By the month, 40c.

Represented nationally by  
M. C. MOGENSEN and CO., Inc.,  
San Francisco, New York, Detroit, Seattle, Chicago, Portland, Los Angeles

## CENSORSHIP FOR COMMENCEMENT SPEAKERS

Commencement and baccalaureate speakers at the University and the State college will have to watch their words hereafter or things dire may happen to the persons by whom they are chosen. Presumably it will be proper for the speakers to be great minds and true prophets so long as they let the army and navy alone and keep clear of the sacred subjects of preparedness and armaments. Speakers may hold forth at length on the desirability of peace and the horrors of war but they will have to keep to generalities and voice no treasonable thought concerning materials from which wars are made. In brief, the speakers may speak their minds frankly so long as they offend no preparedness advocate.

The foregoing are our own drafts of thought boundaries for graduation speakers. We sketched them after reading editorials in the Corvallis Gazette-Times and the Albany Democrat-Herald attacking the persons responsible for choosing commencement speakers at the two institutions of higher learning. A speaker at the recent college commencement was one who showed himself too prominently on the armament parapet and consequently drew the fire. Albany paper spoke of the speech as "an insult diatribe against the United States army and navy and the ROTC." That paper joined the Gazette-Times calling on the state board of higher education to look into the matter of the selection of its commencement speakers. The Democrat-Herald said, "It (the state board) should ascertain who are the culprits who are hiring them. And, if necessary, it should look into records of those who are responsible and fire them from the schools. . . . It is shameful that the contributions of state and federal governments to education should be turned by pacifists to contribute to the downfall of their donors."

The last sentence neatly expresses the problem which is always arising to plague mentally honest educators. It also neatly expresses the great fallacy that governments are creatures separate and distinct from the people and overshadowing them. It is surprising that men of the intelligence of the editors of the Albany and Corvallis papers should stand vigorously for either preparedness or adequate military defenses. But it is surprising that they should fall into the error of believing governments superior in authority to the people who make them.

We are forced to depend on the Gazette-Times' editorial for an account of the Corvallis commencement address. From that report we would judge that the speaker was guilty of a clumsy and considerably biased piece of work. For one thing he coined sarcastic names for American battleships, "Munitions," "Monroe Doctrine," "Bill Collector," etc. The report would lead to the belief that the speaker did in fact offer insult to the army and the navy, neither of which is responsible for campaigns for huge armaments. However, the listeners at the college commencement were undoubtedly intelligent enough to sort the bias and insult from the fact and well-founded theory in the address. The listeners were quite capable of resenting unjust remarks concerning the army and navy. And the two newspapers had a perfect right to criticize the speaker as severely as they saw fit.

However, if the two editors believe that the college and the University should be higher educational institutions in fact as well as in name, they had no right to attack the person or persons who hired the speaker. After spending four or more years in an institution of higher learning, the students ought to be adult enough to draw their own conclusions from the commencement speaker if he is sufficiently interesting to hold their attention. The students are supposed, at least during their upper class years, to do considerable independent thinking and study. If, at the close of their college careers they are unable to pick the sound and usable ideas out of their commencement address, they have either wasted their time or their alma mater has failed them. In the latter case the fault would probably lie with persons who reason that the school should teach what its supporters think it ought to teach.

\* \* \*

Any person who believes in the American form of government must also believe that the will of the voting people is sovereign. In that statement we take into consideration the fact that the American form is republican and not pure democracy. Besides having constitutional privilege of electing men to govern them, the people also have the privilege of paying the tax bills. Thus it would seem that the people and not the state and federal governments are the actual supporters of the state institutions of higher learning—even in the matter of the R.O.T.C. Now, if the editors of the Albany and Corvallis papers can produce an edict from the sovereign voters demanding censoring of commencement speakers, they will have firm ground to stand on. If not, the schools will have to struggle along as in the past, enjoying some measure of intellectual liberty through operation of the American system. For the persons who choose commencement speakers are appointed by appointees of the people's elected representatives and consequently, by a round-about process, are themselves representatives of the people.

## Educational Overhead

**R**EDUCTIONS in costs of running the higher educational institutions of the state have been chiefly in the administrative rather than the instructional organization, according to the figures from the school officials. Colleges long ago changed from the old idea of a student on one end of a log and "Mark Hopkins on the other". An elaborate overhead organization was built up, particularly in public-supported institutions, which has been very costly. The Eugene Register-Guard wonders if the reductions in administrative costs in this state have been adequate, and observes:

"Where once a president and a few deans sufficed to run each school, it now requires a small army of titled functionaries. In addition to the chancellor, each school has its president and an executive secretary, and a dean of personnel, and deans of men and deans of women, and deans of schools and deans of lower division. The last board meeting, with appropriate salary gestures, elevated the publicity chief to the office of 'assistant to the chancellor,' and recently the staff was augmented by a grand comptroller."

"This type of development is not confined to Oregon. In recent years it has been the trend in education everywhere. It would be interesting to have a study of the number of persons engaged in teaching and non-teaching activities now and the number so employed before. Nor do the dollar savings lead us away from the fact that in the Oregon system there has been a deplorable slashing of teaching pay and a deplorable overloading of teaching hours."

This is along lines which The Statesman has emphasized from the beginning of this consolidation set-up. We opposed the establishment of an elaborate overhead organization in Salem; and have pointed out the extra costs of the chancellor-president system. Oregon is by no means alone in over-supply of top sergeants and educational staff colonels. But with our poverty and our persistence in supporting a bevy of schools, there is even greater necessity here for rigid paring down of educational overhead.



June 8

## DR. SWARTZ AGAIN

A letter from John Burtner gives us the correct quotation from the written manuscript of Dr. Swartz concerning the soldier uniform.

"... third, you may find it takes less bravery to step into the war than to resist the clever clamor of those who want you to do their fighting for them. I remember the situation the last time . . . and I know that sometimes the girls urged their men to enlist because they wanted to see them in uniform."

That's not the way it came to us, but in any event, the intention was plainly to discredit the man who enlisted to sustain his country's honor. We hate and despise war as much as Dr. Swartz does. So do the men who wear the uniform and who will have to do the fighting. These young pacifists on the campus are merely half baked kids and if a war should come tomorrow they would be as anxious to enlist as anybody. The pity of it is that these anti-ROTC fools would not be prepared but would still be obliged to go, handicapped of course by following the false emotional leadership of the Swartzes and Morrows.



## ACADEMIC FREEDOM

In commenting on this newspaper's censure of the speaker at the recent Oregon State college commencement and its suggestion that the board of higher education ascertain for disciplinary purposes the faculty members who were responsible for hiring him, the Eugene News holds no brief for the speaker but asserts that his sponsors should be held blameless. It bases its position on the theory of academic freedom. Academic freedom, it seems, must be preserved even at the price of disloyalty. Including in its comment, this newspaper and the Corvallis Gazette-Times, it says:

However, if the two editors believe that the college and the university should be higher educational institutions in fact as well as in name, they had no right to attack the person or persons who hired the speaker. After spending four or more years in an institution of higher learning, the students ought to be adult enough to draw their own conclusions from the commencement speaker, if he is sufficiently interesting to hold their attention. The students are supposed, at least during their upper class years, to do considerable independent thinking and study. If, at the close of their college ca-

reers they are unable to pick the sound and usable ideas out of their commencement address, they have either wasted their time, or their alma mater has failed them. In the latter case the fault would probably lie with persons who reason that the school should teach what its supporters think it ought to teach.

The above paragraph breathes the spirit of the doctrine of academic freedom. Disloyalty, treason can be preached, it seems, in our higher educational institutions, for the students are supposed to be able to winnow the false from the true. Yet the fact is that the propagandists, who do the commencement oratory, choose such occasions as commencement for their work because they realize that the seed bed is adapted to the crop they would sow. Youth is always the idealistic age, the time for jousting for Utopian conditions, and they strive to put over their radical views in the hope that the young graduates will carry into life the doctrines which they pronounce.

This newspaper recognizes the fact that academic freedom has its place in the curricula of higher education. It is well enough for students to search Communism, Fascism, Hitlerism, pacifism and all the other isms for a complete understanding of them. That is academic freedom. But academic freedom ceases when teachers and commencement speakers become propagandists for any of them.

Were the recent Oregon State college incident an exception to the common practice, no fault could be found with the faculty for its choice. But it is not an isolated case. It seems that both college and university commencements invariably select commencement speakers of extreme radical views. Such continued evidence of sympathy with radicalism had led some of us to wonder whether our great educational institutions are in reality true abiding places of academic freedom or whether they are hothouses for radicalism.—Albany Herald.

ULATION?



## THE SWARTZ TIRADE

To the Editor — In connection with your editorial, "Dr. Swartz Again," in your issue of June 8, I should like to call attention to the fact that possession of the written manuscript is not proof that Dr. Swartz did not deviate from that manuscript, nor is it the best obtainable evidence as to what Dr. Swartz said. The best obtainable can be secured from the hundreds of persons who heard him talk, included among which are the president of the state board of higher education and the chancellor.

His manuscript not withstanding, Dr. Swartz did say, in effect, the following: "That those in uniform would use the youth of the country to pay off its debts—use them as cannon fodder," and that he "does not know why there is anyone in the uniform of this country unless it be to make the ladies fonder of him," and he did advise those present "never to put a foot outside of this country in its defense and never to obligate themselves to do this" and he suggested renaming the battle ships of our navy and, as new names for them, proposed, among others, the following: "Monroe Doctrine," "Munitions" and "Bill Collector," and he suggested that when this is done "and the fleet returns to the Pacific, we will know why it is here," this at the commencement exercises of the college.

From the comments and condemnations of this talk which have reached me from faculty members, students and outsiders, there is no question in my mind but what he terribly discouraged not only the graduating class but some others as to a completion of their respective courses and in some other instances incited the thought as to whether it is advisable to enroll in an institution of higher learning. To my mind, there was an additional damage done by him. After the wholesome instruction given by the faculty of the college, and its efforts to increase its enrollments, a talk such as Dr. Swartz gave will undoubtedly make patriotic parents think before they have their children enrolled.

This is a case which should be met courageously — no evasion nor side-stepping will settle the issue — neither will attempts to cover up

what was said. The time has come for courageous speech and courageous action — let the chips fall where they will. The Constitution and the institutions of the United States are paramount to all other issues. For the masses to deplore and cuss out that speech is insufficient; they should unite and demand positive action to preclude a recurrence of any such thing. All it requires on their part is an ounce of intestinal courage and it is a matter of putting principle above special favors. Any action taken should include that against any who harbor and encourage agitators and agitation with resulting ill-feeling, discord and controversies. Very sincerely,—W. H. Patterson, Colonel, Infantry, P.M.S.&T.



more beer. The owner refused Mr. Harris' request, and other neighbors urged him to enter a car and he was taken back to his home and left at the gate. He was found lying on the ground near the gate by the older son who had returned from the berry patch, and the younger boy who appeared on the scene.

Accustomed to previous lapses on the part of their father, the two  
(Continued on page 6)

## WAR DEBT CRISIS

### COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES

We are not the only one who is indignant about the speeches of Bishop Lowe and specially about the address of the Rev. Mr. Swartz of the Pacific Divinity school. We do not know who picks out the men who have been coming here to give the graduates the worst kind of a sendoff they could possibly get, but, he does a good job of it and the graduation from the Rev. Holmes of the unpatriotic Civil Liberties Union to the Rev. Swartz ought to convince those in authority that perhaps it would be a good plan to call in a real patriot sometime and cut out the ministry a few years. Besides, they are so

Isn't it possible to find a speaker for college commencement any more who doesn't think it incumbent upon him to show his patriotism in the ears?

### TELEPHONES

I did not regret having braved public opinion when I knew public opinion was sure to be merciless. — Holmes Greely.

Subscription Rates  
By mail, one year in advance \$5.00  
By mail, six months in advance 2.75  
By mail, one month in advance .50  
Delivered by carrier, per month .50

PACIFIC COAST REPRESENTATIVE  
G. B. Bell  
Portland, Oregon

Member of the Associated Press  
The Associated Press is exclusively entitled to the use for publication of all news dispatches credited to it or not otherwise credited in this paper and also the local news published herein.

Official Paper City of Corvallis  
OFFICIAL PAPER BENTON COUNTY  
Published every evening except Sunday, Office Third and Jefferson St., Corvallis, Oregon.  
Entered as second class matter August 5, 1909, at the postoffice at Corvallis, Oregon, under Act of March 2, 1879.  
Incorporated—Established 1862  
Myron K. Myers  
Charles A. Sprague  
C. E. Ingalls

Wd. June 6

ous of the fact that it is a citizen's duty in time of war to obey orders rather than instructions obtained from some sloppy sentimentalist escapes treason by reason of the fact that the definition is pretty definite in this country. The more or less "Reverend" gentleman got very funny and renamed our battalions recently reviewed by the President of the United States. He said one of them should be named "Munitions" and another "Monroe Doctrine" and another "Bill Collector." Now wasn't that very funny? It was SO funny and was calculated to thrill the young people plumb to death. We do not know how the board of higher education feels about it, but it seems to us they ought to feel chagrined, — so chagrined that they would demand that this sort of thing be forever stopped in a state supported institution. As a citizen not on the board, we feel very much ashamed of the whole performance. We thought we had a lesson last year with the Rev. Holmes, but apparently not. If that sort of exhibition is to be a regular occurrence, then it is time the patriotic people of the state had something to say about it. We take off our hat to one of the professors who was so darned mad he got up and left. He should have dragged the speaker with him.



June 7, 1934

Mr. C. E. Ingalls  
Editor Gazette Times  
Corvallis, Oregon

To the Editor:

Referring to your editorial of Wednesday evening regarding the commencement address of Dr. H. F. Swartz, I would like to correct one misquotation. Opinions of the speech as a whole may differ, and of course each is entitled to his opinion and to express it, but I know you will be first to agree that the speaker is entitled to a correct statement of what he actually said.

It so happened that I had an advance press copy of the address which I followed while he was speaking and noted carefully any deviations from it. You say of the speaker, "But when he comes to a government supported institution and tells the audience that soldiers are dressed in uniforms so as to appear more attractive to the gentler sex so they may be induced to breed and raise cannon fodder..."

What he said at that point, according to the manuscript and my notes is as follows:

"...third, you may find it takes less bravery to step into the war than to resist the clever clamor of those who want you to do their fighting for them. I remember the situation the last time... and I know that sometimes the girls urged their men to enlist because they wanted to see them in uniform."

This is given neither as a defense nor a criticism of what was said, but merely as a statement of fact which it seems to me is due any speaker.

Sincerely yours,

John C. Burtner

*(Was following MS notes, digressions from it)*