

## Side Show

Edited by . . .

PAUL DEUTSCHMANN,

There will be no repetition of the 1933 famine in Russia, even if Stalin has to sacrifice progress in the regimentation of farmers.

A recent "sharp" order from the Soviet chief, demanding that purging of collective farm workers be cut to a minimum, indicates that grain for 175,000,000 Russians will be supplied and communistic principles sacrificed.

A great deal of history stands behind the announcement which appeared in the papers Wednesday. Back in 1905 the usually peaceful subjects of the "Little Father" came to him with a request for better treatment. Cossack troops fired upon the gathering and out of the melee a first class revolt developed—known in books as "Bloody Sunday."

The uprising was quelled and reform measures were initiated into the decadent Russian autocracy. Taking a lesson from France, a liberal minister, Stolypin, began a program of creating a large body of landed peasantry—the firmest bulwark against revolution a government can construct.

Unfortunately for the czarist government, Stolypin was assassinated in 1911 and his program was neglected. So, came the revolution in 1919. Unfortunately for the Soviet regime, also, the work started by Stolypin was considerably advanced.

Thus the communist government has been continually plagued with the problem of the peasantry—a group newly set up as property owners, generally conservative, and suspicious of change or improvement. In the early years of the Red experiment peasants were left alone. But in 1928, at the beginning of the first five year plan, an extensive campaign to expand collectives was begun.

(For students who do not take Professor Marder's class in Modern Europe, Russian collective farms are formed by the pooling of private holdings, including land, tools, and livestock. The one large farm is then worked communally by the entire group, administration is taken care of by an elected board, the state purchases the output, and the profits are divided.)

Results of the "voluntary" collectivization were disastrous. At the outset the "kulaks" (moderately wealthy farmers) were forcibly liquidated after an uprising. Peasants forced into the collectives slaughtered their livestock rather than turn it over to the communal farm. The resulting shortage has not been overcome.

Production slumped terrifically, with many farmers growing only enough produce for their own use. In 1931 Stalin was forced to relax the drive for collectivization, but too much harm had been done, and when drought struck in 1932, a famine resulted—starving between three and seven million Russians.

From 1933 to the present great strides have been made by the Soviet regime with the agriculture problem. Collectivization has gone ahead until almost all farmers now work

(Please turn to page seven)

# Oregon Daily Emerald

LERROY MATTINGLY, Editor

WALTER R. VERNSTROM, Manager

LLOYD TUPLING, Managing Editor

Associate Editors: Paul Deutschmann, Clare Igoe.

Editorial Board: Darrel Ellis, Bill Peace, Margaret Ray, Edwin Robbins, Al Dickhart, Kenneth Kirtley, Bernardine Bowman.

Elbert Hawkins, Sports Editor  
Bill Pengra, City Editor  
Lew Evans, Assistant Managing Editor

UPPER NEWS STAFF  
Martha Stewart, Women's Editor  
Don Kennedy, Radio Editor  
Rita Wright, Society Editor

Alyce Rogers, Exchange Editor  
Betty Jane Thompson, Church Editor  
John Biggs, Chief Night Editor

The Oregon Daily Emerald, official student publication of the University of Oregon, published daily during the college year except Sundays, Mondays, holidays and final examination periods. Entered as second-class mail matter at the postoffice, Eugene, Oregon.

## No Half-Hearted Support Wanted

THIS year's strike against war has been set, nationally, for April 27 and on that day pacifists on the campus will demonstrate. Although the "call" has been issued just as before, the annual affair is to be on a different basis both nationally and locally.

Developments in the attitude of national groups towards the strike justify a strong doubt that there is really much worth in the movement. Some of the staunchest supporters of the previous strikes have this year declined to participate. Last year several of these organizations paraded enthusiastically and denounced any war, emphatically expressed their allegiance to the Oxford pledge, agreed that the strike was merely a rehearsal for the protest which would result from efforts to involve the United States in combat.

THIS year many of those groups will not participate because of a newly-formed policy—cooperation for defense. Undoubtedly there has been some pressure brought to bear to influence them in the intervening period but at no time has America approached actual war conditions. But if groups are turned from their pledged allegiance to "peace at any price" so easily, the value of their pledges must be severely discounted and the strike has lost considerable of its importance, both as a factor in forming public opinion and as a potential source of opposition to a war involving the United States.

In other ways, too, this "rehearsal" is to be different from those of former years. Some organizations have favored the abandonment of the Oxford pledge. The executive committee of the American Student Union recently voted to drop the pledge and has circulated letters to members attempting to justify the action. So much resentment was aroused that the committee has asked for a referendum on its action. Other backers of the strike have taken similar stands, some on the Oxford pledge, some on other features of the program for the demonstration which, in former years, was nationally approved and suggested. As a result, this year only the call was issued nationally. Each campus is free to formulate its own program.

RECENTLY there appeared in the "In the Mail" column a letter from Charles Paddock, graduate of last year and once active in backing the strike. Mr. Paddock appealed for participation of sincere strikers only. In the belief (which he implied) that many students who had little idea of the real purpose of the strike joined in the demonstration, Mr. Paddock is entirely justified.

This attitude is a sound one. Organizations abandoning the strike have, in a sense, violated a pledge. Judged on the tenuousness of their allegiance, the strike seems hardly worthwhile. Perhaps individual participation can be more sincere, however. It can be only as effective as the participants are firm in their belief in that which it advocates.

THE national strike against war could be an important factor in determining the policy of the United States. No democratic government would declare war if a large portion of its population had sincerely demonstrated that it would not support that war—not, at least, without thinking twice.

Potentially, then, the strike has possibilities. They have not been increased by half-hearted and false participation, however. The movement has been weakened, rather, by this lack of understanding on the part of demonstrators. Many people join the parade because they believe they firmly want peace. But all want peace or at least profess to. Those who conceived the strike did so to make it possible for persons willing to passively resist any effort to breach world peace to express their intention of doing so.

April 27 is dedicated to those people. It is not planned for clowns, fools, ridiculers, or vague-minded pacifists. Mr. Paddock's appeal for sincere strikers only is entirely justified. This demonstration is being advertised on its true basis—as a strike against war. Whether one agrees with the manner in which the backers of the strike would achieve their ends, the ends desired are more than ever clearly defined and are worthy. The right of those who truly believe in the strike's ends and methods should be observed. There should be no doubters among the demonstrators.

## In the Mail

### SOC AGAIN

To the Editor:

The person who took a crack at the newly formed sociology honorary seemed to know how to insult a lot of people in a hurry, but his purpose in doing this seems to be obscure because the evident result was destructive rather than constructive. If the people who started the organization are sensitive they will give up the ghost and let the group disintegrate, if they are sensible they will take note of the aims and objectives of the organizations as well as the needs that might be fulfilled by such a group and proceed as they seem to have already done.

I believe that the aims and objectives of the organization justify such a group. There should be an honorary to provide social contact among those who are interested in sociology. The contact among individuals or "social interaction" is of in-

initely greater benefit than the formation of a group of the "select few, who gather together to hear a paper read." I would not care to belong to this "select few" but would rather belong to a group in which I could attain status and prestige by doing things or engaging in activities.

The major objective seems to be "to bring students interested in the field together by means of social activities." What is wrong with that?

Another point that should be considered by the organization is the student-faculty contact. Few students have an opportunity to avail themselves of the contact with the brilliant minds in the sociology department. It seems that Sam Jameson would get behind such a movement. So far I have not yet seen any practical application of sociology except from either Parsons or Karl Oshank. The rest of the soci-

ologists talk about it.

The first step to be taken in criticizing the organization is not by unintelligent, destructive, fault-finding methods, but by a consideration: first of the value of an organization and second of the probable success of such an organization in fulfilling these needs.

The first consideration "is there a fundamental need?" I feel that there is a real need. I have yet to find anyone with whom I could discuss the practical application of sociological principles to everyday life. The society might provide that contact that would enable me to discuss and crystalize my own ideas, as well as to enrich the understanding of others, during the remaining month I will be in school.

The second consideration, so bitterly attacked by the person with the initials is that of personnel. In the names mentioned in the Emerald stories I

## MYSTERY to HISTORY

By  
GLENN HASSELROOTH

"Dawn in Lyonesse" by Mary Ellen Chase.

If you have ever gone to sleep and had a beautiful dream, only to find yourself suddenly awakened, you know how hard it is to come back to reality. You are hurt to find your new world blotted out so quickly. But after your eyes have become accustomed to the brightness, and your nerves are no longer on edge, you remember your dream and cherish it. Because of that memory, your life is more complete.

So it was with Ellen Pascoe, the hotel waitress of Cornwall, who almost lost her dream when the world of reality came crashing down on her.

Ellen, at 33, had built her life around Derek Tregonny, a hardy, middle-aged seaman who fished off the bleak and rocky coast of Cornwall, the land which centuries before was called Lyonesse. It was there that Tristram loved and lost the fair Iseult.

From a book (that Ellen had been forbidden to touch) in the lobby of the hotel, and a kind guest whose table she served, Ellen learned about the legend, and was touched by its beauty. Alone she sought out the waterfall which concealed the cavern where Iseult once met her lover.

Finding a new contentment in the silence of the forest, Ellen was happier than she had ever been before. To tell Derek, the unknowing, would give her the peace which she had never expected to find.

In the harsh awakening that comes, and the hours afterward, Miss Chase handles the characters of Ellen and her friend Susan with delicacy and human understanding. By the pen of some of the more expulsive writers the ending might have been drawn out and wordily explained. Miss Chase tells just enough.

The length of a novelette, "Dawn in Lyonesse" will provide those with imagination with a pleasant hour; those who do not dream may find something they have never before experienced.

W. L. White's "What People Said," has been called everything from a "social document" to "Middletown in Transition" in the form of a novel since its publication last week. Some say that it strikes so close to home in the exposition of the many everyday realities which have never been told quite so clearly before that it is embarrassing to read. Perhaps it will serve a part in removing a little of the hypocrisy from the lives of us Americans.

see some proven leadership. The organization will need leadership, and it may have to find that leadership outside the sociology school since the sociologists do not seem to be concerned with the practical application.

In ending let me say that although I will get my degree in sociology this term, I know very few sociology students, although I know hundreds outside, so the sociology department.

(Please turn to page seven)