



Abba Hillel Silver Collection Digitization Project

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

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

Series IV: Sermons, 1914-1963, undated.

Reel
155

Box
55

Folder
452

Who wants war, 1934.

WHO WANTS WAR?
Can The Next War Be Stopped?

By
Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver
At
The Temple
On

Sunday Morning, March 18, 1934.



Who wants war? War talk is again heard everywhere. Who wants war? Not the working masses of the world. They don't want war. They have nothing to gain from war. It is they who are butchered, maimed, gassed and torn by shrapnel and left to rot upon the battlefield. Why should they want war? During the war, the masses are robbed of the little freedom they possess. They are forced under iron discipline. And after the war, what have they? Poverty, unemployment, want. War does not enrich the masses of the world. It impoverishes them. If they happen to be within the war area, their homes are destroyed. They and their families are compelled to evacuate. The property and scanty possessions which may be theirs are lost. If the country is blockaded, it is they who suffer hunger and want. They and their wives and children suffer disease. Think what happened during the World War to the populations of Eastern and Central Europe.

The masses of the world don't want war. Who, then, does want war? The mothers of men? The motherhood of the world? Certainly they who give life do not wish to see destroyed the little children whom they love. They do not wish to see them when they reach the age of eighteen, nineteen, twenty or twenty-one, gassed, maimed and

left to rot in filthy dirty trenches. The women of the world are the ones who are left bereft, widowed, with sadly broken hearts by the war. They don't want war.

Who wants war? The average man? The merchant, the manufacturer, the professional man, the doctor, the artist -- what have they to gain from war? War profits are disgorged very quickly. All the war profits which America made in the World War she has lost twice and thrice over. War destroys wealth. It does not produce it. For a time it may speed up industry almost to a fever point, but like all high fevers, it finally consumes and destroys the individual.

But these people, the working masses of the world, the mothers of the world, the average people, constitute ninety-nine per cent of the population of the world. They don't want war.

Why, then, do we have war? Why was the last war fought? Why are we now preparing for another war? Why did Lloyd's of London recently offer odds of five to one that war would be fought in the next six months? Why in the month of January of last year was the shipment of nitrate out of Chile a little over two thousand tons and for that month of this year one hundred forty-six thousand tons?

Who wants war? Why in the first place the professional classes of the world who live off the war business and war institutions -- the military classes, the army and navy men whose interests and prestige lie in increasingly large armaments, which armaments can be paid for only ^{by} the tax-payer and the tax-payer will not pay the huge taxes for armament unless he is persuaded that the neighboring country or countries are plotting against the security of his own country. It is up to the military classes to keep the masses in a war mood or their business is gone. Every time an attempt is made anywhere in the world to come to some international understanding, it is these army and navy men who thwart and block it. And the officers of our own armies and navies are more active than the officers of any other armed forces of any other country against any form of international understanding.

Sums of money are voted annually for armies and navies all over the world. In the last few weeks our own Congress passed the Vinson Bill which contemplates the expenditure of one thousand million dollars for our navy in the next few years. Italy, France and Japan announced that they are proceeding to build additional ships to meet the increase of the navy in the United States. That suits the navy men in all of these countries.

Who wants war? The military cliques want war. The military cliques of Japan have kept the Far East aflame for a generation or two and will keep it aflame for another generation. Japan will force Russia into war. Russia has nothing to gain by War. Russia has no ambitions for territorial expansion.

Who wants war? The munition makers want war. Recently there appeared a book called "The Merchants of Death" written by H. C. Engelbrecht. The gist of this book appears in this month's Fortune. I would strongly urge you to read it. It is a horrible tale of ^{what} the international munition manufacturers are doing in the world today to foment war, to instigate international rivalries, of creating war scares in order to increase the sale of munitions. These ghouls thrive on the business of war. Their businesses languish in peace time. They want war. They require the slaughter of people in order that their huge profits for war armaments may not be lost. You ought to read this book or this article to realize how much we people are blind and unsuspecting pawns in the hands of these interlocking trusts who have more to do with war and peace than all the Parliaments of the world, how they control the government, how they control the people, and how, through a vast system of propaganda of the most subtle kind, these few armament trusts actually control

the world today. Let me read a few paragraphs of this book to you:

"The important point is that every time a burst shell fragment finds its way into the brains, the heart, or the intestines of a man in the front line, a great part of the 25,000, much of it profit, finds its way into the pocket of the armament makers."

"For without a shadow of a doubt there is at the moment in Europe a huge and subversive force that lies behind the arming and counter-arming of nations; there are mines, smelters, armament works, holding companies, and banks, entangled in an international embrace, yet working inevitably for the destruction of such little internationalism as the world has achieved so far. The control of these myriad companies rests, finally, in not more than a handful of men whose, power, in some ways, reaches above the power of the state itself. Thus, French interests not only sold arms to Hungary in flat violation of the Treaty of Trianon, but when Hungary defaulted on the bill the armorers got the French Government to lend Hungary the money to pay the French armorers. Thus, too, the great Czechoslovakian armament company, controlled by Frenchmen, promoted the rise of Hitler in Germany and contributed millions of marks to Hitler's campaign. These same Frenchmen own newspapers that did more than any others to enrage France against Hitler."

"Political France and political Germany may be at constant swords' points, the Polish Corridor may inflame the Nazis, France may quiver at her lack of "security" from another northern invasion -- but the lion and the lamb never lie down together with more good fellowship than these French, German, Czech, and Polish gentlemen, when they come together to discuss, as fellow directors, the problems of increasing Europe's consumption of armaments."

Why even in the last World War, when France and Germany were fighting each other, seeking to annihilate each other, the French munition makers were selling armaments to Germany, and Germany to France. One country was supplying what the other country lacked to keep on fighting and to prolong the war. It is fantastic! It is unpardonable, this rascality. France draws about seventy per cent of the ore which she requires for the manufacture of munitions from the mines in Briery Basin. From those mines, Germany drew three-fourths of all the ore she used during the war.

In 1916, the French armies came within firing range of these mines. They could have stopped the war in 1916, but the order was given not to bombard those mines because French munition manufacturers owned those mines. In the Chamber of Deputies in 1919, Deputy Barthe made this charge

which was never contradicted, and which is common knowledge among all the French: "I affirm that either by the pact of the international solidarity of the great metallurgy companies, or in order to safeguard private business interests, our military chiefs were ordered not to bombard the establishments of the Briey basins, which were being exploited by the enemy during the war. I affirm that our aviation service received instructions to respect the blast furnaces in which the enemy steel was being made, and that a general who wished to bombard them was reprimanded." A French general who wished to bombard these mines from which ore was mined to make munitions used to kill French soldiers was reprimanded for entertaining such an outrageous and preposterous idea.

Who wants war? Why every move towards international reconciliation and disarmament is thwarted by these war merchants. Lord Robert Cecil made this statement: "There is a very sinister feature to all the disarmament discussions. I refer to the tremendous power wielded against all the proposals by armament firms." These armament makers succeed in getting their own people to go to these disarmament conferences. A gentleman by the name of William B. Shearer, our own lobbyist, boasted that he wrecked the International Naval Conference in Geneva in 1927. He represented a ship-building company in America

and he got \$25,000 for the job. He sued the company for an additional \$25,000 and as a result these facts became known. He was paid by an American ship-building company to wreck a Naval Disarmament Conference and he succeeded in doing it.

Who wants war? The munition makers want war. They are clever devils, they are. They want to sell their goods to all the nations even if they haven't money to pay for them. They have a system all their own. They tell them, "Never mind. You buy our munitions and we will get our government to make a loan to buy munitions." Who wants war? These gentlemen want war. They are the outstanding patriots of their country, the one hundred per centers. They give charity. Many are of the nobility. In England the board of one of these organizations is made of Lords and clergymen. They sold arms to England during the Boer war. During the Russian-Japanese War, they sold arms to both sides although at that time England was supposed to give its support to only one of these contestants. As a result of the machinations of these munition organizations, the armament bill of the world today is something over one and one-half billion dollars and growing by leaps and bounds every year.

Who wants war? Why who profit from war. In England there is a gentleman by the name of . He is an oil magnate. This gentleman finance heavily Hitler -- the Nazi party before it came into power. You wonder why an oil

magnate in England would finance a Nazi party in Germany. He assisted the Nazi party in Germany on the basis of an agreement as regards their foreign policy..... a policy which must ultimately lead to war.

Who wants war and who makes war? Not you and I.

We stand helpless before this huge conspiracy of war profiteers who play with human life as with so many worthless toys and who prosecute their cynical interests regardless of the cost. These people who know their business succeed very well by controlling the press and by misleading us to inspire us with a stupid national chauvenism. It is amazing!

Last week I was in Syracuse and addressed the faculty and students of the University. I happened to pick up a Syracuse paper. One whole section of the paper was devoted to a reprint of the horrible pictures of the last war. You have probably seen them -- pictures of men torn and maimed and ~~xx~~ pictures of children emaciated as a result of starvation. You would think the natural reaction would be to put an end to every thing that goes to make war. That same paper carried on the same page a syndicate article denouncing the attempt by certain groups in the colleges of the United States to force compulsory military training in our higher schools of learning.

Who wants war? Every dictator in the world wants war, not immediately but ultimately. They are preparing for it. Hitler in Germany and Mussolini in Italy. They are indoctrinating

their people with the inevitability of the next war. They are training them for it. They have to give the people something in return ultimately. What will they give them for all they are depriving them of? They will have to give them a sense of national conquest. They are doing every thing in the world to increase the population. Mass weddings, one hundred brides and grooms, is a common sight in the streets of Berlin. They are being subsidized by the government. Why? They want soldiers for the next war.

What is the solution. I am afraid there is no solution. It has been suggested that national control of the manufacture of munitions would solve the problem. There is no lobby quite as powerful which a senator would dare to oppose as the lobby of the munition maker.

Ultimately, of course, the ninety-nine percent are going to win out but that can never be without the whole profit making system going down into complete defeat and destruction. Our only hope lies in educating our people, in exposing these war makers, these war gangsters, these one hundred per centers, in showing what is really behind this clamor for national defense. It is our only hope. It is the only hope of our children. Don't permit yourself to be beguiled by a patriotic speaker. Be realistic. Confront him with such a book as the "Merchants of Death." Ask him,

"Whom do you represent and why do you advocate it? Who are going to get the money in this patriotic enterprise of yours?" That is the only hope, my friends, for the time being.



1. Who wants war?

1. Certainly not the ^{working} masses - Nothing to gain - Cannon fodder -

It is they who are butchered -

War does not enrich them - impoverishes them.

Robs them of their freedom - brutalizes cattle - discipline -
must obey submissively orders

What have masses during war - or after war - unemployment.

If in war area - homes bombarded - evacuated - property
destroyed -

If blockaded - hunger - cold - disease - population, E. Europe -
Central Europe - Germany during war!

2. Who wants war.

1. Certainly not the mothers, the earth. They who bring life
do not want to see it destroyed. - Dear children - to
be horrified - blinded - warmed - passed - left to rot
in trenches -

2. War leaves them bereft, widowed, crushed & broken
hearts -

3. Who wants war -

1. Certainly not the average man, the workman, the unemployed,
the professional man - the teacher - the artist - What
have they to gain from war? The ^{war} profits that big men
make - they greedily devour - All that man made
in world war - it has lost twice & this time over -
war destroys wealth. It does not produce it -
it may spend up industry to a point - but
like a high fever it finally consumes the patient
and destroys him.

& But then represent 99% of the population, the unemployed. These
do not want war - Why, then, have we war? Why

had we been lost war! why are we preparing ourselves
for the next war - which is now to come? Lloyds - ⁵to 1
or was somewhere within 6 months - Statement of initiative from

5. Who wants war? Child Jan. 1933 - 2,238 tons - Jan. 1934 - 146.16 tons

First (1) The professional classes who live off ^{the} war institution.
the military caste in every country. The army and navy
cadre - whose interest and prestige demand increasingly
large annual salaries - who for which the tax-payer must
pay. The tax-payer will refuse to pay unless he is kept in a
war mood - unless he is made to suspect ^{the designs of} the countries of
his country - unless his nat. champion is kept alert
and instigated.

(a) Every time an attempt is made by any country, including
our own to reduce armament - the army navy men block
it - instigated & war - scan to stampede the nation into
nothing else pay an appropriation. It is then charged that
over U.S. army & navy are far and away more active & efficient than any other armed
forces in the world
(b) Yuson Bill - Japan - military clause.
1 billion dollars

6. Who wants war?

(2) Manufacturers - makers - "Merchants, Wealth" - Engelbrecht. H. Anighen
abstract in "Fortune", March -

(3) It is a horrible tale of real suffering & inter. armament
manufacturers, who foment war, instigate or keep alive
inter. feuds, incite war - scares, corrupt politicians
in the effort to sell new and more weapons of
war. These glorify themselves in war business. Their
business languishes when there is no war or preparation
for war - Their huge profits can come only from
the slaughter of men and the ruin of nations.

(4) You should read that W.M. or articles. You will know

what is going on in the world - (then) as they are already
in blind & unseeing pairs in the hands of a few huge
international & interlocked munition trusts who have more
to do with the control of international affairs, & war & peace,
than all the parliaments of the world - ~~there~~

(5) Let us read a few paragraphs from this amazing
document. (Quote)

(6) Even in war-time there disarmament remains, tho they
may belong to the opposing sides, the struggle never the-
less cooperate with one another. along the war-French
arm. manuf. sold munitions to Germany - German to France!
What one nation lacked - the other supplied -

(1) Barley barrel - ~~from~~

mines produce 70% & are used in France
captured by Germans - supplied Germ. with 3/4
& are used in making munitions -

1916 - came with in range of French guns -
- Ordered not to attack - Fr. munition concerns
had interest in those mines -

Deputy Barthe - Chamber of Deputies - 1919

(Quote)

(7) Every move for international cooperation & disarmament
is thwarted by these war-mechanisms

(1) Lord Robert Cecil (Quote)

(2) Our own disarmament lobbyist, William B. Shearer,
working for ^{Am. Ship-Building Co's.} ~~Beckwith~~ - boasted of having
worked the General Naval Disarm. Conf 1921

25.000

Since Visson Hall
W. J. Ship-Building 156
Beckwith 2678

: Govt. 200 m. on disarmament

(8) SKoda - Czech - On its board French, Czech, Germans
financed Nitler - for no one -

(9) Schneider-Creusot - ^{highest govt. officials} contractors, press, politicians, banks.
had 5 hundreds of armament firms in Europe -
got govt. to make loans to foreign govt
to pay for armament but from it -

(10) Sir Basil Zaharoff - greatest armament salesman
(1) sells on subscription to peace - 2 to Turkey.

(11) no patriotism.

Vickers - Armstrongs -

Boers - England

Russia - Japan

(12) As a result, the mobilization, then on -
Krupps - Vickers - Armstrongs - Schneider-Creusot
Vereinigte Stahlwerke. Fritz Thyssen (work hand in hand)
world's armament hold = 1 1/2 billion.
Land - Sea - air -

7. Who wants War?

(1) Those who get profit out of it.

(2) who ~~incite~~ incite him politicians, writers, press & media
who buy up newspapers & syndicates - to mislead,
misinform, confuse the 99%. (Synagogue)

(3) Who hold nothing sacred - human life, a lot
(country, or ideals, civilization)

(8) ~~the~~ Who want war?

Militarists + dictators want war!

Japan - will keep Asia aflame for a generation -
- Russia does not want war - Japan will force it -

Hitler - militaring Germany - Youth -

need to compensate - Experiences. Curfew -

Ewald & Bause "Germany Prepares for War"

(Note)

(9) Solution - difficult - perhaps bipolar!
ownership

(1) Govt. control of all munition ~~manufacture~~ manufacture.

(2) Exposing & removing forces behind the scene
which wreck all attempt at intern. disarm.

(3) Permanent education of people - who are the
patrons! the 100% - ~~the masses~~

(4) Internat. control of armament.

(10) Will the 99% run out against the 1%?

Wreck the entire capitalist - profit-system - and
go Bolshevik

1. Who wants War?

1. Certainly not the working masses -

Nothing to gain - Cannon fodder -

It is they who are butchered - Pictures

Robs them of freedom - discipline -

If in war area - hunger -

If blasted - hunger, cold - disease - East - Europe - Germany -

Enrich them - factories - After war - unemployment

2. Who wants War?

Certainly - Mothers - They who give life - Rear -

- War leaves them bereft - widowed - broken hearts

3. Who wants War

Certainly - Average man -

War - profits -

War destroys wealth -

It war spend up - penury -

4. But these 99% - Why, then, have we war - They do -
sluement, inflation - 2.2 38 / 100 - 146.16

5. Who wants war?

(1) Professional classes who live off the War institution
military caste - whose interest & prestige - demand
for which Tax-payers -

(2) Every time an attempt is made - blocked - "U.S. Army
and Navy forces - active against

(3) Vinson Bill - 1 billion dollar - competition -

(4) Military clique in Japan - Keep Axis aflame - Russia

6. Who wants war! Munition - Warf - "Merchants of Death"
Engelbrecht - Harpers - "Fortune"
Known to Europe - Holland -

(1) It is a horrible tale - rascality - forment -
instigate - war - rears - cannot - sell
there should there - laughishes -
Huge profits - slaughter

(2) You should read - parsons - parliaments -

(3) (Just)

(4) Even in war-time cooperate - blurring world war -

(a) Brisey Basin - 70% - ore -

(b) Deputy Barth - 1919.

(5) Every more - thwarted

(1) Lord Robert Cecil (Just)

(2) William B. Shearer - \$25,000.

(3) 200 m - in U.S. munition bill - Vinson - 75% -
"N.Y. Ship-Building Co."

(6) SKoda - "Hitler."

(7) Schneider-Creusot - Loans -

(8) No Patriotism:

"Vickers-Armstrongs" - Boers - England.
Russia - Japan.

(9) As a result - mach nations - 1 1/2 billion

7. Who wants war? Sin Nemi Hleterding - Sil moynat - Ukraine -
1. Profit - Who hire - to mislead ^{99%} "Syndrome"
nothing sacred -

8/ Who wants war. - Dictators -
1. Militarize - Youth - Compensate - Expansion
Increase population -
(2) "Ewald Baras" - "Germany Prepares for War"

9. Solution - Hopeless -
1. Govt. Control - Lobby -
2. Exposing - who are profiteers [!] patristers ?

10). Will 99% - win out -



(a) "The important point is that every time a burst shell fragment finds its way into the brains, the heart, or the intestines of a man in the front line, a great part of the 25,000, much of it profit, finds its way into the pocket of the armament makers."

✓ "For without a shadow of a doubt there is at the moment in Europe a huge and subversive force that lies behind the arming and counter-arming of nations; there are mines, smelters, armament works, holding companies, and banks, entangled in an international embrace, yet working inevitably for the destruction of such little internationalism as the world has achieved so far. The control of these myriad companies rests, finally, in not more than a handful of men whose power, in some ways, reaches above the power of the state itself. Thus, French interests not only sold arms to Hungary in flat violation of the Treaty of Trianon, but when Hungary defaulted on the bill the armorers got the French Government to lend Hungary the money to pay the French armorers. Thus, too, the great Czechoslovakian armament company, controlled by Frenchmen, promoted the rise of Hitler in Germany and contributed millions of marks to Hitler's campaign. These same Frenchmen own newspapers that did more than any others to enrage France against Hitler."

✓ "Political France and political Germany may be at constant swords' points, the Polish Corridor may inflame the Nazis, France may quiver at her lack of "security" from another northern invasion--but the lion and the lamb never lie down together with more good fellowship than these French, German, Czech, and Polish gentlemen, when they come together to discuss, as fellow directors, the problems of increasing Europe's consumption of armaments."

✓ "I affirm that either by the pact of the international solidarity of the great metallurgy companies, or in order to safeguard private business interests, our military chiefs were ordered not to bombard the establishments of the Briey basins, which were being exploited by the enemy during the war. I affirm that our aviation service received instructions to respect the blast furnaces in which the enemy steel was being made, and that a general who wished to bombard them was reprimanded."

"The leading munition makers not only in Germany but in France united in their support behind the one man most capable of stirring up a new outbreak of international anarchy in Europe."

- newspaper denounce Hitler

"The greater the competition the greater the amount of business for all competitors."

Lord Robert Cecil

✓ "There is a very sinister feature to all the disarmament discussions. I refer to the tremendous power wielded against all the proposals by armament firms."

WRHS



Books, Drama, Films

Hitler Means War

Germany Prepares for War. By Ewald Banse. Translated from the German by Alan Harris. Harcourt, Brace and Company. \$3.

THIS book constitutes the simplest, the most straightforward, and the most convincing explanation I have yet encountered not only of how Germany lost the last war but also of why she will lose the next. Unfortunately, however, it also supplies a devastating and irrefutable statement of why there is going to be a next war.

In itself, of course, there is nothing new about this book. Professor Hoover, Edgar Ansell Mowrer, Oswald Garrison Villard—in fact, everyone who has studied the Nazi phenomenon at close range—have testified to the same thing: that Hitler means war. The difference lies, however, in the fact that none of them was German. Here, on the other hand, is a German author who discusses the carving up of Europe to achieve German objectives with all the calmness of a surgeon explaining a major operation.

Briefly stated, the thesis of this book, the work of Ewald Banse, professor of military science at the Brunswick Technical College, is that the Germans are a people who, partly through their own blindness and folly and partly through the wickedness and jealousy of their neighbors—of France primarily—have never yet attained their rightful position. It is now the mission of Hitler's Third Reich to establish that place in the sun.

Geographically that place would be marked by frontiers which inclose Denmark, Holland, Belgium, northern France, most of Switzerland, the South Tyrol, all of Austria, the western part of Czecho-Slovakia, and the lost provinces of the east—West Prussia, Posen, and Upper Silesia. Upwards of 100,000,000 people would thus be included within the frontiers of the new Germany, perhaps 70,000,000 willingly, the remainder willy-nilly. To realize this objective France must be subjected to a bloody war, its northern Teutonic population mainly exterminated and the rest expelled. England is to be invaded from Holland—Irish support insuring that this will be a war on two fronts for the British. And our author cannot quite conceal his enthusiasm for the spectacle the ultimate and inevitable decline of Britain will afford.

Now the difficulty of the reviewer in discussing this book for an American audience lies precisely in the fact that what seems most preposterous in it is actually the most realistic. The program which Banse outlines is the prospectus of the *Führer* who dominates Germany today. It is the program outlined by Hitler in "Mein Kampf," which has become the Nazi Bible. It is the geographical concept of Germany which is being taught to all of German youth at the present moment.

But this conception is not merely the new doctrine of the National Socialists. On the contrary, it is also an exact repetition of the old pan-German gospel of the pre-war age. Today it is customary to set down the Nazi explosion to the sins of the Treaty of Versailles. But Holland, Switzerland, and Belgium were not wrongfully separated from the Second Reich by the "Dictate of Versailles." By virtue of that treaty Germany lost some 7,000,000 people, but on the basis of the Banse program she is now claiming no fewer than 30,000,000.

In fact, Hitler and his followers are not seeking to restore the Germany of 1914, with Austria added, but to reestablish the Germany of the Holy Roman Empire: to bring back the errant Dutch, Flemings, Swiss, Alsations and Lorrainers, who are Germans by race but not by desire; to dispose of the alien elements which have crept in or are descendants of those who

weakly permitted themselves to be assimilated to another and non-Nordic culture. "This is the true Germany," says Banse—like Hitler, indicating on the map the whole of Central Europe from the Somme to the Niemen. "Here the inhabitants must be German and that result must be achieved either by violent assimilation, actual extermination, or wholesale deportation. And since this is the true Germany, all who stand in the way of establishing it are actually attacking Germany, and the plan for the realization of this program is a program of defense."

Naturally the British and French will seize upon this book—the British already have begun to—as they did upon that of Bernhardt. Its propaganda value for the nations menaced by the Hitler *cum* Banse program is incalculable. But the trouble is that sober sensible people everywhere on this side of the Atlantic will reject the book for the same reason. They will see in it the expression of an individual German nationalist, not the accurate and authentic expression of the purpose of National Socialist Germany. Yet that is precisely what it is. Not that one-tenth of the German people today perceive the implications of the Nazi phenomenon; obviously they don't. Neither did any considerable number of Frenchmen grasp the implications of Napoleon's program. Nevertheless, the French conscripts marched to Moscow and Madrid.

Germany will, of course, lose the next war just as she did the last, because she is bound to end by driving the whole world into another combination against her. That is the single fact about the World War that escapes Professor Banse. His analysis of the various aspects of that conflict—strategic, tactical, and political—is otherwise admirable. What he doesn't ever suspect is that when you begin—as he does—by announcing a purpose to exterminate a portion of the French population, to invade Britain, to mutilate Italy and Poland, to extinguish Holland, Belgium, and Czecho-Slovakia, you must expect some day to meet these nations armed, united by a common fear and inspired by a common danger.

Of course there is no real justice in the attempt to use this book as an excuse for singling out German nationalism as contrasted with French, British, or even American. What the German seeks for himself is no more than what other peoples have acquired already, and the means he would employ they have used abundantly in their time. At least in the abstract German imperialism is as worthy or unworthy as any other. The main trouble is that the Germans are now trying to do what other peoples did in other centuries and to do it at their expense.

For myself, I wish that Professor Banse's book could be made required reading for all Americans who undertake hereafter to talk or write about peace, disarmament, or the Kellogg Pact. And that wish is not inspired by any desire to see a new wave of anti-German sentiment set in motion. Rather it is the expression of a desire to have these peacemakers brought face to face with the problem they are actually up against. And that problem is not the problem of German nationalism but of nationalism wherever it is found.

Professor Banse's book is an intelligent, straightforward, honest statement of the case for German nationalism. It blurts out the truth instead of disguising it. And the truth is that there can be no peace between German nationalism and French or British or Italian nationalism, because in a nationalistic world there is no way under heaven to reconcile rival territorial ambitions or adjust conflicting national rights. All our post-war peacemaking has been founded upon the assumption that you could reconcile the modern states system and its doctrine of integral sovereignty with a system of international peace and order. Now we are on the verge of a new war because nationalism and peace are themselves mutually exclusive. And in

a vain effort to postpone conflict Europe has scrapped the League and gone back to the balance of power because that and not the League is the appropriate instrument of a nationalistic world.

FRANK H. SIMONDS

The Great Cham

The Life of Samuel Johnson. By Hugh Kingsmill. The Viking Press. \$2.75.

ANY general biography of Samuel Johnson is bound to contain a great deal that is familiar and not much that is new. Nevertheless, the author of this interesting short study does more than merely present an introductory account for the benefit of those unfortunates to whom Boswell and the rest are unfamiliar. His purpose is to rescue the great man from those who would show him off as a kind of monster, and in pursuit of that purpose he manages to be both entertaining and instructive.

Boswell revered his Doctor. At the same time there can be no doubt that both he and his contemporary rivals regarded their subject as a literary opportunity and that they realized the literary value of his peculiarities. Boswell, of course, had long planned a Life and, as Mr. Kingsmill points out, had developed a systematic technique for leading his victim on to furnish him with striking copy. He returned again and again to sore subjects, he displayed a genius for inventing dilemmas and asking questions which stung the great man to fury, and then he gleefully set down as typical the most violently unreasonable opinions which he could trap the moralist into uttering. The result is that we are persuaded to accept as characteristic many vigorous but monstrous judgments which are, in fact, merely examples of the unreason into which any man may be led by a skilful tormentor. Boswell needed only to advance some painfully heretical opinion to wring from Johnson a more and more desperate defense of orthodoxy, and many of his most outrageous pronouncements can be directly traced to a deliberate provocation.

It is plain that Johnson did not apply to his friends the intolerant principles which he enunciated, and in all probability he would not, for example, have consigned Rousseau to the plantations if Boswell had not praised the heretic for the qualities which Johnson could least endure to think about. When he was left to himself, his good sense and good nature triumphed over his moral principles exactly as his sensitive literary feeling triumphed over his equally narrow literary principles. Thus he could regret that Shakespeare was not more didactic in his plays, but when Mrs. Thrale had trapped him into asserting that a passage in Young was more poetical than any similar description by the author of "Macbeth," he soon after recanted impulsively: "Young froths and foams and bubbles sometimes vigorously, but we must not compare the noise made by your teakettle here with the roaring of the ocean."

In reality the great moralist was not only an acknowledged pessimist but an uneasy, unwilling skeptic. "The cure for the greatest part of human miseries is not radical, but palliative." "Life must be filled up, and the man who is not capable of intellectual pleasures must content himself with such as his senses can afford." Because he believed these things he believed also that he could not do without religion, but he knew that only dogged, unreasoning orthodoxy could save him from the intellectual doubts which his reason could not meet. He thundered at Boswell, not for the purpose of convincing either Boswell or himself, but to dismiss subjects which he did not dare to speculate upon. All his strictness of principle arose from a sense of his own weakness. "If," he said, "I had no duties, and no reference to futurity, I would spend my life driving briskly in a post chaise with a pretty woman." And it was surely no prig

who, when someone objected that gifts to beggars were often wasted on gin, burst out impatiently: "Why should they be denied such sweeteners of their existence. . . . Life is a pill which none of us can bear to swallow without gilding; yet for the poor we delight in stripping it still barer, and are not ashamed to show even visible displeasure if ever the bitter taste is taken from their mouths." His expatiations on the importance of birth were self-inflicted penances because, as he once confessed, he "hardly knew who his grandfather was"; his Toryism, which entertained no illusions about the superiority of the nobility, was merely a product of his pessimism and based itself upon an argument strangely like that of Pascal. "There would," he said, "be a perpetual struggle for precedence, were there no fixed invariable rules for the distinction of rank, which creates no jealousy as it is allowed to be accidental."

For a century at least every critic of Johnson has remarked that his fame rests upon his personality and not upon his writing. No one, however, seems to have remarked something which, perhaps, Mr. Kingsmill implies—namely, that Johnson's achievement was, nevertheless, an artistic one, that he is great because he created himself. Our affection for him does not depend, as our affection or admiration for a real person generally does, upon any agreement with his opinions or any approval of his aims. We do not, even, like him any the more for having the things which most offend us explained away. We like him for the same reason that we like a character in a work of imagination—not for his rightness or his goodness, but for his vitality, for his being so vividly himself. Johnson does not belong with the great historical personages so much as with the great figures of fiction—with Falstaff, Don Quixote, and the Peppercorn of Thomas Mann. If his greatness as a character owes something to the art of Boswell, it owes even more to the original whose life task was the creation of himself.

Incidentally it is strange that Mr. Kingsmill, having the thesis he has, should make nothing of the fact that we now know from Boswell's notebook how unscrupulous—or artistic—he was when it came to rephrasing Johnson's remarks. In one place Mr. Kingsmill even quotes the famous "I'll come no more behind your scenes, David, for the silk stockings and white bosoms of your actresses excite my amorous propensities," when we know that what Johnson actually said was something much more downright and much less "Johnsonian."

JOSEPH WOOD KRUTCH

Short and Salty Annals

Village Tale. By Phil Stong. Harcourt, Brace and Company. \$2.

THIS third and, in some respects, best novel by Phil Stong has a more complex and interwoven design than either of his earlier books. Drury Stevenson, the village Iago, who puts Elmer Jamieson up to peppering his wife and Slaughter Somerville, the village squire, with birdshot, is himself less innocently involved with the wife of Bolly Hootman, Somerville's hired man. Drury's daughter Lulu, unsuccessfully in love with Somerville, hoodwinks her suitors impartially into whatever will help her spin her little webs of mischief. Somerville gets Sybil Jamieson, in respectable divorce, without fighting with her birdshot husband, but he avenges Bolly, horribly beaten by Drury, and himself upon the true villain of the piece. Those philosophical, bawdy elders, Ike Crane and Tessie Oosthoek, appear whenever there is need for their dry, sly remarks. The story is tight, if not almost knotted, with a variety of actions. It has three triangles: Somerville and Sybil and Elmer; Drury and Mate and Bolly; Lulu and Ben and Eddie. It runs, tersely, through the whole history of Drury's malice and Somerville's

ABSTRACT OF ADDRESS DELIVERED BY RABBI ABBA HILLEL SILVER AT THE TEMPLE, ANSEL AND
EAST 105TH STREET ON SUNDAY MORNING, MARCH 18th, 1934.

WHO WANTS WAR?

The people who want war are those who get profit out of it, not the masses of the world who have nothing to gain from war. The workers of the world do not want war because it is they who are butchered, maimed, gassed and left to rot upon the battlefields. It is they who suffer hunger and disease during the war and poverty and unemployment after the war.

The mothers of the earth do not want war. They who bring life do not wish to see it destroyed. War leaves the womanhood of the world bereft, widowed and crushed with sorrow.

The average man does not want war. The merchant, the professional man, the teacher, the artist -- what have they to gain from war? War profits are quickly disgorged. All that America made in the World War it has lost twice and thrice over. War destroys wealth. It does not produce it. It may speed up industry for a time to a fever point, but like all high fevers, it finally consumes the patient and destroys him.

Ninety-nine per cent of the population of the world does not want war. It is the one per cent that wants it, instigates it, prospers upon it. The army and navy chieftains in its country whose interest and prestige demands increasingly large armies and navies -- for which the tax-payer must pay. The tax-payer will refuse to pay unless he propagandized to a war mood, impressed with the imminence of danger and made suspect of the designs of other countries upon his own. Every time an attempt is made anywhere in the world to reduce armaments, the army and navy men block it, create a war scare and stampede the nations into voting still larger appropriations. The Vinson Bill recently

passed by Congress contemplates the expenditure of another billion dollars for our navy in the next few years for the production of just such an artificially stimulated war psychosis. It has set in motion the most ominous naval competition among the great naval powers of the world.

The munition makers want war. The story of how international armament manufacturers foment war, instigate or keep alive international feuds and corrupt governments in an effort to sell more and more of munitions of war is a horrible tale of rascality and inhumanity. These ghouls thrive on the war business. Their business languishes when there is no war or preparation for war. Their story first recounted in the book "Merchants of Death" and outlined in the magazine "Fortune" for March, should be read by every American. It points out what helpless we are in the hands of a few international and interlocking munition trusts who have more to do with the final issues of war and peace than all the parliaments in the world. These death vendors who wrecked every disarmament conference, who hold nothing sacred -- human life, love of country who betray other nations as well as their own ~~for~~ have run up the world's annual armament bill to one and one-half billion dollars.

It is doubtful whether the nine-nine percent will ever succeed in putting the sale and manufacture of armament under government control. Their control over legislators and the press is too great. Perhaps only with the collapse of the whole profit system will this unspeakable business cease.