



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
156

Box
55

Folder
500

Thunder on the Rhine!, 1936.

THUNDER ON THE RHINE!

Hitler's latest move and its effects on the peace of Europe

Delivered By
Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver

On
Sunday, March 15, 1936

At
The Temple



In the attractive town of Locarno in October, 1925, at the instigation of Germany, a series of international agreements were reached which insured peace in the Western world and which arranged for the arbitration of any differences which might arise not alone between the five nations signatory to the Locarno Pact, namely: Germany, France, England, Germany, Belgium, but any differences which might arise between Poland, Germany, Czechoslovakia, etc. These agreements which were signed for Germany, by Dr. Luther and Herr Stresemann were hailed with great joy all over Europe, particularly in Germany, because they were looked upon as marking a new departure, a new departure in world affairs away from the hates and suspicions engendered by the World War - causing a new order of pacification, of arbitration, of mutual security.

A definite peace policy was established by the Locarno Pact, a security pact whereby France was assured of military assistance should she be attacked by Germany and Germany was assured of assistance from Great Britain and Italy should France attack.

Unlike the Treaty of Versailles which followed the World War and which was forced upon Germany, this Locarno Pact was solicited by Germany and gladly signed by her, and it resulted, you may recall, in the evacuation of the Rhineland. The allied troops which, according to the terms of the Versailles Treaty were to remain in the Rhineland until 1935 ~~but~~ resulted in their being withdrawn five years sooner. Germany also entered the League of Nations. By this Locarno Pact, Germany confirmed her willingness to observe Article 42 and 43 of the Treaty of Versailles which articles specify ~~that~~ "that a zone

on the left bank of the Rhine and right bank of the Rhine 50 kilometers deep shall be left demilitarized and shall be left unfortified by Germany. No army shall be maintained in that zone. As late as last May, less than a year ago, Hitler declared that this area is a zone between Germany and France. The Locarno Pact was one of the greatest contributions to the peace of Europe.

Last Saturday, Hitler scrapped the Locarno Pact. He repudiated it without the counsel of the other signatory powers, without consulting with them, without following the method of procedure for the denunciation of the Treaty prescribed in the Treaty. Hitler denounced it and proceeded to militarize the Rhineland. The reason which he gave for his amazing act of Treaty Violation was the fact that France and Russia were about to sign a treaty of mutual assistance - a Franco-Soviet Treaty for cooperation in time of war. Such a Treaty between France and Russia is, of course, not outlawed by the terms of the Locarno Pact. There were no limitations placed on any of the signatory nations as regards making other alliances with other nations - other regional alliances with other groups of people.

What is therefore important to this situation is not the treaty violation which is no line of reason, but the fact that now, for the second time within the year, Hitler has scrapped a treaty. Just about a year ago, in March 1935, Hitler, contrary to the provisions of the Versailles Treaty, re-introduced universal military service in Germany. And now, less than a year later, Hitler violates the Locarno Pact. This successive and successful violation of treaties can serve but one purpose - to feed the arrogance, the insolence of the Nazi militarists,

to put a premium upon treaty violations, to make a mockery of international agreements and to drive the last nail into the coffin of the League of Nations. Following a repudiation of the treaty, last May, reintroducing all compulsory military training, Hitler was scolded by the other countries of Europe. The League of Nations properly branded Hitler and the German government as treaty violators. Within a month, conferences were held at Stresa which were attended by England, France and Italy which served notices of warning upon Germany. These three nations announced that "they were united in opposing by all practicable means any unilateral repudiation of treaties which may endanger the peace of Europe and will act in close and cordial collaboration for this purpose." And that was that! Nothing else was done. Hitler, of course, promptly spurned this censure. He told these nations that they had no right to sit in judgment on his acts or any acts of the Third Reich. Shortly thereafter, the attention of the world was turned to Abyssinia. And Hitler scored a national diplomatic victory.

And now comes a second one which promises to be even a greater victory for Hitler and even a more dangerous victory. Of course there will again be condemnation. The League will again denounce Germany for breaking the Locarno Pact. Perhaps another Stresa Conference will be convoked! But it seems likely that again nothing will be done! I say "likely" because no one is in any position to prophecy what will happen in Europe from one day to the next.

England is now talking about conciliation, about negotiating with Germany, England who was so anxious to impose sanctions on Italy for the violation of the treaty because her particular interests were involved.

The life line of the Empire is not being threatened by the remilitarization of the Rhineland. England now says very little about the moral duty to impose sanctions, economic and otherwise upon treaty violating nations. Italy is not going to clamor about the sanctions. She is having enough trouble with her own sanctions. She stands to gain. If they refuse to impose sanctions on Germany, the question of imposing sanctions on Italy blows up. So Italy is marking time and France, alone, cannot move.

Perhaps France, alone, may be driven to move against Germany. But so far, there is no indication that France, alone, will move. Hitler, of course, will be called hard names but he has a remarkably tough hide. He has demonstrated more than once his insensitiveness to the public opinion of the world. The only thing that he fears or recognizes is force and as long as force is not being contemplated by foreign nations, Hitler can well afford to sneer at the moral indignation which is now being evidenced against him in all parts of the world.

To soften the blow of treaty violation, Hitler offers the other nations of Europe a twenty-five year peace pact. That, of course, is a dodge, a diplomatic dodge. It is meaningless. A nation which has just broken one pact is hardly in a position to offer another peace pact to the world in the hope that the world would take it seriously. It is significant that in the proposal of a twenty-five year peace pact with other countries of Europe, Hitler pointedly and significantly omitted Russia. Hitler has no peace pact to offer Russia. Why? Because the policy of Germany is to destroy Russia. Whenever Germany is ready - feels herself ready, she will launch a major attack upon the Soviet Union in the hope that she will find a ready ally in Japan. With Germany in the West and Japan in the East, Russia will be caught.

And by destroying Russia, Germany will then proceed to destroy. ^P Germany, especially Nazi Germany, of course means war. Everybody knows it in Europe and the reason war has not yet been made is because Germany is not yet ready.

Reason for militarism in Germany caused by unusual terms evoked by Versailles Treaty.

That is a favorite excuse which is not true. I am not, of course here to justify the unfair clauses of the Versailles Treaty. I was perhaps one of the first to denounce the unfair clauses of the Versailles Treaty. It is strange that not one German voice in the United States was raised against it at the time. We ought to remember that in 1914, when Germany went to war, there was no Versailles Treaty. Germany was a strong, powerful, prosperous nation. Germany had colonies. Yet in 1914, and years preceding 1914, Germany was the leading nation in the tradition of blood and iron. It is not a recent product. It has been in Europe for many generations. The tradition of blood and iron, the tradition of conquest was fed in Germany. For generations, poets nourished and fed it. Germany was obsessed with the idea of being a chosen people of the world, of having a mission in the world, long before the World War. Germany was convinced and they still are convinced that civilization can be spread only by war. Now the Nazis were simply intensifying this war psychosis, this national chauvenism, this military madness of the people. The Nazi war has become a religious cult, a sign of the supreme destiny of the race. Von Papen, I think, declared that "the battlefield is for the man what motherhood is for the woman." Do you realize what that means? "The battlefield fulfills the destinies of human life of a man."

Hitler has declared in his own book what his military objectives are. His military objectives are to destroy Russia and France by making alliances with England and Italy. I read from his own book "Mein Kampf";

"The future aim of our foreign policy must not alternate between East and West, but be an Eastern Policy with the object of acquiring the necessary soil for our German people. For this, power is needed. The deadly enemy of our people, however, France, strangles us mercilessly and undermines our power. We must shoulder every sacrifice which in effect would contribute to the extermination of the French efforts at hegemony in Europe. Today any Power is our natural ally who, like ourselves, feels the French hegemony on the Continent to be intolerable. No approach to such a Power must seem too hard for us, no sacrifice reach beyond our means, if the final result is the possibility of the suppression of our deadliest foe."

By his own statement and not alone by his own statement but the whole party platform is not satisfied with frontiers of 1914. On page 742 of his book he writes: "In this way we National Socialists have deliberately turned our backs on the aim of our pre-war foreign policy. We start where others left off more than six centuries ago. We stop the eternal Germanic march to the South and West of Europe and turn our eyes to the land of the East...If, however, we talk of new land (Frund und Boden) in Europe today, we can, primarily, think only of Russia and its subject border States." That is where the future of Germany lies - Russia.

On page 705 of his book he writes: "For Germany the French danger involves the duty -- setting aside all sentimentality - to join hands with those who, threatened like we are, will not tolerate or endure the French

hankering after domination. In the nearer future there can be for Germany only two allies in Europe: England and Italy."

All these people have in mind, according to Alfred Rosenberg and Herr Feder, are national states. Herr Feder said: "all people of German blood whether they live under Danish, Polish, Czech, Italian or French rule, must be united in a German Reich." That means that the millions of Germans today living in other lands, Denmark, Poland, Czechoslovakia Italy or France - all these Germans must be torn from their present political allegiance and incorporated in an enlarged Third Reich. That this means war with Austria, is of no concern to these political romanticists, these militarists, and they mean it just as they meant it about exterminating the Jews of Germany. We also said then, you will recall, that Germany couldn't be so mad as to mean that. Yet it is not impossible. That is exactly what they are doing through a cold scientific pogrom. Madmen may be scientific in carrying through their schemes. And they mean this quite as much. And they will carry through their plans even if they have to make a shamble of Europe. They will play one people against another. They tried to get Austria. They carried through the putsch and killed Dollfus. They failed. They want to make peace on the Western Frontier so as to be able to push through their military projects in the East.

Ⓡ They have to make war. It is the nature of dictators to make war because every other article in their program was broken down. The messiahs failed to make good. They have not raised the standards of living of the people. They brought privation, strife on the people. They took away the elementary rights of their people. And now they have to compensate their people, somehow, to quiet the growing resentment of the people. It means launching a glamorous military enterprise which will bring glory to them.

The Nazi Government will never become a part of any peaceful international arrangement in Europe because it can't any more than any Fascist Regime can. The one thing that they are worried about - Mr. Hitler, Mr. Goebbels and Mr. Goering - is the danger of antagonizing England. They regard that as the greatest blunder in the World War. They speak of it as the folly of 1914. They know that if England throws her tremendous power against Germany, they cannot carry through any successful program in Germany. It's sole hope is to keep England either neutral or to win England as an ally. Therefore, in a real sense, Great Britain holds the key to the situation and it is tragic that in these desperate times that England is as vacillating and indefinite in her policy as she was in 1914. England scolds Hitler in public but simultaneously England proceeds to make naval pacts with Hitler without even consulting France. While England insisted that all the nations impose sanctions on Italy, in this case she talks of being calm, cool. She restrains France always but never Germany. England is terribly afraid of the increased armament of Germany. Her leaders are worried about it. England this year voted the largest military appropriation in its history. Yet she permits Germany to grow stronger every day.

England has a chance today not only to insure for all future time the sanctity of international treaties, not only to secure peace in the Western world but England has the power to break Hitler over night. All she needs to do is, together with France, to give Mr. Hitler twenty-four hours to get out of the Rhineland. And he will. He has no other choice. If he has to get out, his prestige will be

broken. His power will be gone. But England will not do it.

There is a certain fatalism about the situation today that is reminiscent of 1914. Rather than be resolute, rather than make a decision, they are bickering, they are double crossing, they are engaging in all kinds of horse theiving. The position of Europe today is exactly what it was in 1914 except that it is in a somewhat worse position because prior to the World War, there was no World Court, no League of Nations, no magnificent attempts of the pacification of the world. Now we have had them all and they are broken down. Today the tragedy of the world is compounded out of the failure of high hopes blasted, great dreams dragged into the mire. Here is a League helpless to prevent war and helpless to stop war. Here is a League which is betrayed by the very nations which called that League into existence. Here is a situation where every disarmament conference of the last fifteen years led not ^{to} disarmament but to greater armament. Here is a situation where no international agreement is worth the paper it is written on because they are constantly dishonored by one or another nation. The world today is nearer catastrophe than it has been since 1918.

The alternative still remains clearly challenging. On the one hand there is armed anarchy. On the other hand there is collective security. The Fascist states want armed anarchy. That is their opportunity. The democratic states, if they had the vision and the understanding of statesmen to realize it, should realize that the hope of democracy lies in collective security and collective defense.

And the democratic countries of the world haven't long to consider which they will choose. The fateful hour of decision is fast approaching. It may be in 1936, or '37 or '38. Europe will quickly be brought into the international situation where all will protect each or Europe will continue to form these hostile military alliances which will inevitably lead to a greater disaster than the World War. The democratic countries lost their opportunity in 1933 when Japan challenged the authority of the League of Nations. Last year, when Italy challenged the League, they lost an opportunity. They are losing an opportunity today when Hitler, now for the second time within a year, is challenging collective security, international alliances in the world.

This cannot go on indefinitely as you can readily see. Sooner or later there will be a blow up. I am inclined to the opinion that what will happen in Europe in the next fortnight will be as decisive for the fate of the world as anything that has happened in Europe in this generation. We can only pray that wisdom, courage and statesmanship and character will prevail in this crisis.

Germany Means War

1. Pre-war - As if Versailles - ① Would Ger. have made
Brest-Litovsk - ② In 1914 - No V. Treaty - Had Colonies
Rattled sabre - intransigent -

③ Prussian century - old ^{blood & iron} Prussianism - Phil. have helped
④ "Mission" - Hegel - Fichte - "Civilis spread only by war"

2. Nazi - War Cult - Fighting = religion -

"The Battle field is for a man what motherhood
is for a woman" - von Papen | A nation in grief
is a nation in grief
(Hitler)

(1) Hitler - man to destroy 2 countries
(a) France & Russia | Alliance with Eng - Italy

{ France - arch-enemy of J - negroid -

{ Russia - red territory for the topher / pop

(2) Alfred Rosenberg - a hardie Mittel Europa
a nat. racial state -

(3) Herr Feder - "all people, German blood,
whether they live under Danish, Polish, Ger.,
Italian or French rule, must be united in
a German Reich."

3. They mean it! just as they meant the Aut!
They will go at it piece-meal - via "Putcher" making peace
with in the East - while fortifying themselves in West
& Via Versa - capitalizing every diff. among Allies
Rearming! ① Danzig ② Thiania ③ Austria
④ Formal annexation of Austria

4. Must make war - Mussolini - Economic
Nazi 9. will never fit in

5. Antagonize England - Folly 1914.
Key - Unanimity - Sir. Edw. Grey
Scales - Naval Treaty
Restrains France - Gives in
Afraid of Gen. Bismarck - Allows it
Sanction - Italy; not Germany
England now has chance - Break -
She won't - Fatalism.
Breaking -

6. Scrapping of Locarno - Leaves - Anarchy
a League helpers - Behaved
Every disarm. Conf. - a failure
" Int. Treaty - dishonored with impunity
No Int. Guarantee - worth
Armament Race
Fascist - Democ
Armed Anarchy } Make up mind!
Collective Defense } of Japan
Democ without French

1- In Locarno - Oct '25 - at the instigation - series
peace - arbitrate -

This agreement which - Dr. Luther, Stresemann - hailed

A def. policy of peace - Security Pact -

Unlike - Versailles - solicited - As a result

By Article I of this Treaty - Gen. confirmed

observe 42-43. demilitarized - 50

2. Last Sat. Hitler repudiated

unilaterally denounced it -
Remilitarized Rhineland - last May - "Order before"

Reason - land excuse

What is important - Twice -

March 16-1935 - Universal Military Service -

this feeds - premunin - mockery - trail

(Nazi militarism - puts a premium on treaty violations - makes a mockery of League Covenants - and drives another nail in coffin of League.)

3. Following his repudiation - last March -
Hitler soundly scolded - notes of protest -
properly branded - Contempt by League
Conference at Stresa, in April, (Eng. Fr. Italy)
"announced that they were united in opposing
"by all practicable means, any unilateral repudiation
of treaties which may endanger the peace of Europe, &
will act in close & cordial collaboration for this purpose".
and reaffirmed League
And that's that! Gen. repudiated Censure -
Nothing else was done - Italy & think -

4. And now another violation!
Again there will be condemnation etc - League
will denounce - another Stresa!
1) England - sanctions - now talks conciliation - negotiation -
2) Italy - of course - stands to gain! If sanctions -
3) France, alone cannot make!

Hitler - will be called hard names - He has a throat-hold!
He has demonstrated now & over his insincerity to
foreign opinion as to moral considerations
all he recognizes, employs fear is force - and
when there are no punitive measures in order
he can mean at their moral indignation.

5. To soften the blow of violations - offers 25 yr. Peace pact
to neighbors - Prates about peace - All that gets
meanings - A new pact when old one has further violations.
No pact with Russia! - His plan! Japan!
Appeal to Capitalist elements -
And after destroying Russia - France!
6. Germany means war! Every one knows it -
but not ready



HITLER'S THIRTEEN POINTS

A CRITICISM

by

The Rt. Hon. Sir Malcolm Robertson,
G.C.M.G., K.B.E.

ISSUED BY FRIENDS OF EUROPE,
122, St. STEPHEN'S HOUSE,
WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.1.

NOTE :

Readers who desire the text of the Hitler speech dealt with in this pamphlet should write for No. 29 : Hitler's Thirteen Points, by Adolf Hitler, in this series.

Attention is called to the following publications of Friends of Europe :

No. 10—The Military Science of Professor Banse : Foreword : Admiral Sir Herbert Richmond.

No. 16—German Foreign Policy Before the War. The 1907 Memorandum of Sir Eyre Crowe ; Foreword : Hillaire Belloc.

No. 19—The House of Commons and German Rearmament : Stanley Baldwin, Winston Churchill.

No. 23—The House of Commons and the German Situation : J. Ramsay MacDonald, Winston Churchill and others.

No. 24—Germany, Great Britain and the League of Nations : The Rt. Hon. Anthony Eden.

No. 25—The New Spirit of Military Education ; Professor Ziegler ; Foreword : Major-General Sir Charles Gwynn.

No. 28—Cross and Swastika ; Manchester Guardian Special Correspondent ; Foreword : The Rev. John S. Whale.

Any of the above pamphlets may be had for 3d. each post free ; the above set of eight pamphlets 2/- post free.

A specimen copy of the "Monthly Survey of German Publications" will be sent on application.

All communications should be addressed to the Secretary,
Friends of Europe, 122, St. Stephen's House, Westminster,
London, S.W.1.

October, 1935.

HITLER'S REICHSTAG SPEECH OF MAY, 1935 AND ITS THIRTEEN POINTS

A CRITICISM

by

The Rt. Hon. Sir Malcolm Robertson, G.C.M.G., K.B.E.

HITLER'S Reichstag speech of May, 1935, if it is to be taken at its face value, is an important pronouncement regarding the foreign policy of the Government of Germany. All Governments and citizens of all countries whose concern is the prevention of war and the establishment of the peace of nations, will have noted with care and reserved pleasure the pledges and the peaceful professions recorded in the speech. Before proceeding further, the more important of them may be tabulated:—

HITLER STATEMENTS AND UNDERTAKINGS.

"National Socialism regards the forcible amalgamation of one people with another alien to it, not only as a political aim not worth striving for, but as resulting in the long run in the endangering of internal unity and hence of the strength of a nation. Its doctrine, therefore, rejects dogmatically the idea of national assimilation."

"Our racial theory regards every war for the subjection and domination of an alien people as a proceeding which, sooner or later, changes and weakens the victor internally, and in course of time makes him the vanquished."

"National Socialist Germany wants peace because of its fundamental convictions on world problems. It wants peace also owing to the realisation of the simple primitive fact that no war would be calculated to eliminate our state of general distress in Europe, but probably to increase it."

"Once in possession of absolute equality of rights, Germany will never refuse to participate in those labours which are intended to serve the cause of human peace, progress and economic welfare."

"Germany has solemnly recognised and guaranteed to France the frontier resulting in accordance with the Saar plebiscite . . . We . . . finally renounce Alsace-Lorraine."

"Germany has nothing to gain by any European war. What we want is freedom and independence. Because of these aims we were ready to conclude non-aggression pacts with all our neighbours."

"Germany neither intends nor wishes to interfere in the domestic affairs of Austria, to annex Austria, or to attach that country to her."

"The German Government are ready at any time to take part in a system of collective co-operation to secure peace in Europe, but consider it necessary to give play to the law of continuous development by allowing for the possibility of the revision of treaties."

"The limitation of the German navy to 35 per cent of the British navy . . . is Germany's final and fixed demand."

"The German Government reiterate the assurance that they are ready to join in any international scheme for the limitation or abolition of arms which shall take effect for all countries at the same time."

It is only fair and pertinent that these important statements should be read in conjunction with two other sets of facts :—

I. GERMAN RE-ARMAMENT.

The rapid re-armament of Germany throughout the whole period of the Herr Hitler regime, in violation of Treaty obligations and long before Germany left the League of Nations. The re-armament involved large battleships, submarines, heavy guns, tanks and aircraft. In the latter case the magnitude of public deceit has come within recent months as a shock, even to the responsible leaders of the British Government.

2. HITLER'S "MEIN KAMPF."

The statements bearing on foreign policy contained in Hitler's book, "Mein Kampf." The following are useful and telling examples :—

- (a) "The foreign policy of the National State is to safeguard the existence on the planet of the race embodied in the State, by bringing into existence a healthy, vital, natural relationship between the number and the growth of a people, on the one hand, and the extent and quality of the soil on the other . . . Only a sufficiently large space on the planet guarantees to a people freedom of existence" (page 728)
- (b) "The question of the reconquest of lost territories by a people or State is primarily always a question of the reconquest of the political power and independence of the Fatherland . . . The deliverance of oppressed, separated fragments of a national body (Volkstum) or of provinces of a Reich does not take place in response to the wish of the oppressed or to the protest of those left behind, but by means of force on the part of . . . what is left of the once united Fatherland . . . Oppressed territories are not restored to the confines of the common Reich by flaming protests, but by a sword which is able to strike. To forge this sword is the task of the political leadership of a people. To see that it is forged undisturbed and to seek comrades in arms is the task of foreign policy." (p. 686).

(c) "The demand for the restoration of the frontiers of 1914 is political folly . . . the frontiers of the Reich in the year 1914 were anything but logical; they were, in fact, neither complete as regards the inclusion of the people of German nationality, nor reasonable in relation to military-geographical strategy." (p. 736).

①

(d) "I must denounce those national wielders of the pen who pretend to see in such an acquisition of land a 'violation of the Sacred Rights of Man.'" (p. 740).

✓ (e) "In this way we National Socialists have deliberately turned our backs on the aim of our pre-war foreign policy. We start where others left off more than six centuries ago. We stop the eternal Germanic march to the South and West of Europe *and turn our eyes to the land of the East* . . . If, however, we talk of new land (Grund und Boden) in Europe to-day, we can, primarily, think only of RUSSIA and its subject border States." (p. 742).

②

(f) "Our mission . . . is to make our own people realise that its future political aim . . . will be realised by the strenuous work of the German plough, *the soil for which the sword alone can provide*." (p. 743).

✓ (g) "For Germany the French danger involves the duty—setting aside all sentimentality—to join hands with those who, threatened like we are, will not tolerate or endure the French hankering after domination (Frankreichs Herrschgelüste). In the nearer future there can be for Germany only two allies in Europe: England and Italy." (p. 705).

③

(h) "The future aim of our foreign policy must not alternate between East and West, but be an Eastern Policy with the object of acquiring the necessary soil for our German people. For this, power is needed. The deadly enemy of our people, however, France, strangles us mercilessly and undermines our power. We must shoulder every sacrifice which in effect would contribute to the extermination of the French efforts at hegemony in Europe. To-day any Power is our natural ally who, like ourselves, feels the French hegemony on the Continent to be intolerable. No approach to such a Power must seem too hard for us, no sacrifice reach beyond our means, if the final result is the possibility of the suppression of our deadliest foe." (p. 755).

④

(i) "The political testament of the German nation for the guidance of her foreign policy should and must always be: Never tolerate the rise of two Continental Powers in Europe. Every attempt to organise on the German frontiers a second military Power, even if it be only in the form of a State capable of becoming a military Power, we should regard as an attack on Germany. To prevent the rise of such a State by every means, including recourse to arms, and if necessary to destroy such a State should it have already arisen is not only a right but a duty. Take care that the strength of our nation finds its foundations not in colonies but in the soil of our homeland in Europe. Never believe the Reich to be secure, unless it is able, for centuries to come, to give to each of its offspring his own piece of land. Never forget that the most sacred right in this world is the right to the land which one intends to cultivate oneself, and the holiest sacrifice the blood which one sheds to acquire this earth." (p. 754).

DR. JEKYLL AND MR. HYDE.

No one can read these quotations without realising that they are in open contradiction both with the spirit and the substance of those just given from the Reichstag speech of May last. If it be said that in the first case Herr Hitler was an inexperienced Party demagogue, while in the second he spoke as responsible Chancellor and Leader, the answer is that the words of the former inexperienced party demagogue constitute in 1935 the main textbook of National Socialism for the whole of Germany. It is always open to Herr Hitler to repudiate the immaturities of irresponsible youth. But as long as he countenances the sale of a book (now in its third million and replacing the Bible) which contains such doctrines of foreign policy, neither he nor his fatherland have any ground of complaint if reasonable and well-disposed men make a heavy discount on the value of a declaration or a pledged word emanating from the "Führer."

The practical effect of this circulation of contrary doctrines is to create the impression of dual personality in the man whom millions of Germans believe to have been sent from God. The Reichstag speech and portions of "*Mein Kampf*" read like alternations of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde. Nothing save the deeds of the "Führer" can remove this fatal impression.

A FURTHER CRITICISM.

The conception of the Third Reich, or Empire, was clearly outlined by Hitler's mentor, Herr Gottfried Feder, in his book "*The German State*," which appeared in 1924, nine years before Hitler came into power. It runs:—

X "The German Reich is the home of the Germans. Its political principle is the formation of a homogeneous national State embracing all of German race. It involves the dismissal of Jews and non-Germans from all responsible positions in public life. None but Germans in communion with the spirit and destiny of Germany may exercise citizen rights. The nation must be made efficient by permitting every free German to serve and to bear arms in a national army under the command of a highly-trained corps of professional officers. The form of State most suitable to the German character is sovereign control united in a central personal power. The creation of a solid national State, embracing all branches of the German race, means that 'all of German blood, whether living under French, Danish, Polish, Czech or Italian sovereignty, shall be united in a German Reich . . . We claim all the Germans in Czechoslovak Germany, Alsace-Lorraine, Poland and the League Colony of Austria which succeeded to the old Austria. This demand, however, expressly excludes any tendency towards imperialism; and it is a simple and natural demand which any strong nationality puts forward as its natural requirement.'"

Herr Gottfried Feder held, until recently, high office in the Third Reich. Though personal differences with Hitler have led to his, perhaps temporary, retirement it is noteworthy that all his postulates except the inclusion of the whole Germanic race within the German State have already been fulfilled. Jews and non-Germans have been dismissed from all responsible positions in public life. Citizen rights have been withdrawn from those Germans who are not held to be in communion with the spirit and destiny of the Third Reich. Every present German citizen has been made free to serve and bear arms in a national army under the command of a highly-trained corps of professional officers. The form of the State is that of sovereign control united in a central personal power. The territorial consolidation of a greater Germany alone remains to be carried out.

It would not be difficult to deal with Herr Hitler's asseverations and contentions point by point, but it would be tedious, for the replies are, in the majority of cases, well known outside Germany and, under the present regime, would not be allowed circulation inside. Let me, however, refer to one or two.

1. HITLER AND THE ARMISTICE.

Herr Hitler avers that it was in reliance upon the promises contained in President Wilson's famous "Fourteen Points" that the German soldiers laid down their arms. The fact is that the German soldiers laid down their arms, in spite of the stern armistice terms dictated by Marshal Foch, because they had no alternative. They had been completely defeated by the sword to the arbitrament of which their rulers had deliberately appealed. Those rulers knew full well that had the Armistice terms not been accepted, the war would have been carried into German territory and they did not dare run the risk of the precedents that they had set in France and Belgium being followed in their own country. They have ever since been able to fool their dupes into believing that it was only the Home Front, corrupted by the Socialists, which gave way behind a stalwart and undefeated army. As regards the Fourteen Points the Allies made certain reservations, notably in regard to the freedom of the seas and the restoration of the invaded territories and made it quite clear that they intended to demand reparations in connection with the latter.

2. THE "DICTATED" PEACE.

It has always been a favourite habit of Herr Hitler and the Nazi Party, innocently adopted now by the entire German

people, to talk of the Treaty of Versailles as a "dictated" peace, imposed upon Germany at the point of the bayonet, as if no Peace Treaty after a war had ever been dictated before. The Treaty of Peace of 1814, for example, was imposed upon France. The subsequent negotiations at Vienna were for the settlement of Europe. France had a Talleyrand who succeeded in sowing dissensions among the Allies. Germany had no Talleyrand in 1918, only a Richt-hoven. Further, did not victorious Germany dictate the most cruel terms of peace to chaotic Russia at Brest Litovsk in 1917 and to defeated Roumania at Bucharest in the same year? In 1915, when a complete German victory still seemed within reach, did not certain German industrial associations and professors urge the German Government to impose the most merciless terms upon the Allies? Were not the following some of their recommendations?

- (a) "Side by side with the demand for a colonial empire which would completely satisfy the many-sided industrial interests in Germany; side by side with the security of our future in matters of custom and commerce and the requirement for sufficient war indemnity ('mercilessly high war indemnity from France' was called for by the professors), the industrial associations demanded the subjection of Belgium to German imperial legislation, both in military and tariff matters, as well as in regard to currency, banking and post."
- (b) "As regards France, the possession of the coastal districts bordering on Belgium as far as the Somme . . . the necessary annexation of the mining district of Briey . . . fortified positions of Verdun, Belfort and the part of the Western slopes of the Vosges which lies between them."
- (c) "As regards Russia, a considerable extension of the imperial and Prussian frontiers in the East by annexation of at least parts of the Baltic provinces and of those territories which lie to the South."

The Professors added:

- (d) "We must supplant the world-trade of Great Britain . . . We must immediately seek to create for ourselves, apart from the empire of the seas, a commercial enceinte as extensive as possible. We must assure ourselves of the Persian Gulf against the pretensions of Russia and Great Britain . . . In Africa we must reconstitute our colonial empire . . . Colonies are the foundation of all European power, but colonies without an opening to the sea would always be the slaves of the good or ill-will of England. We need liberty of the seas . . . To obtain it we must have Egypt, which, as Bismarck said, is the neck of the British Empire . . . From England we can never demand enough money."

Had Germany emerged victorious from the war, would she have shrunk from "dictating" a Peace on the above lines? Brest Litovsk and Bucharest supply the answer.

3. GERMANY'S ALLEGED FULFILMENT.

Herr Hitler claims that Germany fulfilled "absolutely fanatically" the requirements imposed by the Peace Treaty, in a military sense to the point of defencelessness. Those of us who are old enough to have been associated officially with those years immediately succeeding the war cannot but smile somewhat wanly at such an amazing assertion. Germany endeavoured to wriggle out through every loop-hole that she could find, and from her point of view she was possibly right. It was to be expected that she would strain every nerve to avoid fulfilling the stipulations of a Treaty of Peace which, in the very nature of the circumstances, must be imposed rather than freely negotiated. Germany disarmed not "fanatically" nor of her own free will because she was passionately anxious to carry out the terms of the Treaty, but because the Allies had a Military Commission of Control to see, as far as that was at all possible, that she did. She evaded the Commission whenever she could, and who can blame her? As soon as it was withdrawn she started to re-arm, and successfully, as we know full well. Again I, in so far as I am concerned, do not blame her. But I do object to Herr Hitler's hypocrisy and I have wondered for years at the innocence of the British people. The figures which Herr Hitler gives of the number of German implements of war that were destroyed while the Commission of Control was more or less looking on, are, no doubt, impressive. Has he ever looked at similar British figures for example? I have no doubt that he has, but has he ever drawn the attention of the German people to them and pointed out that there was no Commission of Control in Britain? I do not think so.

4. HITLER AND TREATY REVISION.

Herr Hitler states in Point 4 of his 13 Points :

"The German Government are ready at any time to take part in a system of collective co-operation to secure peace in Europe, but consider it necessary to give play to the law of continuous development by allowing for the possibility of the revision of Treaties. They regard the possibility of a regulated development of Treaties as an element for the securing of peace but regard the suppression of any necessary changes as only too liable to result in an explosion in the future."

As I am pointing out later on, provision for the revision of Treaties is contained in Art. 19 of the Covenant of the League of Nations, as Herr Hitler knows full well. All that he has to do is to prove his good faith to the world, rejoin the League, pledge himself to fulfil its covenants in

spirit and in letter, and the free negotiation of the revision of Treaties can be undertaken. He can rest assured that the British Empire will adopt a most sympathetic attitude and Sir Samuel Hoare has already indicated that we are prepared to grant in our Colonies considerable rights and concessions to those who have been styled the "have nots" if only this will help towards the establishment of peace, goodwill and prosperity for others as well as ourselves. There can be no doubt that that is the wish, the earnest wish of the vast majority of the British people.

THE GERMAN CHARACTER.

In considering this speech of Herr Hitler's it is as well to remember that the majority of the German people take it and its protestations of peaceful intentions at its face value. A long experience in the Diplomatic Service in a great many parts of the world has convinced me that an evil people does not exist. The German people are certainly not evil. At heart the German is convinced that he is a kindly, good-natured person, greatly misunderstood and deliberately maligned by enemies who close him in on every side. And those of us who know and have known the German people, whether they be Prussians, Bavarians, Saxons, Rhinelanders or of any other sept, recognise that they are what they think they are, viz., kindly and good-natured—until roused, when they become ruthless and brutal. "Frightfulness" (Fürchterlichkeit) during the war was, to them, a commendable policy provoked by unscrupulous enemies. They did not then realise and they cannot now understand that it was that very policy that arrayed the greater part of the civilised world against them and still makes it look askance in their direction. Herr Hitler states in his speech under Point IX :

"The German Government regard a return to the order of ideas of the former Geneva Red Cross Convention as the sole possible way to achieve"—what he calls—"a practical limitation of unlimited armaments."

Further on he advocates the prohibition of gas, inflammable and explosive bombs outside an actual area of warfare, and ultimately the "complete international prohibition of bomb-dropping."

"If it was once possible," he says, "to prevent the killing of defenceless wounded or prisoners . . . it must also be possible, by means of an analogous Convention, to forbid the bombing of an equally defenceless civilian population and finally to bring it to an end altogether."

These are admirable sentiments which would undoubtedly be echoed by the bulk of the German people. Unfortunately they do not know, for they are not allowed to know, that the bombardment of open towns and villages such as Scarborough and Whitby, to mention only two, air raids and bomb-dropping without any military objective, the use of asphyxiating gases, the sinking of hospital ships, the indiscriminate sinking of merchant ships, and many other demonstrations of unprovoked "frightfulness" during the late war were indulged in by their military and naval authorities in defiance of various Hague Conventions and of the Geneva Red Cross Convention to which the German Government were a party. If the world, including Germany herself, is shuddering now under the fear of wholesale massacre of the civilian population by bombardment from the air, it is because Germany initiated this horror during the Great War. She signed Conventions before. She also signed a Treaty guaranteeing the neutrality of Belgium. Did she honour her signatures when the test of her integrity came? Can she justifiably complain if those who suffered from her ruthless conduct of the war, cannot take the protestations of her "Leader" at their face value?

The Germans are, as I have said and must insist, a kindly, good-natured people in their heart of hearts, but paradoxically enough they are also a war-like people. They are, as a nation, proud of being soldiers, proud of being soldierly. Throughout the entire population, fathers, grandfathers and great-grandfathers, when able bodied, have been soldiers, owing to conscription which is not only accepted but welcomed. It is the boast of mothers that they have soldier sons. Unquestioning service of the State, preferably in uniform, race-worship, discipline, obedience, not freedom, not democracy as we understand it, are the ideals of the great mass of the people. References to blood, iron, force, shining armour and iron fists (*Blut, Eisen, Gewalt, Schimmende Wehr, Eiserne Faust*) will always command enthusiastic approval and applause, whereas they make us shudder.

THE DANGERS OF THE GERMAN MENTALITY.

There are, as it must be obvious, several dangers in such a mentality. It is against human nature for a man to have a gun, rifle or pistol, to keep it constantly cleaned and oiled and never to want to fire it off. If he fires and misses, he will want to try again. If he tries his weapon on a human target the only possible thing to do is to disarm him. Germany fired at a human target during 1914 to 1918. She scored

several inners. But the human target fired back, finally hit the bull and then disarmed her. This disarmament she considered to be unfair and still considers it to have been unfair. She put up with it as long as she had to, that is to say as long as the Inter-Allied Military Mission of Control had its eye upon her. After that she proceeded to re-arm, secretly and rapidly. She has one of the most powerful and efficient air forces in the world; she is speedily rebuilding her fleet with modern ships which will be concentrated, not scattered over the world as ours are bound to be; she is arming and equipping an army of 550,000 men, peace strength. And so she has regained her self-respect which depends in the first place upon military force. Is it psychologically likely that a war-like people will permanently accept defeat by the sword to which it appealed in order to win for itself a "place in the sun," when all the best places were occupied by latterly less war-like people before the Germans became a united nation?

There are other considerations, other dangers. Germany has become more race-conscious than ever before. Until the period of the war, the Bavarian, Württemberger, Saxon, etc., would no more admit that he was a "German" than a Scotsman would that he was an Englishman. That has changed. These septs are now proud to be Germans. Hitler himself was an Austrian. "Deutschtum" is now the ideal. Germans, wherever they may be, the Saar, Memel, Danzig or elsewhere, are the concern of the German State. They must be re-united to the Fatherland. To what will this ultimately lead? Herr Hitler tells us (see above) to the use of "a sword that is able to strike."

Further, and more disturbing yet. Outside Russia and modern Italy there is almost certainly no people on earth that is as deliberately kept in ignorance of events and movements of opinion in the world beyond its borders as is the German. There is no people more easily led, more easily fooled by its masters. This was one of the causes of the war. The vast majority of the Germans took their views on foreign affairs as served up to them by the famous Press Bureau of the Wilhelmstrasse. But in those days, at least, foreign newspapers were allowed to circulate more or less freely and those who could read foreign languages might have kept themselves informed to some extent. Now, even that source of outside information is very heavily restricted. The Germans are shut up within themselves and encouraged to nurse their grievances, the "war guilt lie," the "dictated peace," the division of Europe into "victors and vanquished," the obsession that they are a poor, weak, misunderstood and

maligned people who, moreover, are alone in bearing the burden of suffering that, as is elsewhere widely known, the war brought to all the nations that took part in it and others as well. It is to them utterly unreasonable and yet further evidence of deliberate ill-will if we enquire how a ruined people, hemmed in and oppressed by "victors," could afford to re-arm by land, sea and air to such a point that it could again become one of the most formidable military States in the world. Nor must we enquire how such a poverty-stricken country can afford to build and to run ships like the "Bremen" and "Europa" and many others which are running those of "wealthy" Britain off the seas. They have no idea of the burden of taxation which weighs upon this country. They think and they are taught to think of nothing but their own grievances, real or imaginary.

That is a very dangerous state of mind in an essentially virile people, all the more dangerous because, as I have said, they are so easily led, are not allowed and do not wish to think for themselves. All they ask is to serve the State and to obey. They are willing to accept from their rulers anything that is told them. Herr Hitler is their "Führer," their leader, and they are content to follow him and the General Staff behind him. The adoration of the Kaiser and the Hohenzollerns in the old days was almost religious in its fervour, as is the adoration of Herr Hitler now, whom millions of them think to be sent by God, a German God. Was not the Kaiser "All-highest, almighty, all-gracious, all-serene, Emperor, King and Lord"? (Allerhöchster, Allmächtigster, Allergnädigster, Alldurchlauchtigster, Kaiser, König und Herr). Herr Hitler cannot be much more than that.

THE RELIGIOUS NATURE OF THE GERMAN.

The religious struggle which is now rending the German conscience is, no doubt, a serious internal matter, and the Hitler regime has created a very difficult situation for itself in this respect, for the Germans, as I know them, are a deeply religious people. But it is a purely internal affair. Criticism of Herr Hitler in regard to this and other matters is not unknown in the secrecy of the home and out of hearing of the "Gestapo" or Secret Police. There are also many, far more than those foreigners who never fully appreciated the loyalty and devotion of the German people to the Hohenzollerns, can possibly realise, who yearn for their return, even for that of "unser lieber greiser Kaiser" (our beloved grey-haired Emperor). But that again is internal. In the

cult of "Deutschtum," in the worship of "force," in the determination once again to be the foremost military Power in the world, cost what it may, the German people, with but few exceptions, are united and will remain united. Will they ultimately be led first to the East, as Herr Hitler appears to suggest on p. 755 of his book "Mein Kampf"? Or will he first turn to the West again? Who can tell? "No sacrifice" he writes on that same page 755:

"No sacrifice must seem impossible if it offers the final possibility of the overthrow of our deadliest foe"

which he states to be France.

GERMANY AND THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

I do not doubt that Germany's real leaders, that is to say the General Staff, are sincere in their desire for peace for the moment, time in which to perfect their military machine, "to forge undisturbed a sword that is able to strike," as Herr Hitler puts it on page 686 of "Mein Kampf," and perhaps to find allies again. If, however, they truly want permanent peace, peace for love of the human race, peace to spare their own kindly people and the other yearning nations of the world, the ghastly horrors of another war, they have, as I have said, but to join the League of Nations the Covenant of which, if loyally adhered to, provides security for all in a manner such as no other Treaty or Covenant in the history of the world has ever done. They cannot now honestly argue that they do not possess "equality of rights" or that there is any distinction between victors and vanquished among Members of the League who have solemnly undertaken not only to respect but to "preserve as against external aggression, the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all Members of the League," an undertaking which is referred to as an "obligation" in the same Article X. I need not here quote the subsequent Articles which are now, at last, becoming widely known among our people and especially among our working classes, but Germany would once and for all remove every fear as to her intentions, once and for all secure peace for herself and a trembling world if she would boldly support the League in the present grave crisis and announce that she, too, will cut off all personal, economic and financial relations with Italy now that the Report of the Council has been issued and Italy has been found guilty of aggression by 51 nations of the League as against two or three in doubt. No nation could stand against a universal boycott, backed, if necessary, by the nations of the world in arms. If Germany fears a Russian attack, as

I am told she does, the League will protect her, though it is only fair to point out that in view of Herr Hitler's statement on p. 742 of "Mein Kampf" that

"we turn our eyes to the land of the East . . . If, however, we talk in the Europe of to-day of new ground we can in the first place only think of Russia and its subject Border States,"

entitles Russia rather to fear a German attack. From whatever source Germany may fear aggression, the same applies. As regards Bolshevist propaganda and communism within her own borders, she has shown herself quite capable of dealing with this unaided. When once she has re-joined the League and, by so doing, created an atmosphere of confidence which is now lacking, the nations can proceed in a spirit of goodwill, which will readily be forthcoming in so far as this country at any rate is concerned, to the reconsideration of treaties and "the consideration of international conditions whose continuance might endanger the peace of the world," under Article XIX of the Covenant. But so long as she cold-shoulders the League and remains determined to regain her former military predominance regardless of the fears of other nations which are based upon the bitter lessons of the past, so long will she be regarded with suspicion and so long will she remain "misunderstood."

Printed by
Arthur's Press Limited
Woodchester,
Stroud, Glos.



sermon 458

ABSTRACT OF ADDRESS DELIVERED BY RABBI ABBA HILLEL SILVER AT THE TEMPLE, ANSEL
ROAD AND EAST 105TH STREET ON SUNDAY MORNING, MARCH 15, 1936

THUNDER ON THE RHINE!

The scrapping of the Locarno Pact by Germany leaves Europe where it was before the World War - armed anarchy plus the fear compounded out of the failure of great experiments and international peace, and of high hopes which have come to naught. The world today is faced with the spectacle of a League of Nations helpless either to prevent or stop a war and consistently betrayed by its friends; every disarmament conference leading to increased armaments, every international treaty dishonored with impunity, no international guarantee worth the paper it is written on, Fascist governments insolently defying the world and getting away with it, and Democratic governments bungling, divided and at cross purposes.

Collective security has received a severe blow through the uni-lateral abrogation of the Locarno Pact, a Pact which Germany herself voluntarily solicited and hailed with great joy.

It seems that the key to the situation and to the salvation of Europe is in the hands of Great Britain. But unfortunately, Great Britain is as uncertain and vacillating and as undecided in 1936 as she was in 1914. Nazi Germany, in order to carry through her avowed military plans - by destroying Russia and France - dares not antagonize England. The Nazis do not wish to repeat Germany's fatal blunder of 1914. If England were firm with Hitler, the Rhineland would be evacuated by Hitler's forces within twenty-four hours. But England has been pursuing a policy of scolding Hitler in public but quietly making naval treaties with him. She restrains France regardless of the provocation but she helps Germany to grow stronger every day. She clamors for sanctions against Italy but is conciliatory towards Germany. This policy which is being skillfully capitalized by the Fascist governments in Europe is bound to prove fatal to the peace of the world.

The failure to impose sanctions on Japan three years ago made the Italian invasion of Ethiopia possible. The failure to impose real sanctions on Italy last year made the destruction of the Locarno Pact possible. The failure to impose sanctions now will make future international agreements worthless.

Europe hasn't long to wait. It must choose - and that quickly - between the way of collective security and defense enforced by military punitive measures against violators, or the way of armed anarchy. The Fascist governments want armed anarchy. That is their only chance for carrying through their military ambitions. The hope of a free Europe lies in such international compacts as will bring disaster down automatically and relentlessly upon a nation which dares to break them.

