



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
158

Box
56

Folder
548

Shall We have a Referendum on War?, 1938.

498

SHALL WE HAVE A REFERENDUM ON WAR?

By
Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver

At
The Temple

On

Sunday morning, January 16, 1938



The American people burnt its fingers twenty years ago in the World War and it is unwilling to have itself maneuvered, trapped or enticed into another war. For twenty years now, we have been paying the price of our military adventures. We have now had nearly two decades in which to reflect on the cost of the last war on the world, and upon the bitter fact that the motives which moved us into the world war, which at the time seemed so real, cogent and compelling have proved to be vain and illusory. We have come to realize today the emotional pressure of those war years. We rationalized that an international, imperialistic war is a war of brave human ideals. We have come to understand that those pretended objectives were never achieved even though we won the war. We set out to make the world safe for democracy. The world was never so beset with despotism and tyranny and dictatorship in the last hundred years as it is today. There is far less freedom in the world than there has been in the last one hundred and fifty years.

We set out to build with our sacrifices and with our blood an international organization for peace, arbitration, reconciliation, the League of Nations, that great institution which we believed then justified all the multitude of sacrifices and lives shattered and broken. We said then, and we said it quite seriously, that that was to be the last war - a war to end war. Twenty years later, both Western Europe and the Far East are yielding to war. The nations of the world are engaged today in the wildest, the maddest and most desperate and menacing race for rearmament that mankind has ever known.

We have also had time during these last twenty years to discover the sinister influences which played upon our emotions in those years, propaganda of munition-makers and others which helped to get us in to the World War. We realize today that the world is a powder keg that a spark may explode.

The American people today are determined not to repeat the ghastly experience of the World War. The American people is determined to guard itself against being trapped into another world war. It wants to free itself from all international entanglements, of being dragged into or being trapped into another war. We want to remove ourselves from the death trap which is Europe. That much we understand.

Furthermore, there is among our people today a very real and very strong sentiment for peace. There are many powerful organizations which work among our people for peace - the National Council for the Prevention of War, the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, the Emergency Peace Campaign, the Fellowship who sought of Reconciliation and other organizations/to educate our people in the last fifteen or twenty years to the real nature of war, its horror, cost and stupidity.

In 1935, two years ago, when the Ethiopian invasion was taking place, when there was a danger of another world war, the Congress of the United States passed a neutrality law which practically authorized the President of the United States, when a state of hostility existed between two nations, to declare than war existed and to prohibit the shipment from our ports of arms and munitions to either of the belligerents. The Act also announced that Americans traveling on the ships of such

belligerents are traveling at their own risk and should not count upon the protection of the American government.

In October 1935, you may recall that the President of the United States issued a proclamation that a state of war did exist between Italy and Ethiopia and he called on the people of the United States to carry out the Neutrality Law. This law was intended to remove us from the scene of danger, from being enmeshed in another world war.

In 1937, last year, when the Spanish civil war developed, this Neutrality Act was amended to apply also to countries where there was civil war, civil strife. It authorized the United States to declare an embargo on all shipments to countries engaged in civil strife. It prohibited also other articles besides munitions. It also authorized the President of the United States to require that all cargoes before leaving our ports shall have passed to foreign consignees and should no longer be regarded as the possessions of American people. The amended bill of 1937 made travelers on ships of belligerents unlawful. It also prohibits the arming of American merchant vessels and prohibited them from trading with warring nations.

Some of our people have come to think that this Neutrality Act actually insured peace for the American people. That, unfortunately, is not the case. The difficulty of enforcing such a neutrality law was evidenced in the last last in the Sino-Japanese War. To this day the President of the United States has failed to invoke the full force of this neutrality act in Japan and China.

In September of last year, the President did impose a partial embargo on arms shipped to China and Japan. Shipment of munitions aboard government-owned vessels was prohibited. All other vessels travel at their own risk. But the full law has not been invoked. China actually protested this partial embargo because China declared that Japan can import her own munitions aboard her own vessels while China has no Navy. China which is the weaker party, is actually discriminated against in such a so-called neutrality law.

This struggle between China and Japan which brought war closer to our shore has also been responsible for the introduction into the Congress of the United States of the Ludlow Amendment.

This is an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which, if passed, would deprive Congress of the right to declare war except in the case of actual invasion of American territory. The question of war must be submitted to popular referendum of the American people. It reads: "Except in the event of an invasion of the United States or its territorial possessions and an attack upon its citizens residing therein, the authority of Congress to declare war shall not become effective until confirmed by a majority of all votes passed thereon in a nation-wide referendum.

"Congress when it deems a national crisis to exist, may by concurrent resolution refer the question of war or peace to the citizens of the United States, the question to be voted on being --, 'Shall the U.S. declare war on'. Congress may otherwise by law provide for the enforcement of this section."

This Ludlow Amendment has proved to be very popular, so much so that some 218 Congressmen signed a petition to get this Amendment and to have it presented to the floor of the House for debate. It is an unusual procedure to have so many Congressmen pass on the lifting up of a bill unto the floor of Congress. Pressure was brought to get some 55 party leaders to change their minds, thereby permitting the bill to remain in committee. That was accomplished after a only/hectic bit of work, last Monday.

The arguments in favor of such an amendment are readily understood. In the first place, it is understood that such a procedure would delay war and anything which gives the passions a chance to cool off is desirable. In the second place it would give the issues involved in the proposed war a chance of a full airing. All the facts would be laid bare. All the reasons would be told to the American people. There would be less likelihood of a stampede. Furthermore, it is argues that this is the more democratic way of deciding a vital issue. The people of the United States are, after all, in our democratic set-up, the court of last resort, final authority. What more democratic method remains but to put it to the vote of the people. Finally, it is argued, the poeple are called on to lay down their lives and they ought to have the right to decide whether they want to go to war or not.

I am afraid that in spite of the fact that this Amendment is well-intentioned and nobly motivated, their arguments are not very plausible. Upon closer investigation, it will be proved to be highly impractical, far from achieving what it sets out to achieve. It might actually provoke war. A popular referendum may ~~delay~~ delay

for a few months or a year a war decision. Debate upon the issue may delay the decision for a time but it will not delay the enemy. There will be that much more time to prepare, to build up its armies, its navies, to augment its navies, to select a locale for the struggle, to make every conceivable preparation. The enemy will also have time and opportunity to blockade our ports, to cripple our shipping, to do everything to harass our government without actually invading our territory. And by the time we shall have debated the issues, by the time we shall have voted to go to war, we shall have been so completely out-maneuvered, out played, that our war may be practically lost.

While it is true that a popular referendum^{on war} would bring about a full airing of the issues, while it is true that such a full airing is desirable, we ought to bear the following facts in mind - that much debate precedes any action of Congress upon any vital issue. There is not a vital piece of legislation which Congress votes upon which Congress will not declare itself very forcibly. Congress by and large reflects the sentiment of the American people, ~~and~~^{of} the majority of the American people.

Let us not delude ourselves. When Congress declared war in 1917 the American people wanted war. They wanted it incisively. They may have been propagandized into it. The point is that war was wanted by an overwhelming majority of the American people and that if the question of war were put to vote it would have won by an overwhelming majority. In fact it would have voted for it prior to that time - two years prior, when the Lusitania was sunk.

That is true of any war which Congress has declared. The American people backed. It is not true - and this is one of the

things we ought to guard ourselves against because it is not true - that the masses of the people are more pacific, more peace-inclined, more peace-minded and less likely to be propagandized. It is not true that the masses are less likely to be driven into war than the Congress of the United States. It is not true that the rank and file are better-intentioned, more idealistic, more pacifistic than their chosen representatives in the Congress of the United States.

A popular referendum will only give the prospective enemy a chance to bring in a barrage of propaganda into our country. It would pay the prospective enemy to spend hundreds and millions of dollars to propagandize our people, to divide and incite them, and to evoke old world loyalties so that even if war is declared, the American people would find itself hopelessly divided, embittered, enmeshed in partizanship, facing a civil war rather than a foreign war.

Again, while a popular referendum would seem far more democratic, it actually is not. Our government is not a primitive absolute democracy. We do not legislate directly. We legislate through authorized chosen representatives of ours. If we cannot trust our own chosen representatives on great issues then the whole philosophy of our government is bankrupt. It is a mockery and a delusion to ask for a Town Hall meeting sort of government among a people of one hundred and thirty millions in the year 1938 which may have been adequate in a small New England town one hundred years ago. This would not help democracy but would make it so unwieldy as to destroy it. If we are dissatisfied with the moral integrity and the intellectual competence of our chosen representatives, we can send others to take their places. We have a right to express our own personal opinion

through the pulpit, the press, through the radio, the public forum as through direct communication with our law-makers. There is hardly a Congressman whose ear is not open to the opinions of his constituents. But beyond this, in our system of government, we must trust, rely upon the judgment, the wisdom, patriotism of our chosen representatives, to make important decisions in grave hours. That is the chance we have to take in a democracy. The President of the United States clearly pointed that out in a letter which he sent to Congress this week:

"In response to your request for an expression of my views respecting the proposed resolution for a referendum vote as a prerequisite for a declaration of war, I must frankly state that I consider that the proposed amendment would be impracticable in its application and incompatible with our representative form of government.

"Our government is conducted by the people through representatives of their own choosing. It was with singular unanimity that the founders of the Republic agreed upon such free and representative form of government as the only practical means of government by the people.

"Such an amendment to the Constitution as that proposed would cripple any President in his conduct of our foreign relations and it would encourage other nations to believe that they could violate American rights with impunity.

"I fully realize that the sponsors of this proposal sincerely believe that it would be helpful in keeping the United States out of war. I am convinced it would have the opposite effect."

And I am inclined to believe that such an amendment would actually cripple the State Department, the President of the United States in their international activities. They simply would not be taken seriously. Governments in the world today are inclined to respect only force and

they would not regard the protestations of the State Department very seriously. They would know that Congress can do nothing about it, that a war decision would have to go through the slow, laborious process of a referendum before war is declared. They know that the American people are peace minded people and that many of them believe in peace at any cost. They have already capitalized on that sentiment of the American people. They have bullied, black-mailed and gotten away with it. And if, added to this well known peace-mindedness is added this issue of declaring war only by popular referendum, these dictators will simply go the limit of committing every international crime confident that nothing will happen.

The Secretary of State, who is certainly not a belligerent individual, sent this communication to the House: "In reply to your inquiry, I would say that on December 15, 1937, in referring to the Ludlow Resolution, I stated to the press that 'from the standpoint of promoting peace and keeping this country out of war, I am unable to see either the wisdom or practicability of the proposal'.

"The primary objective in the conduct of our foreign affairs is to safeguard the peace of the United States. All American citizens agree alike that this country should be safeguarded against war to the fullest possible extent.

"It is my judgment that under our present form of government 'of the people, by the people and for the people', our foreign affairs can be conducted far more efficiently from the standpoint of keeping this country out of war than would be at all possible

It might interest you to know that the people who were most chagrined that the Ludlow Amendment was not passed, were the Nazis in Germany. They would like to see democracies tied hand and foot and unable to move so they can carry on their work unhampered.

No, I am afraid that this is not the way to have peace.

There is no short cut to peace. Pacificism will not bring it about because there are all too few pacifists in the world. It takes two to make a war and even if one side is war-minded, the other side may not be. Peace agitation will not bring about an end to war. Dwelling upon the horrors of war, the futility of war, will not bring about peace.

I read, the other day, an account of the storming of Nanking by the Japanese. I don't know whether you read the account. This is from an eye-witness reported in the New York Times.

"In taking over Nanking the Japanese indulged in slaughters, looting and rapine exceeding in barbarity any atrocities committed up to that time in the course of the Sino-Japanese hostilities. The unrestrained cruelties of the Japanese are to be compared only with the vandalism in the Dark Ages in Europe or the brutalities of medieval Asiatic conquerors.

"The helpless Chinese troops, disarmed for the most part and ready to surrender, were systematically rounded up and executed, Thousands who had turned themselves over to the Safety Zone Committee and been placed in refuge centers were methodically weeded out and marched away, their hands tied behind them, to execution grounds outside the city gates.

"Small bands who had sought refuge in dugouts were routed out and shot or stabbed at the entrances to the bomb shelters. Their bodies were then shoved into the dugouts and buried. Tank guns were sometimes turned on groups of bound soldiers. Most generally the executions were by shooting with pistols.

"The Japanese themselves announced that during the first three days of cleaning up Nanking 15,000 Chinese soldiers were rounded up. At that time, it was contended that 25,000 more were still hiding out in the city.

"These figures give an accurate indication of the number of Chinese troops trapped within the Nanking walls. Probably the Japanese figures of 25,000 is exaggerated, but it is likely that 20,000 Chinese soldiers fell victim to Japanese executioners.

"Wholesale looting was one of the major crimes of the Japanese occupation. Once a district was in their full control, Japanese soldiers received free rein to loot all houses therein. Food seemed to be the first demand, but all articles of value were taken at will, particularly things easily carried. Occupants of homes were robbed and any who resisted were shot.

"Chinese women were freely molested by Japanese soldiers, and American missionaries personally know of cases where many were taken from refugee camps and violated."

Disarmament as a means for achieving peace will be the result of peace. It will not be the cause of peace. Nations will not disarm until they feel secure. Notice the huge military budget which our own ~~legislature~~ country voted. It was the largest appropriation ever voted in peace-time America. International gestures for peace

like the Kellogg-Briand Pact will not bring about peace. Neutrality laws will not bring about peace. Peace is an international problem and must find an international solution. Peace is an engineering problem and we must find the engineering blue print adequate for the task.

Peace can only be established through common action. That sense of security can not be established by one nation alone. Only a League of Nations that is implemented with the power to force observances of treaties, capable of the instantaneous application of both economic and military sanctions will give the nations of the earth a sense of security and will make the piling up of life-draining armaments unnecessary. Only such an international organization, whether you call it a League, a Federation or by some other name, which will have that power to crash down upon an aggressor nation to protect the weak against the aggressor - only such an organization which will provide compulsory arbitration, which will insist that its judgments will be respected and that will tell possible aggressors that it will not pay it to go to war. There is no substitute for it. There is no substitute for a police force and courts of law in community life. If we did not have them, we would do as was done in the pioneering days - tote guns. And there is no substitute for a police force and courts of law in international life. If we are not willing to make some sacrifices in our so-called sovereignty, we will make absolutely no contribution to the solution of peace and war and we will not by way of any new measures and referendums protect ourselves against being dragged into another war.

It is one of those desperate simple things which nations do not want to think about because they do not want to face it that they find themselves in the condition in which they are today - a

conditon full of menace, a condition where the whole western civilization is in danger of being hurled into an abyss of the most ghastly war.

I have personally refused, in the last few years, to identify myself with any peace movements. They are all led by fine intentioned people. But I am persuaded of the absolute futility of it. Two years ago, eleven million Englishmen voted for peace - the greatest demonstration in Great Britain for peace. Within that year, Parliament asked people to approve appropriation of enormous sum for Navy - which was gladly approved.

Peace can come, my friends, only by way of building up concerted action for common security, by way of building up an international organization like the League of Nations, but unlike it, a League of Nations made up of free and equal peoples pledged only to one thing - a League backed by a compulsory international tribunal, unquestioning compliance with the decisions of that tribunal, a League backed by international forces which may never be used but whose presence will guarantee the compliance of it.

Along these lines, my friends, the future work in behalf of world peace ought to be carried on. All these others are a waste of precious human time and precious human material and they help to confuse and darken when counsel ought to be ^aclear. and objective voice.

votes in
to pass the measure.

SECRETARY HULL'S LETTER

Secretary Hull's letter to Mr. Mc Reynolds was as follows:

In reply to your inquiry I would say that on Dec. 15, 1937, in referring to the Ludlow Resolution, I stated to the press that "from the standpoint of promoting peace and keeping this country out of war, I am unable to see either the wisdom or practicability of this proposal."

The primary objective in the conduct of our foreign affairs is to safeguard the peace of the United States. All American citizens agree alike that this country should be safeguarded against war to the fullest possible extent.

It is my judgment that under our present form of government "of the people, by the people and for the people," our foreign affairs can be conducted far more efficiently from the standpoint of keeping this country out of war than would be at all possible under the operation of any such plan as the Ludlow Resolution proposes.

After the fullest consideration, I am satisfied that this plan would most seriously handicap the government in the conduct of our foreign affairs generally and would thus impair disastrously its ability to safeguard the peace of the American people.

American interests
might be ignored with impunity.

The President's Letter

President Roosevelt's letter of condemnation was addressed to Speaker Bankhead, who read it from the floor. It was as follows:

Jan. 6, 1938.

My Dear Mr. Speaker:

In response to your request for an expression of my views respecting the proposed resolution for a referendum vote as a prerequisite for a declaration of war, I must frankly state that I consider that the proposed amendment would be impracticable in its application and incompatible with our representative form of government.

Our government is conducted by the people through representatives of their own choosing. It was with singular unanimity that the founders of the Republic agreed upon such free and representative form of government as the only practical means of government by the people.

Such an amendment to the Constitution as that proposed would cripple any President in his conduct of our foreign relations and it would encourage other nations to believe that they could violate American rights with impunity.

I fully realize that the sponsors of this proposal sincerely believe that it would be helpful in keeping the United States out of war. I am convinced it would have the opposite effect.

Yours very sincerely,
FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

The Hon. William B. Bankhead,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

55 Signers Reverse Their Stand

There followed slashing attacks on the discharge petition and the referendum proposal itself by the Administration leaders, who knew their task from the fact that 218 members had signed the petition and that the attitude of Republicans was uncertain.

The vote showed that their struggle, begun weeks ago, to wean away signers from the petition, had been fruitful, for fifty-five who had signed voted against the petition. Veterans could not recall when a

Continued on Page Eighteen

hered in a
th to die in
n.

of the city
also became
There was
es, and the
uch as was
y into build-
bject of the
her supplies.
deserted by
n the safety
tocked with

ed intensive
orning, and
e the walls
ate and the
e object of a
tion of the
noticeable.

foreigners
itted a grow-
a falling off
rent.

over the walls
ly after noon
ng built tem-
s the moat.
ad a heavy
scaled the
an Hsi Men.
the vicinity
ning through
e safety zone.
ghth Division
were unsuc-

at toward the
in progress.
orderly one.
continued to
alls and suc-
off Japanese
siderable area
Monday morn-

rrific conges-
thousands of
pted to crowd
w opening in
ic seized the
get through.
clothing to-
s for scaling
General Tang
; other high
left.

retreat had
Chinese col-
leaderless and
s happening,
uld only real-
over and try

he city had
ese collapse
by excesses
d by trapped
soldiers, but
incendiarism
e troops were

and Arms

y spread all
nd thousands
uniforms. Ci-
en or begged
and when no
und the sol-
carded army
their under-

along with
eets became
grenades,
ts, shoes and
of military
near Hsia-
ng. In front
munications

been eliminated and the Japanese
were in complete control of the
city.

In taking over Nanking the Jap-
anese indulged in slaughters, loot-
ing and rapine exceeding in barbar-
ity any atrocities committed up to
that time in the course of the Sino-
Japanese hostilities. The unre-
strained cruelties of the Japanese
are to be compared only with the
vandalism in the Dark Ages in
Europe or the brutalities of medie-
val Asiatic conquerors.

The helpless Chinese troops, dis-
armed for the most part and ready
to surrender, were systematically
rounded up and executed. Thousands
who had turned themselves over to
the Safety Zone Committee and
been placed in refugee centers were
methodically weeded out and
marched away, their hands tied be-
hind them, to execution grounds
outside the city gates.

Small bands who had sought ref-
uge in dugouts were routed out and
shot or stabbed at the entrances to
the bomb shelters. Their bodies
were then shoved into the dugouts
and buried. Tank guns were some-
times turned on groups of bound
soldiers. Most generally the execu-
tions were by shooting with pistols.

Every able-bodied male in Nan-
king was suspected by the Japanese
of being a soldier. An attempt was
made by inspecting shoulders for
knapsack and rifle butt marks to
single out the soldiers from the
innocent males, but in many cases,
of course, men innocent of any mili-
tary connection were put in the exe-
cuted squads. In other cases, too,
former soldiers were passed over
and escaped.

The Japanese themselves an-
nounced that during the first three
days of cleaning up Nanking 15,000
Chinese soldiers were rounded up.
At the time, it was contended that
25,000 more were still hiding out in
the city.

These figures give an accurate
indication of the number of Chinese
troops trapped within the Nanking
walls. Probably the Japanese fig-
ure of 25,000 is exaggerated, but it
is likely that about 20,000 Chinese
soldiers fell victim to Japanese
executioners.

Civilians of both sexes and all
ages were also shot by the Jap-
anese. ~~Firemen and policemen were~~
frequent victims of the Japanese.
Any person who, through excite-
ment or fear, ran at the approach
of the Japanese soldiers was in
danger of being shot down. Tours
of the city by foreigners during the
period when the Japanese were con-
solidating their control of the city
revealed daily fresh civilian dead.
Often old men were to be seen face
downward on the pavements, ap-
parently shot in the back at the
whim of some Japanese soldier.

Wholesale looting was one of the
major crimes of the Japanese oc-
cupation. Once a district was in
their full control, Japanese soldiers
received free rein to loot all
houses therein. Food seemed to be
the first demand, but all articles of
value were taken at will, particu-
larly things easily carried. Occu-
pants of homes were robbed and
any who resisted were shot.

Foreign Properties Looted

Refugee camps were entered and
in many cases the few dollars of un-
fortunate refugees were taken.

Nanking
Daidin

RY 9, 1938.

After Chinese

Houses that were barricaded were broken into. Foreign properties were not immune. Japanese soldiers entered faculty houses of the American mission Ginling College and took what they pleased.

The American mission University Hospital was searched and belongings of nurses taken from the dormitory. Foreign flags were torn from buildings and at least three motor cars were taken from foreigners. The home of the United States Ambassador, Nelson T. Johnson, was entered, but the five intruding Japanese soldiers were made to leave before they had obtained any loot except a flashlight.

Chinese women were freely molested by Japanese soldiers, and American missionaries personally know of cases where many were taken from refugee camps and violated.

It should be said that certain Japanese units exercised restraint and certain Japanese officers tempered power with generosity and compassion. But the conduct of the Japanese Army as a whole in Nanking was a blot on the reputation of their country. Responsible high Japanese officers and diplomats who visited Nanking some days after the occupation admit all the excesses reported by foreigners who saw them. These Japanese explain the Nanking barbarities by saying that a section of the Japanese Army got out of hand and that the atrocities were being committed unknown to the high command in Shanghai.

When the final collapse of the Chinese came in Nanking, so great was the feeling of relief among the populace and such was the bad impression created by the break-up of the Chinese municipal regime and the defense command that the people were ready to welcome the Japanese troops. Indeed, scattered bands of civilians actually cheered Japanese columns as they marched in from the South Gate and the West Gate.

But feelings of relief and of welcome soon gave up to terror when Japanese barbarities began. The Japanese might have gained a wide measure of support and confidence from the Nanking Chinese. Instead they drove deeper into the Chinese soul a hatred of Japan and set back to a distant future prospects for gaining the Chinese "cooperation" for which they profess to be fighting China.

An account of the siege of Nanking would not be complete without reference to the safety zone and the role of the foreigners who remained in the city.

Not an unqualified success, the Nanking safety zone was nevertheless instrumental in saving thousands of civilian lives. It was the aim of its foreign promoters to obtain its complete demilitarization and have its neutrality respected throughout the sieze. Full demilitarization was never attained and during the last days of the battle

small A
riod of f

The s
was Dr.
sor of S
Nanking
initiative
the nego
zone was
fessor of
Dr. Bate
of effort
Nanking
planned
withdraw
city peac

Fifteen
American
dents an
photogra
during th
Briton a
the rema
ingent v

From t
the Pan
until cor
the Japa
14, this
without
world, t
troops v
The city
there wa
phones a
unobtain

All the
cept the
ly associa
zone or
the safet
attemptin
Thousand
had to be
had to be
ties had
skeleton
set up.

The R
palian n
eign com
efforts to
thousand
wounded

Chinese
treating
sketchy.
the numb
was hop
many ho
men from

The Rev
during t
trated ef
medical r
the existin
porting w
stitutions.
cope with
of casua
wounded
the street
siege were
ing sights
tacle. Inj
dragged t
ways, died
main stree

The Ame
Hospital o
battle, and
keep it res

FALL
tillery

urther on,
staff cars,
nd small
in a junk
\$2,000,000
city, was
stored in-
a spec-

ught fire
ext day.
wagons
nd their
rightful-
olocaut
ne main
te, and
ng side

of the
et into
junks
cross
owned
river

anese
area
nt of
t in-
in.
dis-
out.

THE TEMPLE BULLETIN, published weekly, except during the summer vacation, by Tifereth Israel Congregation, East 105th Street at Ansel Road, Cleveland, O. Rabbi Melbourne Harris, Editor; Harry A. Levy, Sec'y. Subscription price, 50 cents per annum.

Entered as second-class matter Nov. 12, 1931, at the Post Office in Cleveland, Ohio, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

The Ludlow Amendment

"Except in the event of an invasion of the U. S. or its territorial possessions and an attack upon its citizens residing therein, the authority of Congress to declare war shall not become effective until confirmed by a majority of all votes passed thereon in a nation-wide referendum.

"Congress, when it deems a national crisis to exist, may by concurrent resolution refer the question of war or peace to the citizens of the U. S., the question to be voted on being — 'Shall the U. S. declare war on.....'. Congress may otherwise by law provide for the enforcement of this section."

Dr. Silver Chosen National Chairman U. P. A.

Dr. Silver has been elected national chairman for 1938 of the United Palestine Appeal. Dr. Silver will succeed Dr. Stephen S. Wise as national chairman.

The United Palestine Appeal will endeavor to raise, this year, four and one-half million dollars for the up-building work in Palestine. The budget of the Jewish Agency for Palestine in which both Zionists and non-Zionists are represented covers agriculture, colonization, land purchase, afforestation, immigration, the settlement of German Jews in the country, housing, credit and education.

Dr. Silver will be installed in the office at the National Conference for Palestine which will be held in Washington on January twenty-second and twenty-third.

Temple Team Wins Debate

Our Temple debating team was awarded the unanimous decision of the judges in their debate with the Detroit team last Sunday morning, when they discussed the question of the partition of Palestine. The Temple team consisted of Arthur Aptel, Donald Goodman, and Arthur Roth.

Following the formal debate, an interesting discussion of the subject was entered into by the student audience.

During the coming weeks, our team will engage in debate with other teams in the Inter-Temple League.

THE TEMPLE WOMEN'S ASSOCIATION

JANUARY MEETING

WEDNESDAY AFTERNOON - JANUARY 19th - 2:00 O'CLOCK

RABBI ABBA HILLEL SILVER

will review

"THE MOTHER" by SHOLEM ASCH

Social Hour and Tea

Admission by Membership Card

The TEMPLE BULLETIN

THE TEMPLE
East 105th St. and Ansel Rd.
CLEVELAND, OHIO

Abba Hillel Silver, DD.
RABBI

MELBOURNE HARRIS
Assistant-Rabbi

Vol. XXIV

January 16th, 1938

No. 16

SUNDAY MORNING SERVICE

10:30 O'CLOCK

RABBI SILVER

will speak on

**"SHALL WE HAVE A REFERENDUM
ON WAR?"**

Friday Evening Services
5:30 to 6:00

Sabbath Morning Services
11:20 to 12:00

1). Am. people - burnt fingers - not willing -

For 20 yrs - paying price

Motives proved vain, illusory

We had rationalized

the victories - pretended objectives

{ Dictatorships - less free > 1914

{ League

{ Re-armament

We also discovered sinister propaganda

World - powder-keg -

2/. So that Am. people - determined not repeat -

Would like to guard itself - foreign entanglements
" " remove ourselves - cock-pit, death trap

3/. Again - strong peace sentiment .

{ Nat. Council for the Prevention of War
Women's Intern. League for Peace & Freedom
Emergency peace campaigns
Fellowship of Reconciliation

Honor - Cost - Futility .

4/. 1935 - Ethiopia - "Neutrality Act" (Inst.)
On Oct. 1935 - Pres. R. issued a Proclamation that a
state of war existed bet. Italy & Ethiopia and called
for observance of Neutrality Law

5/ In 1937 - amended - "Spanish Civil War" - embargo on shipments to countries engaged in Civil Strife.

Prohibits also other articles besides munitions
may require cargoes before leaving our ports shall have
passed to foreign consignees.

Makes travel - unlawful - not only at their own risk
Prohibits arming Am. merchant vessels engaged in

6/ Difficulty of enforcing - evidenced in Sino-Japan War.
To this day Pres. failed to make full use of Neutrality Act
On Sept. 14 - imposed partial embargo on arms to
China-Japan. Forbids shipment ~~of~~ ~~from~~ abroad

Govt-owned vessels

All other vessels travel at own risk

China protested - unfair to her.

7/ Sino-J. War but was closer to Am. shores.

Ludlow Amendment - defers Congress - invasion (but)

Popular - 218 Congressmen. Russan - 55 -

8/ Pro ① Delay

② Govt using full-arming - all facts - less likelihood

③ Memorandum

④ - People, called to lay down lives

9). Cannot agree - valid - well intentioned; wholly motivated, plausible,
impractical - far from achieving peace

I may delay - 6 months - 4 years - debating, ballotting
But will not delay Enemy -
By June

II Full airing - Much debate precedes any action, types
Congress reflects - not all people -
When Congress declared war in 1917 - Am. people wanted
that it wanted it - unwisely - propagandized -
Endorsed it - If asked to vote
That is true every war

(a) It is not true that masses are more paucific
- less likely to be propag. & stampeded -
- naive - better-informed, better-intentioned, more idealistic

(b) A pop. Refer. will only give prospective Enemy
- democracy - to divide - incite ^{in nationalist} groups against
groups; to evolve old-world loyalties; confuse
Counsel - So that, even if war is declared -
hopelessly divided - embittered - enmeshed in
partisanship - Civil War -

(c) In such vital issues - minority - ballot box

(d) Govt. would have - despotism -

III Our Theory of Govt.

No primitive - absolute sense.

If we cannot trust - whole system

To ask for a Town-meeting forming Govt - 130 m.

Fascism.

If we are dissatisfied

We have also Channels

Our rep. not deaf - constituent

Beyond this - Trust

That is chance

(Justice Roosevelt)

IV Undermining prestige [State Dept. Thus
not taken seriously - respect nothing but force
slow, cumbersome - will go brunt
Have done to tell now - peace-mindedness

If, added,

They will perpetrate - (Wodgers) Panegy -

(Justice Hall)

Nazis - chagrined -

10/ Not the way - No short-cut -

① Pacifism - Refusal to bear arms

② Peace agitation - Horrors (Justice) No public opinion left

- (3) Disarmament - See budgets -
- (4) Outlawry of War - Kellogg Brand
- (5) Neutrality Leg.
- (6) Referendum

11). Peace is an inter. problem - inter. actions.

Collective actions.

A League - implemented - to enforce inter. law -

Econ. & military sanctions

No substitutes - for Courts & Police



SHALL WE HAVE A REFERENDUM ON WAR?

The Ludlow Amendment is well-intentioned, nobly motivated and the arguments for it are quite plausible. It is, however quite impractical and will not achieve the desired goal of peace.

It is a democratic delusion that the masses are more peace minded and less likely to be propagandized into war than their chosen representatives. It is naive to assume that the rank and file is better informed, better intentioned and more idealistic than the men to whom they have delegated the authority to make laws for them and vital decisions.

Our government is not a primitive absolute democracy. It is a representative government. If we cannot trust our chosen representatives to make grave decisions then our whole philosophy of government is bankrupt. To ask for a Town Meeting system of government in 1938, and for a nation of one hundred and thirty millions, is to invite chaos and dictatorship. If we are dissatisfied with the intellectual competence and the moral integrity of our chosen representatives, we can send others to take their places. The electorate also has adequate channels to make its opinions heard - the press, the public forum, the radio as well as direct communication with the law-makers in Congress who are not at all deaf to the opinions of their constituents. Beyond this, we must trust the wisdom and the patriotism of our representatives.

The long delay which would be involved in a popular referendum on war would simply give the prospective enemy not only the opportunity to build up his military forces but to lay down a barrage of propaganda in our own country dividing our people, inciting one nationality group against another and invoking old world loyalties. So that even if war is finally declared, our people would be found hopelessly divided and enmeshed in bitter partisanship.

There is no short cut to peace. Neither pacifism nor peace propaganda nor the outlawry of war nor disarmament proposals nor neutrality legislation nor a popular referendum will bring about peace. Peace is an international problem and calls for international action. Only collective action for collective security would meet the situation. Only an international organization implemented to enforce international law, capable of the instantaneous application of both economic and military sanctions, will give the nations of the earth a sense of security and will make the piling of life draining armaments unnecessary. There is no substitute for a police force and courts of law in community life. And there is no substitute for a police force and courts of law in international life. This is one of those hard and desperate simplicities which the nations of the world, including our own, have tried not to face and because of which they are today where they are - on the brink of disaster.

