



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
163

Box
58

Folder
825

The Struggle between Democracy and Dictatorships, 1950.

THE STRUGGLE BETWEEN DEMOCRACY AND DICTATORSHIP

How Real Is It?

Sunday, October 15, 1950

The struggle, dear friends, between democracy and dictatorship is very real indeed. It has been very many decades and many generations. It is today. But it is very confused in our day, and the line is not at all clearly drawn. We seem to be listening to a confusion of tongues, to sort of a battle in semantics. Not all who call themselves Democrats and who champion democracy are really true democrats at heart, and not all who hurl the epithet "dictatorship" are really averse to the use of the methods of dictatorship when they serve their purposes.

And because of this linguistic Babel, because of this battle of catch-words - democracy, dictatorship - our clear thinking on these subjects is frequently roiled and muddled, and our resultant action is accordingly disordered, contradictory and frequently baffling, even to ourselves.

It might surprise you, for example, to learn that the Soviet dictatorship regards itself and calls itself democratic. Especially since the adoption of the Soviet Constitution in 1936 Stalin and his associates in the Communist dictatorship have been very fond and very eager to characterize their form of government as democratic. They evidently regard any form of government under which a country is ruled for the benefit of its people as democratic. The fact that that country is run by a small group that holds absolute power and ruthlessly suppresses all opposition in no way militates in their minds against their definition of democracy, and they have no trouble in rationalizing their position. They maintain that the dictatorship of the proletariat is only a temporary phase, a temporary device, by which they had to seize power from the ruling classes who would not have surrendered their power through any peaceful, democratic process, and their dictatorship is a device by which to hold that power against capitalist counter-revolution and attempts to destroy the rule of the proletariat until such time as the classless society is firmly established and the whole state machinery, the whole

state apparatus will wither away and with it, all forms of suppression and state domination. Thus, they regard their dictatorship as a sort of authoritarian democracy, if you will - a passing phase in the evolution of their society into the perfect democracy.

This, of course, is sheerest nonsense, as the last 30 years of Communist dictatorship in Russia have demonstrated. Dictatorship during these 30 years - and 30 years is a long time - dictatorship in Russia has not grown less rigorous, but more - more relentless, more ruthless, more oppressive. The individual has received none of those rights which the Bolshevik Revolution promised to bestow upon him. He is less free today than he was under the Czars, though materially he is undoubtedly better off, and better off in other ways, too.

Dictatorship never passes over peacefully into freedom. Dictatorship never liquidates itself. The ruling class, the ruling group under a Communist dictatorship, as under any other form of dictatorship, does not willingly abdicate or surrender any of its powers or privileges, and the ruling group in Russia possesses vast powers and vast privileges.

It is, therefore, a sort of a clever but not very convincing dialectics to call a system of government which tolerates no opposition political party, which sends critics of the government to concentration camps or the firing line, which outlaws free speech, a free press and a free assembly, and which punishes ferociously any deviation from the prescribed line either in thought or action - to call such a system of government democratic. It is certainly not democratic in our sense of the term, in the American sense, in the Anglo-Saxon sense of the term - a government of the people, by the people and for the people - government wherein the final authority rests not with the state, but with the citizen, wherein the majority rules but the minority must be free to be heard, free to criticize, free to organize political action against the majority so as to unseat the majority and vote it out of office. It is certainly not democracy as we know it based upon a Bill of Rights which protects the individual and the minority against the possible willfulness of tyranny of the majority or even of the state itself.

I say, there is much confusion today in the use of terms, and therefore, in our thinking, and therefore, in our action. But keeping this definition of democracy in mind, the American definition, the true definition of democracy, we must take a step forward and realize ~~today~~ that Russia today is not the only dictatorship in the world, and that Communist states are not the only dictatorships in the world today. Many of us like to forget that simple fact. There are many other states which are not democratic, which are not Communist, which we do not condemn as violently as we condemn the Soviet Union - in fact, which we do not condemn at all - because their economic system does not seem to be as obnoxious to us as that of the Soviet Union. And so, when we speak of democracy, we have two kinds of democracy in mind, and when we speak of dictatorship we have two kinds of dictatorship in mind - the kind we like and the kind we don't like.

Recently a great exponent of true democracy in Latin America, the editor of that famous newspaper, "La Prensa" in the Argentine, which has been put in a strait-jacket of suppression by Peron, the dictator of the Argentine. The editor, Alberto Gainza Paz, was recently honored in the city of New York by his journalistic confreres, and he took occasion to say at this gathering a few days ago:

It should be frankly recognized that we face a double danger; a sham Pan-Americanism and a sham democracy. We must defend ourselves against the fiction of democracy. Freedom of the press, of worship and assembly are often violated on our continent.

Quite a number of the states south of us, Latin American states, who are within our friendly orbit, with whom we cooperate very closely, are unabashed and ruthless and brutal dictatorships. In fact, just a few short years ago we were fighting to defend human freedom and civilization, not against Communist dictatorship, but against the foremost anti-Communist states in the world - Fascist Italy and Nazi Germany - and we welcomed in this war as a powerful ally Communist Russia. All through the years between the two World Wars we were propagandized to believe that the real enemy of Western democracy was Russia. Hardly was the First World War over than we sent an expeditionary force into Russia in an attempt to crush the Bolshevik Revolution in 1919, and thereby giving the Russian people a complex from which they have never been able to shake themselves, a

complex of what they call capitalist encirclement.

Right after our victory over the Kaiser we proceeded to break the powers of the workers' and soldiers' governments which had been established in many parts of Germany after 1918, and we helped to restore to power the ousted officials of the Kaiser, the Junkers and the militarists, because of our fear of Communist Russia. And of course, the Western Powers helped to build up Hitler in an effort to contain Russia, and yet, when the showdown finally came, when we went to war, it was not against Communist Russia that we went to war, but against the Hitler-Fascist-Japanese aggression and lust for power and world dominion.

Those are facts we forget, facts which we should not forget, and I suspect - I do not know - I suspect that in the Third World War, if, God forbid, there is to be a Third World War, we shall again be fighting a resurgent Germany, nationalist and militaristic as ever, bent upon revenge, the return of lost provinces and lost prestige, bent upon world domination, a Germany whom we shall help again to re-arm, as we did once before, under our fatal obsession and fear of Communist Russia. Our Secretary of State has already called for the rearming of Western Germany as a bulwark against Russia. The Pentagon is all in favor of it. Fortunately today for the peace of the world, Germany is still weak and partitioned. Should Germany ever be reunited and rearmed, I am afraid that the Third World War will be upon us. Unless Germany is de-militarized and neutralized and lifted from the field of power politics, a Third World War is inevitable and it will originate as the first two World Wars, not in Moscow but in Berlin.

Is it to serve the true ends of democracy that we now propose to rearm an unrepentant, unde-nazified Germany which has always fermented enmity between the East and the West? Is this to be regarded as a part of our world-wide crusade to defend democracy?

At the close of the Second World War at Potsdam in July 1945, the leaders of the great powers which defeated Germany - Truman, Stalin, Churchill, Attlee - met and resolved, and this is part of the agreement which was signed at Potsdam, ~~that German~~
~~rearmament~~

German militarism and Nazism will be extirpated...all clubs and associations which serve to keep alive the military tradition in Germany shall be completely and finally abolished in such manner as permanently to prevent the revival or re-organization of German militarism and Nazism.... To destroy the National Socialist Party and its affiliated and supervised organizations, to dissolve all Nazi institutions, to ensure that they are not revived in any form, and to prevent all Nazi and militarist activity or propaganda. ...Nazi leaders, influential Nazi supporters and high officials of Nazi organizations and institutions and any other persons dangerous to the occupation or its objectives shall be arrested and interned. All members of the Nazi Party who have been more than nominal participants in its activities...shall be removed from public and semipublic office, and from positions of responsibility in important private undertakings.

This was the first reaction, a sound and logical reaction, of the leaders of the great nations who went through the agony of the World War, to crush this octopus of Nazism which brought such disaster upon the world. They determined to tear it up root and branch, this noxious weed which poisoned the life of the peoples of the world. And that was only five short years ago. Those who had observed this program of de-Nazification without exception really have come to the conclusion that de-Nazification is a failure. This is a statement of one of the principal men who was charged with the task of carrying out the de-Nazification program in Germany. "American Military Government long ago abandoned responsibility for the placement in really important private and public positions of persons of positive democratic convictions. The responsibility was turned over to the Germans, much to the grave concern of those Americans who saw the development at close range. The tragedy of Weimar in failing to replace persons of known anti-Democratic convictions in private and public institutions is well known, but it was apparently no lesson to the American policy-makers since there were no safeguards retained such as the screening of key personnel in German government and industry. It is easy to see," concludes the writer "that the democratic and anti-Nazi fervor which accompanied the drive of our occupation troops into Germany is gone. In May 1945 the word Nazi was anathema; in 1949 it is no longer so; among the Germans it is practically accolade. As righteous ambassadors of democracy we were prepared at all costs to extirpate Nazism. The tragedy is that we have paid the cost and are now witnessing the Nazi revival. It couldn't happen here, but is happening now!"

In the city of Bremen, for example, 60 out of 61 police officers were former Nazis; 65% of the top positions of the Justice Department are filled with former Nazis; 75% of the highest positions in the Finance Department are held by former Nazis. And as far as the trials of Nazi criminals are concerned, the following figures may be of interest.

We have witnessed a series of acquittals and shockingly light sentences for many notorious and dangerous Nazis. In the few cases where prison sentences were pronounced, they were usually far less than the period which had already been spent in confinement awaiting trial, so that the subject was immediately freed. Thus Hubert Hildebrandt, head of the foreign-labor branch of the Labor Ministry, top assistant to Fritz Sauckel (who was hanged at Nuremberg) and deeply involved in the German slave-labor program, was classified as a Nazi "follower" and fined 250 marks. Gerhard Klopfer, an SS major-general and second man to Martin Bormann in the Nazi Party Chancellory, was classified as a "minor offender". Karl Wolff, SS lieutenant-general, long Himmler's top personal aide and later chief of all SS and police activities in Italy, after awaiting trial for about four years in internment, was sentenced to four years' imprisonment, and thus set at liberty seven days later.

If such men are to go free, there is little point in excluding those of far paler Nazi hue from normal employment. Indeed, the ponderous denazification "mill" has ground rapidly and exceedingly coarse in the British Zone, out of more than 20,000 former SS and Party officials who were "tried", only 143 were still in prison by February 1949. In Bavaria some 14,000 Nazis were classified as "major offenders" or "offenders", but in May 1949, exactly 55 of these were still serving sentences.

Antisemitism is rampant in Germany again, and all the practices, including desecration of cemeteries, are again in full swing. Neo-Nazi, para-military units, underground groups are again being organized rapidly. Close on to 100 newspapers have appeared within the last year who are edited again by the same Nazi editors who filled their papers with all of Nazi vicious propaganda in the years before the war. No reform of the school system has taken place, and the same Nazi teachers and professors are back in their classrooms. This is all that is left of that illusory hope to create a free and democratic Germany in our lifetime.

Now, the question which we have a right to ask is, how do we help democracy in its struggle against dictatorship by helping to strengthen and to build up this war-mongering nation in the heart of Europe, whose nationalistic, militaristic, irredentist, aggressive tendencies no one really denies, and whose industrial output, and therefore, its military potential, is rapidly climbing back to its pre-war level. Germany as a bulwark of democracy, as an outpost of the great American tradition, is just a colossal and ghastly delusion. Germany will fight - Germany will fight for revenge, for "lebensraum", for world dominion, for "Deutschland uber alles", but it is the height of folly to expect that Germany will fight to defend the Truman Doctrine or the principle of our Declaration of Independence.

And is it to serve the ends of democracy that we now propose to arm and finance Franco Spain? The Congress of the United States, against the advice of the President, voted an appropriation for Franco. The American Legion a few days ago demanded that Spain be readmitted, or admitted into the United Nations and rearmed. The United Nations has consistently refused to admit this butcher Franco and his government into the United Nations and has asked all the members of the United Nations not to send diplomatic representatives to that country. An attempt is now being made in the name seemingly of serving the cause of democracy by containing Communist Russia to white-wash this Fascist government. Franco, like Hitler, beguiled many nations into helping him destroy the Spanish Republic because he set himself up as the strong defense against Communism. He had the backing of the church in this effort, and now democracy must turn to Franco - Franco with his precarious hold on a land of deepening poverty and its badly equipped army and his bankrupt finances - the great western democracies have to turn to this man as the saviour to save them from dictatorship.

and

How do we hope to maintain/to build up the morale of struggling democratic peoples all over the world if we woo and align ourselves with this notorious, bloody, Fascist ruler and dictator?

If ever we have to fight Russia, and one dreads to think of such a possibility, we shall find little aid and comfort in a Western Germany which cannot be defended and cannot be trusted and in a decrepit and bankrupt, Fascist Spain.

My dear friends, if we are really to concern with the preservation of democracy in the world, recognizing that there is this struggle between the forces of freedom and the forces of tyranny, that the struggle is a real one, a bitter one and a prolonged one, there are in my humble judgment two things which we can do constructively. One is to help the democratic peoples economically to increase their production, to raise their standard of living, to grow strong economically and improve the lives of their citizens, to help them, of course, within the limits of our own economic stability, for our resources are not inexhaustible and our power to help has its definite limits. But as we give these republics and democracies, the true democracies in the world, which are beset today with so many grave economic handicaps, as we give them economic aid and support to better their economic life, we are helping to strengthen democracy in those countries whose peoples are democratically inclined, who have a real, historic, deep-seated love and affection and devotion to the democratic way of life.

That is contemplated in one of the measures that was adopted by the Congress of the United States.

And secondly, to strengthen and to exemplify true democracy at home. People fail to realize that America, by the mere fact of its existence, its achievements, its institutions, has exercised tremendous influence upon the course of democracy in the world in the last 175 years. Many of the suppressed peoples of the earth were inspired by our example to throw off the chains of tyranny and set themselves free. We exported our democracy in more than a century and a half, but not really by battle ships or by jet planes. Those are poor vehicles for the exporting of democracy. We exported them by the contagious example of our successful and desirable way of life, by the example of our free and contented citizenry, by the standard of living which we achieved here

under a democratic system of government. Here in the United States democracy has shown itself to be a productive and life-giving, an efficient form of life, a blessing to its people. And in my humble judgment, if we will continue to keep our democracy just that - free, free from militarism, free from intolerance, free from political repression, political constraints - if we shall continue to increase the wellbeing of our people, raise their standard of life and to give them increasingly a higher sense of security, wellbeing, we shall continue to advance the cause of democracy throughout the world by the mere fact of our existence, our being here and doing what we do in the way we do it, democratically.

Dictatorship has far less to offer mankind than democracy. What these small peoples of Asia are doing by submitting to Communist control is not due to the fact that they are actually persuaded of Communism, of its doctrine, of its ideology, but because the Communist armies come to them at the moment as liberators and redeemers of crueler burdens than what they at the moment impose upon them. Backward peoples of Asia are struggling for freedom, for an end of feudalism, of exploitation, of poverty, of misery and their present rulers do not seem to be concerned with the wellbeing of the masses, so they turn to any Messiah who promises immediate lifting of burdens, release from oppression. But that is a passing phase, and only a passing phase. Democracy has much more to give to these people than dictatorship ever can.

I am not advocating that we in the United States should not take reasonable precaution against the foes within, against the traitor in our midst, against the foreign agent - not at all. In the kind of a world in which we live, it would be suicidal for democracy to be so naive as to not to protect itself against those who bore from within, against those who would do violence to the essential freedom and security of our country. But we ought to guard ourselves that in an excess of fear we do not destroy the very freedoms which we seek to conserve and to safeguard. That is not a very easy thing to do, to find just the proper technique, the proper and adequate formula, but it must be done. Any other action dictated by panic, by fear, might drive us into a series of repressions

constraints and terrorization which, before very long, would simply make a mockery of our Bill of Rights and of our basic American liberties.

In my humble judgment these are the only two ways in which we can help democracy today in its struggle against dictatorship. Democracy cannot be achieved, democracy cannot win its battles - let's put it that way - in its struggle against dictatorship through war. That sounds almost heretical, but all you have to do is to think of the last two wars which were fought in the name of defending democracy. We won those wars, magnificently won the wars, and tragically lost the purposes for which the war was fought. Democracy cannot thrive amidst the ruins and the poverty and the hate which wars bring about.

Therefore, the free democracies must learn to have sufficient confidence in themselves to be greatly patient. They must learn to live for a long time in the same world, side by side, with non-democratic countries, building up always their own inner strength, believing as they have every right to believe that their own inherent truths and their own moral superiority will ultimately prevail everywhere.

The human race is frequently given to fatal dogmas. During the 16th and 17th century Europe was victimized by one fatal dogma; namely, that Europe must be either wholly Catholic or wholly Protestant, that the two cannot live side by side, that one must be destroyed, and bloody wars were waged. One war lasted 30 years and devastated two thirds of Europe. Because of the obsession with this dogma of either-or - Europe must be either Catholic or Protestant. Well, Europe was not either all Catholic or all Protestant and hasn't been so to this day. And all the wars were wasted. Compromise had to be found, and adjustment had to be made whereby violently differing opinions - and there are no opinions which are so violent as those which take on a religious view, because then one fights not in his own name or the name of his country, but in the name of God. Adjustment had to be made between radically opposing opinions so that life could go on.

In the 18th and 19th century another dogma which victimized the nations of Europe. Europe had to be either wholly democratic or wholly monarchical. And wars were fought over that, and after much blood was shed, it was found that democracies, constitutional governments, all forms of monarchies must live and can live side by side.

In our century a new dogma is being fostered, to my mind as dangerous as any dogma that was ever afflicted upon the human race; namely, that not only Europe but the whole of mankind must be either Communist or free enterprise, or Communist or democratic. Here already there is this great confusion of tongues of which I spoke a moment ago. They cannot live side by side. One must be destroyed in order that the other might survive. And the wars are beginning - cold wars, little shooting wars, and before long the big wars. When it's all over - if anything is left of the world - they will have to find ways of compromise and ways of adjustment.

Communism is here to stay. Socialism is here to stay. Free enterprise is here to stay in one form or another, in this part of the world or in that part of the world. There will never be a rigid uniformity, political or economic, in the world. Mankind ~~is~~ too complex. Its background is too various. The conditions under which they live too different to have one uniform orthodox system. And so those that urge today that in this struggle between democracy and dictatorship, the struggle must be a struggle with weapons, and it must have for its objective the extermination of one or the other - these are people who have themselves been obsessed with this dogma of uniformity, and are imposing it upon the rest of us. If we believe in democracy, let's work for it by helping democratic countries in the best way we know how to the limits of our material possibilities, and above all, let's build on this great continent of ours, the oldest democracy in the world upon which the eyes of the world are today focussed - let's build here as an enkindling and inspiring example to the rest of the world, the noblest kind of democracy that we can achieve here, a democracy in which no man will be born in helplessness and go out in total defeat, a democracy which will give a human being security, dignity and opportunity. I think that's the mission of America in the world today. May we remain faithful unto it.

LA PRENSA EDITOR IS HONORED IN N. Y.

Buenos Aires Newsman Wins Pan-Americanism Award

BY MARY HIRSCHFELD
Staff Correspondent

NEW YORK, Oct. 12—Alberto Gainza Paz, head of one of the greatest newspapers in the history of journalism, the presently Peron-muzzled, 80-year-old La Prensa of Buenos Aires, received the Americas Foundation award tonight at a banquet attended by a galaxy of internationally known luminaries.

It was the emotional climax of the Inter-American Press Conference.

As a matter of diplomacy, hard-headed business and a natural, in-born courtesy, Dr. Gainza Paz, a man of patient manner, cannot open his heart to the world, but his acceptance speech was stirring in the light of conditions under which he must operate Argentina's finest daily.

"Pan-Americanism, as it is understood and practiced by some in public office, frequently stumbles as it marches forward, halts and even recedes because they may be mistaken in their efforts and moved by momentary circumstances," he said.

"Democratic ideals are the primal substance of Pan-Americanism; democracy and American fraternity are inseparable principles.

"A Pan-Americanism that is exclusively governmental or legalistic, consisting only of ceremonies and protocols, will always be weak and hollow.

"It should be frankly recognized that we face a double danger; a sham Pan-Americanism and a sham democracy.

"We must defend ourselves against the fiction of democracy. Freedom of the press, of worship and assembly are often violated on our continent.

"Let us multiply our efforts and have faith. America has been and will continue to be the hemisphere devoted to peace and democracy."

Dr. Gainza Paz, who was loudly applauded, then announced the establishment by his paper of the Alberdi and Sarmiento award for American friendship, to be conferred annually upon a writer of any American country. In addition to a check for 25,000 pesos (Argentine currency) and a silver plaque, travel expenses will be paid to Buenos Aires for participation in a public ceremony.

Lucille Ball's Esquire Film Is Slapstick Dilly

"Fuller Brush Girl" Esquire

"FULLER BRUSH GIRL," comedy from story by Frank Tashlin; directed by Lloyd Cowan and produced by Columbia Pictures with following players:
Sally Elliot.....Lucille Ball
Humphrey Briggs.....Eddie Albert
Christy.....Carl Benton Reid
Ruby Rawlings.....Gale Robbins
Jane Bixby.....Jeff Donnell
Harvey Simpson.....Jerome Cowan
Watkins.....John Litel
Rocky Mitchell.....Fred Graham
Claire Simpson.....Lee Patrick
Inspector Rodgers.....Arthur Space
Bangs.....Sid Tomack
Punchy.....Billy Vincent
Deval.....Lorin Raker
Mrs. North.....Lelah Tyler
Mrs. East.....Sarah Edwards
Mrs. West.....Lois Austin
Mrs. South.....Isabel Randolph
Mrs. Finley.....Isabel Withers
Sue Lou.....Donna Boswell
Alvin, Albert.....Gregory Marshall

RED SKELTON'S "Fuller Brush Man" was funnier but its sequel on the distaff side, with Lucille Ball as the "Fuller Brush Girl" of the Esquire's new opus, is much wackier and noisier in chucklesome, slapstick nonsense.

Following the pattern of ancient Harold Lloyd farces, this one whips off its antic gags and "who dunit" travesty in a cyclone fashion.

The star again shows she is an excellent comedienne. Here she has just the right hoydenish touch for her role as a nit-wit switchboard operator who does everything wrong.

ALTHOUGH EDDIE ALBERT sometimes plays her dopey boy friend too straight, their partnership pays off laughable dividends when they are pursued by a gang of diamond-smuggling killers.

Nobody should pay any attention to the disjointed story. It's merely a stepping stone for Lucille after she is fired by a crooked steamship-line owner for blowing her P. B. X. board to pieces.

Posing as a Fuller Brush cosmetic salesgirl, her luck doesn't improve. She accidentally burns the hair off four bridge-playing matrons, stumbles into two murders and nearly sinks a tramp steamer with her boisterous horse-play after the murderers shanghai her as well as Albert.

Aboard ship, these silly dillies have a wild time heaving bowling balls, bananas and kegs of dynamite at their pursuers.

Carl Benton Reid, once of the Cleveland Play House, collaborates satisfactorily with Jerome Cowan, John Litel and a crew of ugly hoodlums in this rip-roaring cops-vs.-robbers burlesque.

PULLEN.

Warner Bros. Theatres Play the BIG ONES

Now!

IS IT LOVE