



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
165

Box
59

Folder
932

Where is our foreign policy taking us?, 1954.

853

WHERE IS OUR FOREIGN POLICY TAKING US?

November 7, 1954

The subject of my address this morning concerns the foreign policy of our government, and on two matters I find myself in disagreement with that foreign policy. The one concerns the rearming of Germany and the other concerns the arming of the Arab states. And it is significant that in those instances arms are at the crux of the problem. In neither instance do I question the motives of our government. I am persuaded that American foreign policy is motivated by a strong desire for peace and for the defense of freedom throughout the world. Our government and our people have no imperial or colonial interests. In all of our international relationships our government is guided by a wish to be helpful, to give and to share, not to encroach, not to exploit, and not to over-power. My disagreement with our foreign policy is based on its methods and its tactics, which in my humble judgment may serve to defeat the very objectives which that policy seeks to attain, namely, world peace.

I believe that our foreign policy is too rigidly fixed and too centered on the containment of the Soviet Union so that it lacks flexibility, maneuverability, which are so essential in successful diplomacy. There are, my friends, only two ways for advancing international objectives - one is war and the other is successful diplomacy. And our diplomacy, I am afraid, has in recent years become too dogmatic, too doctrinaire, and therefore, also, too intolerant and too impatient. So much so that our own friends and allies walked away from us, you will remember, recently at Geneva and since that time diplomatic initiative in the western world has come not from Washington, but from London and Paris.

In our eagerness to build up a powerful military defence in Europe against

the Soviet Union, we have overlooked the fact that the problem of Europe is not only the problem of the Soviet but also the problem of Germany. Germany, which twice in our life-time disrupted the peace of Europe. Germany, which the free peoples of the world including ourselves, have had to fight in two world wars. We have been so eager to rearm this Germany as a bulwark against Russia that we have refused to be guided altogether by the experiences and the lessons of the recent past.

The statesmen of the Western world, you will recall, connived at Hitler's rearmament of Germany in the hope that he will use his German armies against Communist Russia. That was the hope of these statesmen. And on the basis of the hope they helped Hitler to rearm, but Hitler made an alliance with Communist Russia, and then Hitler used his German divisions against the Western world.

These same statesmen or their successors of the West are again hoping for a miracle that German armies, reconstituted, rebuilt, rearmed will again be used in the cause of the defense of the democracies of the world. No one speaks today any more, as if by common agreement, of Prussian militarism, as if it is a thing dead, never to rise again, or of German aggression and of German expansionism which were responsible for two world wars and the destruction of half of Europe. We are led to believe, at least the silence seems to suggest it - that all the Nazis are dead, the entire Junker class in Germany is dead, all the militarists are dead, German fanatical nationalism and chauvinism is dead. They all died in 1945, the year that Germany lost the war! From then on only repentant and contrite democrats and lovers of peace and democracy are left in Germany. And the good anti-Nazi Dr. Adenauer, we are led to believe, is the true spokesman of them all. I am inclined to believe that all this is frightful naivete! I don't call it cynicism, because

I do not believe that our statesmen are motivated by cynicism, but frightful naivete and terrible blindness! None of these forces have disappeared in present-day Germany. They all went underground, and they are all coming to the surface again. Keen, objective observers have seen them propping up again into positions of control, dominance in present-day Germany.

On the eve of the San Francisco Conference in 1945 (that conference, you will recall, which brought the United Nations into existence), a distinguished American wrote the following: "My fourth proposal for the San Francisco conference is that agreement upon continued and total disarmament of the entered into either as part of the United Nations charter or as a separate agreement. In any event, it will have to be enforced by the security council, and it profoundly affects the whole question of peace. Three years ago Mr. Gibson (the writer refers here to Mr. Hugh Gibson, the American diplomat) and I proposed that the enemy states must be completely disarmed for an entire generation. We pointed out one of the great errors of the Treaty of Versailles in which Germany was permitted to retain a professional army of 100,000 men, supposedly for the purposes of maintaining internal order. She was permitted to have a navy, limited only in tonnage and type of ships. We stated that this leeway perpetuated the warrior caste and all its traditions. It afforded a skeleton army and navy of skilled men ready for quick expansion. It assured the continuity of the general staff with its military skill and brains and ambition. It perpetuated their "know-how" to make war and repeated experience with the warrior caste of these nations in their intimidations, aggressions, blitzes, and attacks without even declaration of war should be enough for the world in this particular. We must make a better job of it this time. We should prohibit the manufacture of arms of any kind by these countries." The man who wrote these words in 1945 was the former President of the United States, Herbert Hoover.

And at Potsdam, you will recall, the heads of all the allied governments in-

cluding the President of the United States agreed that it was essential for the peace of the world that Germany remain permanently disarmed. But these apprehensions which the heads of the governments and all men who emerged from the second world war entertained nine years ago - these apprehensions, I am afraid, are as warranted today as they were then - in fact, moreso! Because since that time Germany has recovered economically from the ravages of the war almost completely, and is today economically the strongest nation in western Europe. It is now proposed to rearm Germany within the framework of a European setting within a western European union. Germany is to become completely sovereign and is to be permitted to build up 12 divisions, an air force, some 20,000 officers who will of course be drawn from the ranks of those, primarily from the ranks of those who formerly served in Hitler's army - there are no others. And it is piously hoped that Germany will never exceed that number of twelve divisions allowed and that it will remain loyal and obedient to the central military control of the Western European Union and of Nato.

Now anyone who can recall Germany's secret re-armament after the first world war in violation of the Versailles Treaty and how German militarists outwitted all allied controls and precautions will realize how unrealistic all this is. German armies will be loyal to the German government and the German government will not always be the government of Dr. Adenauer and the German state and the German government have always been subservient to the military caste in Germany, to the military clique.

It is of interest to note that the liberal forces of Germany, the progressive forces of Germany, do not all want the rearmament and the Western military alliance.

They fear, many of them, that the rearmament of Germany will mean the end of German democracy and will make impossible the re-unification of their country, which is their primary interest, and understandably so. This, for example, is the attitude of the German Social Democrats who number over 8 million. The Federation of German Trade Unions, numbering some 6 millions, recently almost unanimously adopted the following resolution: "The Convention affirms regretfully that the London agreement, (the most recent agreement, which followed the collapse of the EDC), would prepare the way for the incorporation of the German republic into a power block. This would prevent the relaxation of international tension and the re-unification of Germany. For the German republic, armament means the development of a military state which in turn means an end to the worker's struggle for political, social, and economic democracy. This Convention rejects any German contribution to defense until every effort has been made to institute negotiation aimed at bringing about international understanding and German unification." This London pact has been signed by Dr. Adenauer. It is not at all certain that Germany will ratify the London agreement which followed the defeat of the EDC and which agreement has been hailed as "a near miracle." The French, through Mendes France, have also signed this London agreement pact. The French fear German re-armament. They have reason to fear it. They turned down, you will remember, the EDC, in spite of covert threats from our state department. They agreed to accept the London pact which was skillfully drafted by Eden of Great Britain - they agreed for two considerations: first the promise of Great Britain to become a full partner in the new setup and to keep at least four divisions permanently on the continent of Europe. Secondly, they agreed, because they received some very important economic concessions in the Saar.

The Germans are now demanding a reconsideration of that Saar agreement which Mendes France regarded as the sine qua non of the entire Pact.

Mendes France is now promising to his Parliament, in order to get them to ratify the London Pact, what he calls parallel talks with Russia for an over-all settlement of the problem of peace in Europe. Many of the followers of Dr. Adenauer have expressed the same wish. In my judgment if this London Pact will help to make such talks with the Soviet Union more realistic and more fruitful, it will have served a useful purpose. But as a permanent solution for the peace of Europe with a divided and restive Germany at its very heart, this Pact is a broken reed. The soundest solution was the solution envisaged by two presidents of the United States - Herbert Hoover and President Truman and by all the statesmen of the free world following the second world war - the soundest solution is that of a united, free and de-militarized - permanently de-militarized and neutralized Germany. The threat that a disarmed Germany will invite an attack by the Soviet who are eager, so it is said, to gobble it up, is in my judgment quite unrealistic. If that is the intention of the Soviet Union it would have acted long before, and twelve divisions will not stop it. An eminent statesman in the French Assembly said recently, "Why talk about twelve German divisions when 15 H-bombs could wipe out the whole of France."

We have to find a way for co-existence. The way is full of danger, full of difficulty, but not as dangerous or disastrous as the way of war. Both we and the Russians have today the A-bomb and the H-bomb. The H-bomb is 2,000 times the force as the Hiroshima bomb possessed and both the Western world and the Eastern world have now these jet bombers to deliver these bombs. There is, therefore, no substitute in the world for co-existence; there is no substitute for peace - only annihilation! And you have to start from that position; that is the only position from which to start. Difficult as co-existence is, full of danger as it is, full of mistrust, fully realizing the duplicity and the evasiveness of the Soviet Union in many instances. That still is the situation which we must confront.

War or a preventive war are totally out of the question. What remains are diplomatic negotiation, conference, agreement, peaceful agreement. Total agreement will not come for generations.

Our foreign policy, therefore, I say in all humility, has been a bit too inflexible, too hard, too set, too impatient. We should become a little less military minded in our diplomacy. We should center our activity in the world less upon pressuring for armies and for arming the world against the Soviet. More stress should be laid by us on the grand design of the United Nations than on regional pacts without, of course, lowering our own guard. That would be silly in these times. We should have a little more confidence in the power of our position, of freedom, democracy, to win in the long run in the contest for men's hearts and men's loyalties. Man has struggled through the long centuries to free himself from the bondage of nature; he will not voluntarily and indefinitely submit to the bondage of man. Dictatorship cannot and will not command the future of the human race. All forms of tyranny and dictatorship are the sunk wreckage of the past which the storms of our age have dredged up again from the bottom. And this struggle between liberty and tyranny between self-government and imposed government is going to be a very long struggle and it will not be decided by arms. The democratic victories by arms in the last two wars have simply extended the domain and the power of dictatorship in the world. I am persuaded that dictatorship in the long run will destroy itself, and the more contacts it is permitted to have with the free world, the quicker will be that self-destruction. And I am inclined to believe that the new trend in our foreign policy from here on after its great setback at Geneva will take this more flexible, this more compromising, this more patient line than the hard line which we followed in the last few years and which made us few friends in the world.

And what I said about the re-arming of Germany holds equally true about the arming of the Arab states because that too is dictated by the same desire to build up a military defense in the Middle East against the Soviet Union, and it is just as naive to believe that these feudal peoples of the Middle East, ruled by a small group of self-minded and self-centered will become the enthusiastic defenders of democracy in the world by giving them arms. They are likely to use these arms to suppress popular social unrest in their own country because the masses of the peoples in the Middle East are frightfully impoverished, under appalling conditions of misery, illiteracy, disease, and these millions upon millions which are poured into the Middle East by way of oil royalties have gone to line the purses and the pockets of that small group at the top. They have not percolated down to the masses to improve their standard of living and to give them a better chance. And these arms are likely to be used, if these heads of the Arab states have their way, and they have indicated what their way is likely to be if they have their way - they will be used against the one truly democratic state in that part of the world, the young, small state of Israel - which the American government helped to create and was the first to recognize. These Arab states have said that they will never make peace with Israel. The foreign minister of Iraq recently said, "Whoever calls for peace with Israel would be guilty of high treason and should be hanged." And the King of Saudi Arabia a few months ago declared that he would be prepared to sacrifice the lives of ten million Arabs in order to wipe out the state of Israel. It is these rulers of these states that our government would like to arm today in order to defend the free world against the Soviet. They say they won't give them enough arms to threaten Israel, but presumably they will give them enough arms to threaten Russia. Our state department has sort of been "courting" these Arab states in the last few years, wooing them, and thereby intensifying their intransitiveness, their unwillingness to sit down

and make peace. And by arming one or another or all of these Arab states, our government would naturally be creating a military imbalance in that world which would be dangerous to the security of Israel.

I disagree with this policy. It is unwise. I disagree with it because it is not good for America, not only because it is dangerous to the state of Israel which we have no right to endanger. Israel wants peace, has made any number of times offers of peace, is prepared to sit down and try to settle all the problems outstanding between Israel and the Arab countries, but the Arabs have said no, they will not sit down, they will keep up with the boycott, they will keep up with the blockade of the Suez Canal, and yet our government is determined to arm these states just as it is determined to arm Germany. Perhaps from now on a new attitude will develop on the score of our policy in the Middle East. The recent declaration of the President of the United States, President Eisenhower, at the Tercentenary banquet in the city of New York seemed to suggest that there has been a growing realization upon - by the responsible leaders of our country that the policy which has been pursued in the Middle East heretofore has not improved the situation, but it has brought about a tragic deterioration of the situation and that a new policy is now in order.

I say again, all that I have said is not to suggest that there is anything wrong with the heart of America, with the motives of our government. I believe in them fully. It is merely to express the humble judgment of one citizen who believes that our over-emphasis of recent years on arms as a solution of the whole problem - the cosmic struggle between liberty and democracy in the world has not only not yielded the hoped-for results but cannot yield the hoped-for results.

1) On 2 matters - disagreement with foreign policy of our
govt. - ① Rearming of Germany ② Arming of Arab States.

In neither instance do I question the motives
I am persuaded that Am. foreign pol. motivated by
desire for peace - defense of freedom.

No imperial or colonial ambitions - In all of
its internat. relations it is ~~dedicated~~^{guided} by a
wish to be helpful - to give aid to share - not
to ~~dominate~~ encroach, exploit and over-power.

My disagreement is based on the methods and tactics
of our foreign pol. - which in my humble judgment
will never defeat the very objectives which it
seeks to attain - World Peace - and Freedom.

2) I believe that our f.p. - so rigidly fixed and centered on
the containment of the Soviet - as to rob it of that
flexibility - and maneuverability so necessary in successful
diplomacy.

There are only two ways of advancing internat. objectives
war - and successful diplomacy

Our diplomacy has in recent years ~~been~~ become too dogmatic,
too doctrinaire, - and therefore also too inflexible
and too impatient:

So much so that our friends and allies walked away
from us at Geneva - a few months ago -

and since then ~~for~~ diplomatic initiation and leadership (2)
~~has come~~ in the West. world has come not from Washington
but from London and Paris.

3/ In our eagerness to build up a powerful military defense
in Europe against the Soviet - we have overlooked the fact that
the Problem, Europe is not only the problem of the Soviet - but
also the Problem of Germany - ~~which tries by a 6th - form disguised the fact that Europe is not against~~
Germany - ~~against whom the fact is second world war~~
whom both the free people the world - and we, the U.S. had
to wage 2 World wars -

We have been so eager to learn this - as a ^{lesson} ~~lesson~~
of Munich - that we have refused to be guided by ~~lessons~~
of the past.

The ~~statesman~~ ^{statesman}, the ~~first~~ West. world committed at Hitler's
reassurance of - in the hope that he will use his
German armaments of. ~~commitment~~ - He made an
alliance with Com. Russia - and he used his
army of divisions ag. the West. world.

The statesman the W. world are again hoping for a miracle
that G. armaments ^{which they now hope to use} will be used to defend the cause of
democracy in the world.

~~the~~ Not one speaks to day of German ^{any more - as if by agreement} ~~nightmare~~, as if it is
a thing dead, never to rise again, and of German
aggression and expansionism which were resp. for the
2 world wars -

Nazis are dead - The other class is dead - The ~~militarists~~
are dead - Gen. Panathal ~~underminers~~ & ~~chambers~~

are dead - They all died out in 1945 - the year of the end of the war! From ~~then~~ ^{there} on only repentant and cowardly democrats and slaves of peace & democracy ~~was~~ ^{were} left in ~~from~~ the Fatherland - And the good anti-Nazi Dr. Adenauer is the ~~father~~ ^{not} true spokesman, thus all. What traitors! or what opportunists, or what blindness! - Now ~~I~~ ^{these elements} ~~disappeared~~ ^{underground} 1945

4). ~~At the~~ On the eve, the S.F. Conf. ~~which~~ ¹⁹⁴⁵ when U.N. was created - ~~an~~ ^a distinguished American wrote the following (Intro). Herbert Hoover ~~and at Potsdam~~

These apprehensions, I am afraid, are as warranted to-day as they were 9 years ago - Even more so! - for G. has now recovered almost completely from the ravages of war - and is to-day even the strongest power in the W. Europe.

- 5). It is now proposed to re-arm G. within a Eur. framework - G. is to be permitted to ~~be~~ ^{within a West Eur. Union} - 12 divisions - A stronger G. is to be permitted to ~~draw~~ ^{draw} - an air force - 20.000 ~~planes~~ ^{who will 7-ways} ~~who can~~ ^{only} be drawn - largely from ranks, those who served in Hitler's armies - It is proudly hoped that G. will never exceed that av. and will remain loyal and obedient to the ~~control~~ ^{control} of the West Eur. Union and Nato.
- Any one who can recall G. secret rearmament in violation of the Versailles Treaty - and how G.

(4)

militants introduced all Allied controls and precautions
who realize how unrealistic all this is. G. answer
will be loyal to the S. state - and the S. state has always
been subservient to ~~the~~ its military caste.

6/ The liberal press of G. do not want this rearmament
and W. military alliance.

They fear that the rearmament of S. will mean the
end of S. democracy - and will make impossible
the revocation of their country

This is the attitude of the S. Social Democrats - numbering
over 8 M.

the Federation of S. Trade Unions - 6 M. work. workers
and agreed to rearmament - (Drafted)

7/ It is not at all certain. that G. will ~~accept~~ ^{ratify} the
London agreement, which following the defeat of E-X,
has been hailed as "little a year for miracle".

The Fr. who fear G. rearmament - turned down E-X -
in spite of the Soviet threats from an 1st Sept -
- agreed to accept the London pact - which Eden
drafted - for 2 considerations (1) Promise of G. B.
to be of 4 divisions German on the east - & to assume
full responsibility and (2) Agreement in the Saar -

The J. are now demanding a reconsideration of the Paris Agreement (5)
which Mander France regarded as the sure good and the
entire Pact.

8/ Mander-France is now promising to his Parliament -
in order to get them to ratify the London Pact - parallel talks
with Russia - for an over-all settlement, the problem
the peace, Europe -
and among D. - Advancers followers the same work is

expressed -
if the London Pact will help to make such talks more realistic
fruitful - it may well serve a useful purpose
as a permanent solution for the peace, Europe - with
a dis united divided and restless J. in the center
it - it is a broken reed:

The spontaneous solution - was the no enveloped at
Potsdam - a United, free and demilitarized J. -

A vacuum? Disarmament fact, peace subject - There
are words - as if disasters! - In vacuum - most
pressures - All nations disarmament is
envisaged for all nations -

Russia will not gobble it up - if that is its intention -
12 division - will not stop it - forces work - Fr. Nat

Assembly - Why talk abt. 12 G. deenun when (6
15 H. bombs could wipe out ~~France~~ ^{France} I

9/ We have to find ways for co-existence - Full of difficulties
full, danger - but not as different or dangerous - as

war - Both we & Russia have the A & H. bomb - 2000 times
as powerful as the Hiroshima bomb - both have

strategies for it - how to deliver them
There is no substitute for peace - everywhere only accumulations!

10/ Our f.p. - should in my humble judgment, become more
flexible - less military minded - less pressing for armory the world of.
Soviet - more stress on the peace design, the U.N. -
than on regional ports - without buying our own

Confidence in power of freedom to win on the long run in the
contest for men's hearts and men's loyalties -

Man has struggled thru long centuries to free himself
from brutal, nature - submit to bondage / man
Dictatorship cannot rule and command the future / the
human race -

It is part of the unlucky Wreckage, the part which the stones
of an age have dropped up again from the bottom of
that -

The struggle will be long - I will not be deceived by
arms - Dict. will destroy itself - and controls will
hasten it -

11). Middle East - Army Arabs - to chest Soviet - regional defense (?)

France - Germany - feudal state - no state parts

- ~~forced 7 help~~ ^{use to suppress rebellious populations - major variant}
- Folly - ~~danger~~ ^{only danger} ~~has been excluded from any defense arrangement~~ - Israel - Fake
- will not make peace - boycott - blockade - free - 21.2.73
- renounce

- Israel Foreign Minister - "Whoever called for peace with high treason and should be hanged"

- Saudi Arabs - 90%

- U.S. - arms will not be sent to Israel - Just enough - appeal

12). Intelligence - Intelligence

U.S. - reception Israel

Peace

