

THE UNIVERSITY
AND THE WAR

Six Addresses in January, 1942, before
the Students and Faculty of the
University of Illinois

C
Ilbu Iuw
cop. 4

THESE addresses were delivered at convocations held in the University Auditorium between the reopening of classes after the Christmas holidays and the semester examinations. The two first in order of publication (actually given last) were designed to provide information of immediate local interest. The other four deal with aspects of the war—two of them with the historical approaches to the war, and two with the philosophies of government which are chiefly involved. They are thought to be of sufficient value to publish for the parents of our students and for other citizens of the state.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Members Ex Officio

DWIGHT H. GREEN, Governor of Illinois.....Springfield
JOHN R. WIELAND, Superintendent of Public Instruction.....Springfield

Elected Members

(Term 1937-1943)

HOMER MAT ADAMS.....704 W. Vine Street, Springfield
JAMES M. CLEARY.....310 S. Michigan Avenue, Chicago
CHESTER R. DAVIS.....69 W. Washington Street, Chicago

(Term 1939-1945)

FRANK A. JENSEN.....LaSalle
ORVILLE M. KARRAKER.....405 Centennial Building, Springfield
DR. KARL A. MEYER.....Cook County Hospital, Chicago

(Term 1941-1947)

JOHN R. FORNOF.....122 S. Bloomington Street, Streator
MRS. HELEN M. GRIGSBY.....Pittsfield
PARK LIVINGSTON.....20 N. Wacker Drive, Chicago

Officers of the Board

JAMES M. CLEARY, President.....Chicago
HARRISON E. CUNNINGHAM, Secretary.....Urbana
FRANK M. GORDON, Treasurer.....First National Bank, Chicago
LLOYD MOREY, Comptroller.....Urbana

OFFICERS OF ADMINISTRATION

ARTHUR CUTTS WILLARD, B.S., D.Eng., LL.D., *President of the University*
ALBERT JAMES HARNO, B.S., LL.B., LL.D., *Provost of the University*
ROBERT DANIEL CARMICHAEL, Ph.D., *Dean of the Graduate School*
FRED HAROLD TURNER, Ph.D., *Dean of Men*
MARIA LEONARD, A.M., Litt.D., *Dean of Women*
GEORGE PHILIP TUTTLE, B.S., *Registrar*

CONTENTS

	PAGE
THE RESOURCES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS FOR WARTIME SERVICE	7
By ARTHUR CUTTS WILLARD President of the University	
TYPES OF MILITARY SERVICE	19
By Colonel LEONARD C. SPARKS, F. A. Commandant of the University R. O. T. C.	
THE PRINCIPAL CAUSES OF THE WAR IN EUROPE	35
By Dr. A. L. SACHAR National Director of the B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundation	
THE PRINCIPAL CAUSES OF THE WAR IN THE FAR EAST	49
By ALBERT H. LYBYER Professor of History	
WHAT IS TOTALITARIANISM?	63
By ARTHUR E. MURPHY Head of the Department of Philosophy	
WHAT IS DEMOCRACY?	77
By ERNEST BERNBAUM Professor of English	

THE RESOURCES OF THE UNIVERSITY
OF ILLINOIS FOR WARTIME SERVICE

by

President A. C. WILLARD

January 21, 1942

THIS country is now engaged in total war with powerful enemies in Europe and in Asia. Every resource of these United States is needed in the attempt to win this war with the aid of our allies. For this colossal war effort the University of Illinois, along with all other colleges and universities, is pledged to render every possible assistance to the federal government, and do it *now, immediately*. Otherwise, what we do may be "too little and too late." We have already learned since the attack on Pearl Harbor that, as someone has already said, "it is later than you think."

But whatever we do, we must keep in mind the fact that in serving the country in either peace or war, the colleges and universities are primarily educational institutions. The great importance of this fact has been recognized by the President of the United States in a recent letter to the Association of American Colleges under date of December 29, 1941. Mr. Roosevelt said:

We have one great task before us. That is to win the war. At the same time it is perfectly clear that it will be futile to win the war unless during its winning we lay the foundation for the kind of peace and readjustment that will guarantee the preservation of those aspects of American life for which the war is fought. Colleges and universities are in the particularly difficult position of balancing their contributions to these two ends. I am sure, nevertheless, that the leaders of our colleges and universities can be depended upon to find the wisest solution for the difficult problem of how to make this twofold contribution.

I am anxious that this national crisis shall not result in the destruction or impairment of those institutions which have contributed so largely to the development of American culture. I shall appreciate being kept informed through the United States Commissioner of Education as to the effects of federal legislation and federal programs upon our colleges and universities.

The United States needs the services of its institutions of higher learning and we know we can depend upon their complete cooperation in carrying forward the present war effort.

Just what have we as one of the 52 land-grant colleges and universities to offer in the "one great task before us," and what are we capable of doing; in brief, what are the war resources of this publicly supported institution? In my opinion, our most effective resources are closely related to the regular services we render to the state and nation. Those services are:

1. Education at the college level in all fields of knowledge—nearly every one of which is or will be needed in winning this war and maintaining a permanent peace.

2. Research in all fields of pure and applied science as well as many other areas of knowledge.

3. Military training in what is now the largest R.O.T.C. unit in the country.

In these categories we have had experience and success, we have

competent teaching and research personnel, and a splendid plant with the necessary staff and equipment to operate it. A brief general summary of our present resources as a going University, as they existed on November 1, 1941, should have a place in this survey.

THE R.O.T.C.

1. The basic course, in which all able-bodied male students are enrolled during their first two years, consists of 3,648 men.

2. The advanced course, in which qualified juniors and seniors are given appointments leading to commissions as second lieutenants in the United States Army Officers' Reserve, consists of 595 men.

3. The United States Army staff of 86 is under Colonel Leonard C. Sparks, F.A., Commandant, and comprises 31 officers and 55 enlisted personnel.

Note: Over 50 per cent, or about 75,000, of the officers entering the United States Army have been secured from the advanced R.O.T.C. graduates of the land-grant colleges and universities of the United States. At present the R.O.T.C. is supplying the Army at the rate of 10,000 officers per year.

FACULTY AND STAFF

The University of Illinois employs a total of 3,888 persons, as follows:

	<i>Urbana</i>	<i>Chicago</i>	<i>Total</i>
Administration, teaching, research, clerical, etc.....	2,025	813	2,838
Maintenance of buildings and grounds.....	875	175	1,050
<i>Total</i>	<u>2,900</u>	<u>988</u>	<u>3,888</u>

STUDENTS AND ALUMNI

On November 1, 1941, 13,060 undergraduate and graduate students were enrolled, and of these 1,291 were enrolled in our three Chicago Colleges of Medicine, Dentistry, and Pharmacy. In addition, our 1941 Summer Session enrolled 3,194.

Alumni of the University now living total about 146,000.

PLANT AND EQUIPMENT

All buildings, grounds, and equipment necessary for teaching and research have actually cost \$39,000,000 as of November 1, 1941.

These are the major resources available at the University of Illinois for aiding our state and nation in "all out" war against our enemies.

Just how do we propose to use our resources in helping to fight and win this war? I think it must be obvious to anyone that this same question confronts all the other colleges and universities of the country, and so a National Conference of all these institutions was called to meet in Baltimore, Maryland, on January 3 and 4, 1942, and discuss the many common problems. Approximately 1,000 representatives of

higher institutions of learning from 46 states and one from Canada and one from Porto Rico attended the conference, which adopted the following 16 resolutions. I will read only a few, although we are in agreement with all of them.—

The Conference recommended that:

1. Institutions of higher education cooperate to the fullest extent with the National Resources Planning Board and other federal agencies responsible for surveys (a) to determine the immediate needs of man power and woman power for the essential branches of national service—military, industrial, and civilian, (b) to determine the available facilities of colleges and universities to prepare students to meet these needs, and (c) to appraise the ultimate needs in professional personnel for long-term conflict and for the post-war period, in order that a continuous and adequate supply of men and women trained in technical and professional skills and in leadership to meet both immediate and long-range needs shall be maintained.

2. There be brought to the attention of the President the necessity of issuing a statement of national policy which will avoid competitive bidding for faculty and students by government agencies and by industry and will conserve adequate personnel on all levels of education to assure the effective instruction of youth and adults, in order to provide a continuous supply of trained men and women.

3. The United States Office of Education Wartime Commission be requested to study and develop appropriate plans for the solution of the problems of (a) how to meet the teacher shortage in elementary and secondary schools and the shortage of workers for community programs, and (b) how to supplement the training of present and potentially available teachers and other workers for new and changing responsibilities.

4. The United States Office of Education Wartime Commission offer its services for cooperation with the United States Department of Agriculture, the Executive Committee of the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities, and the Conference of Negro Land-Grant Colleges to assure an adequate supply of county agents, 4-H club leaders, home demonstration agents, and other leaders in rural life.

5. All institutions of higher education give immediate consideration to ways and means for accelerating the progress of students through such extension of the annual period of instruction and such adjustments of curricula as may be consistent with national needs and with educational standards, and as may be possible with available resources.

6. Desirable acceleration of programs of higher education should be accomplished without lowering of established standards of admission to college.

7. An immediate study be made by the National Committee on Education and Defense and the United States Office of Education Wartime Commission of desirable articulation in the academic calendars of the secondary schools and the colleges to facilitate acceleration of total educational progress.

8. An immediate study be made by the National Committee on Education and Defense and the United States Office of Education Wartime Commission as to the needs for and bases of federal financial assistance

to higher education (including junior colleges), for the duration of the emergency, in order that the training of students for national service may be accelerated.

9. The National Committee on Education and Defense and the United States Office of Education Wartime Commission be requested to assemble and publish accounts of changes made by educational institutions in the interest of war service.

10. Credit be awarded only to individuals, upon the completion of their service, who shall apply to the institution for this credit and who shall meet such tests as the institution may prescribe. In cases in which degrees are of distinct advantage to students in the service, it is recognized that some departure from this practice, on an individual basis, may be justified.

11. All colleges and universities take such steps as will be necessary to bring each individual student to his highest possible level of physical fitness.

12. The general application of the principle of selective service promises the most effective means for the placement of the individual in accordance with his capacity to serve national needs and with the least disturbance of basic social institutions.

13. The Selective Service System be requested to make adequate provisions for the deferment of bona fide *premedical* students in colleges whose tentative admission to an approved medical school has already been assured on the basis of the completion of not less than two years of college.

14. The Selective Service System be requested to make similar provisions for the deferment of bona fide *predental* students in colleges whose tentative admission to an approved dental school has already been assured on the basis of the completion of not less than two years of college.

15. The Selective Service System be requested to make provision for the deferment of bona fide *pretheological* students in colleges or universities who have been approved by their appropriate ecclesiastical authority.

16. The Selective Service System be urged to issue a directive calling attention of state directors and local selective service boards to this need and the consequent necessity of providing occupational deferment for selected individuals pursuing graduate work.

So much for the general background and policies against which our University resources for wartime service are being developed. That development has been in progress for many months and has proceeded very rapidly since December 7, 1941, as the following record indicates:

1. Research work for the Army and Navy is now being actively engaged in by members of our teaching and research staffs both here on the campus and away from the campus. The Department of Physics has granted leaves to Professor Loomis, the head of the department, and six or more of its principal men to carry on a highly technical program of research in the East, all of which has been in progress for over a year.

2. The Department of Chemistry has a number of men similarly engaged on very important research projects related to the war for various departments of the government. The head of this department, Dr. Roger Adams, is now serving as Chairman of Division B (Chemistry and Chemical Engineering) of the National Defense Research Committee.

3. The Board of Trustees has made it possible for faculty and staff members to retain their positions through leaves of absence without pay when called into the military and naval service of the United States or into service essential to the prosecution of the war. The number of persons now on leave in these services includes 71 for military service and 16 for defense projects, in addition to 24 who have resigned.

The most recent activities of the University in meeting the war situation by using our resources are briefly summarized in the following paragraphs:

1. On December 10, 1941, the President of the University called a *General Convocation* of students and staff over which Provost Harno presided. Approximately 9,000 persons attended and were given information and advice in facing the war situation thrust upon the country.

2. A *Central War Emergency Committee* headed by Provost Harno and composed of chairmen of important standing committees was set up immediately to study and coordinate our resources and programs for meeting a situation of national peril unprecedented in the history of the University.

One of the first problems the new Central Committee has had to consider is the question of accelerating the University's program in order to enable students to proceed more rapidly to a degree. This can be accomplished by curtailing vacation periods to some extent as is now done in many universities. Our own Colleges in Chicago have already been authorized by the Board of Trustees to operate on a year round program, in order to meet the greatly increased demands on the medical profession. Under the University Statutes, since this matter involves problems of educational policy, the authorized agency to deal with it is the Senate Committee on Educational Policy. With the assistance of the Central Committee, the Senate Committee on Educational Policy has been working on an accelerated program which involves keeping the doors of the University open to students all year round with only short intermissions. It is expected that the Senate Committee will announce the results of its deliberations very soon.

3. The University Senate acting on recommendations from its Committee on Educational Policy, Professor J. O. Draffin, Acting Chairman, promptly passed a series of war-time regulations granting certain credit for courses and providing for graduation of students who leave the University and enter the military or naval services of the United States or go into war industries under certain conditions.

4. The present Committee on Student Affairs, J. J. Doland, Chairman, has formulated and has already put into operation an extensive program. It has approved approximately thirty extracurricular defense projects. These have been opened to students, and registration is now being carried on. So far as possible, students are asked to limit their interests to one activity. At the present moment the greatest interest is being shown in radio operation, the learning of Spanish (extracurricular), first aid training on the part of men and women students, women's health service, nutrition courses by the Home Economics Department, and Red Cross work for women.

This committee has also been very active in providing facilities for visiting recruiting officers from various branches of the service; the

University has been visited by representatives from the Marine Corps, the Army, the Navy, Army and Navy Aviation, and the Coast Guard.

5. A new *Committee on Curricular Course Adjustments*, C. R. Griffith, Chairman, has appraised the courses of the University in relation to special types of military service and defense training and has studied the areas in which new courses might be given.

Of existing courses, the committee points out that several branches of engineering science, of chemistry, of the premedical curriculum, and other divisions offer valuable specialized training in the recognized occupational and professional fields. For example, adequate training can be had in the University in physics, the various branches of electrical engineering, motorized equipment, transportation, road construction and maintenance, radio and communication, civil engineering, and kindred fields.

A highly practical form of work is given in the Department of Agricultural Engineering in the construction and operation of motorized equipment.

In the Department of Bacteriology, special attention will be given to types of laboratory work with pathogenic bacteria, such as are concerned in the operation and maintenance of military services.

In times of war even more than in times of peace a steady supply of foodstuff is imperative, so that work in agriculture and in agricultural extension occupies a position of importance along with other specialized occupations. The same fact holds true of other divisions of the University as, for example, of Education, where the demand is growing for an increasing number of qualified teachers at all levels.

In consideration of the wealth of training and experience that can be provided through existing courses, the committee on courses has been impressed by the need for continuing our main policies of instruction and research. These policies possess values in their own right, but they now have additional merit because (a) of the basic training in all fields of knowledge that ought to be available to those men and women who are not yet ready to be called to the service and (b) of the extreme demands that will be made on all educated citizens during the post-war period of reconstruction.

Several departments of the University have pooled their information in order to give divisional courses, as in the Division of Social Sciences, which are aimed to give students clear ideas of the forces which have led up to the present war and the issues that are involved.

The special facilities in the General Division of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences will continue to provide a new form of basic training for many students. A special value lies in the fact that those students who may not be able to complete more than two years of work before they are called to the service can resume, on their return, their educational plans for specialization with the advantage of a broad foundation in knowledge and experience.

Of direct practical value are a wide variety of resources in physical education. In view of the many defects uncovered by the selective service examinations, the Departments of Physical Education for Men and for Women will provide facilities for corrective gymnastics and physical fitness.

6. *New Courses* sponsored by the Committee on Curricular Course

Adjustments are also being set up in various departments to meet specific situations applicable to the war. Those already announced are:

Latin American Civilization (Social Science 1). The relations between North and South America are already becoming more friendly. One effect of the war will doubtless be a greater degree of cooperation and understanding. These results will depend, in part, on what we know about the peoples and activities of the countries to the south. Several departments will cooperate in the presentation of this course.

Military Law and Defense Legislation (Law 99). The R.O.T.C. of the University has been anxious to have the College of Law give a course on military law. The faculty was very glad to respond. It has conceived this course, however, to be one of much broader significance than the teaching of the mere principles of military law. A substantial amount of legislation has been passed affecting the rights of fighting men. Along with the study of military law proper, the student will study legislation bearing on the Selective Service Act, Soldiers' and Sailors' Relief Act, war risk and civil insurance.

Quartermaster Corps Organization and Operation (B.O. & O. 40). Quartermaster's service covers a wide variety of topics such as the organization and administration of the Quartermaster Corps, mess management, procurement of supplies, industrial mobilization, administration of supplies, theater of operation, accountability for property, and the operation of the quartermaster's depot.

Background and Problems of the War (Social Science 2). Ideals and practices of all sorts are intermingled in the present conflict. If we are to act wisely and promptly, we must have an understanding of the best practices in these areas.

Wartime Communications and Censorship (Journalism 48). This course will cover restrictions on naval and military information, sedition and espionage, Government information agencies, etc.

Pathogenic Bacteria (Bacteriology 25). Classification, morphology, cultural requirements and reactions, toxins, diagnostic tests, and methods of differentiation. Laboratory methods of the United States Army.

Introduction to Chinese Culture (Sociology 46). Comprehensive survey and introductory analysis of Chinese civilization from the standpoint of cultural sociology and ethnology.

Economic Problems of the Defense Program (Economics 53).

Ultra-High Frequency Techniques (Electrical Engineering 53).

Training Home Economists for Work in Community Programs for the Present Emergency (Home Economics 23e).

Red Cross Nursing (Home Economics 40e).

First Aid (Hygiene 6). A complete Red Cross First Aid course and open to all undergraduate women.

First Aid (Hygiene 7). A complete Red Cross First Aid course and open to all undergraduate men.

Nurses' Aide (Hygiene 8).

This committee also organized and sponsored a program of *Convocations*. A schedule of the dates, speakers, and subjects for these convocations follows:

Tuesday, January 6—The Chief Causes of the War in Europe. Dr. A. L. SACHAR of the Hillel Foundation.

Wednesday, January 7—The Chief Causes of the War in the Far East. Professor A. H. LYBYER of the Department of History.

Tuesday, January 13—What Is Totalitarianism? Professor A. E. MURPHY of the Department of Philosophy.

Thursday, January 15—What Is Democracy? Professor ERNEST BERNBAUM of the Department of English.

Tuesday, January 20—Types of Military Service. Colonel LEONARD C. SPARKS, Field Artillery, Commandant of the University R.O.T.C.

Wednesday, January 21—The Resources of the University of Illinois for Wartime Service. President A. C. WILLARD.

7. *Centers of Information for Men and Women* have been established in the offices of the Deans of Men and Women respectively, and appropriate special committees are collecting and organizing the material. This information is available to students in Dean Turner's Office, and individuals familiar with this information will be available in that office to answer inquiries and to advise students. The committee has information on the Navy, Marine Corps, Army, Coast Guard, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Army Intelligence, and numerous industrial agencies working on defense projects. These materials are being summarized and arranged so that students may be able to secure information easily and without confusion. The committee plans a library of official publications, and summaries will be available in the Office of the Dean of Men and in the offices of the other members of the committee.

A similar center of information has been established for women students in the Office of the Dean of Women. Dean Leonard, in cooperation with a committee, has available in her office various types of information bearing on services which women can perform in the present emergency. Through the Office of the Dean of Women and in cooperation with the Committee on Student Affairs, extracurricular classes and services have been organized for the women students. These involve, among other things, a women's health service, a refresher course on nutrition given under the supervision of the Home Economics Department, a program of physical education organized by the Physical Education Department for Women, and a program of Red Cross work, as well as other activities.

8. *The Division of University Extension* under Director Robert B. Browne has been most active in making the resources of the University available to the entire State of Illinois. The work of this division in the field of help to industry and other activities related to the war has been in progress for many months and is very comprehensive in its scope.

(a) Most impressive is the Engineering, Science, and Management Defense Training Program. Under this program, training at the college level in engineering, chemistry, physics, and production management is provided in those industrial areas of the State that are in the battle of production. At this time there are in operation 24 different courses in 18 Illinois communities, for a total of 148 classes and an enrollment of 3,600 students. The courses are: Elementary Electrical Engineering; Chemistry of Powder and Explosives; Sanitary Engineering for the Emergency; Pre-Foremanship; Elementary Engineering Drafting; Advanced Engineering Drafting; Shop Mathematics; Production Engineering; Elementary Tool Design; Elementary Machine Design; Motion and Time Study; Safety Engineering; Personnel and Industrial Relations; Heat Treatment of Steel; Foundry Sand Control; Engineering Chemistry; Mathematics, Mechanics, and Strength of Materials; Engineering Physics, Electrical Circuits; Industrial Cost Accounting; Supervisory Training; Power Circuits and Machines; Stress Analysis. The Illinois communities are: Alton, Granite City, Decatur, Springfield, Champaign-Urbana, Kankakee, LaSalle,

Elgin, Aurora, Rockford, Dixon, Beardstown, Danville, Chicago Heights, Chicago, Evanston, East St. Louis, and Moline.

Further courses are in the process of organization—such as Ultra-High Frequency Techniques, Stress Analysis, Theory and Practice of Reinforced Concrete Design, Pyrometry, Aerial Bombardment Protection for Civilians, Training for Radio Engineers and Technicians; and more industrial communities will shortly be added to the list given above. It seems highly probable that more than five thousand of the men and women of Illinois—engineers, production supervisors, metallurgists, chemists, foremen, accountants, and others who make up the non-commissioned officers of the State's industrial army—will go into classrooms, laboratories, and shops, often after the day's work, to become for a time the student body of the University's E.S.M.D.T. program.

(b) The Division has provided courses in conversational Spanish for the officers of the Air Corps stationed at Chanute Field. There have been almost two hundred of these officers receiving this instruction, which came as a result of a directive from the War Department to all such officers to learn the language.

(c) The Division is having prepared by the appropriate staff members materials for courses for young men who, lacking the necessary college training for admission to the flying cadet schools of the United States Army, wish to prepare for the mental examination required by the Army in lieu of sixty semester hours of college credit.

(d) The Division operates a Speakers' Bureau. This is the channel through which flow the requests for University faculty and student speakers from program chairmen of clubs and organizations in the State. The Bureau has been booking speaking engagements for those able and willing to inform the public on the problems of our National war effort. This is an important contribution to the maintenance of civilian morale.

(e) There has been created a state-wide school and college civilian morale service to work in conjunction with the Office of Civilian Morale in Washington and the United States Office of Education. It is the purpose of this service to muster the resources of the colleges and public and private schools of the State to contribute to the building of civilian morale for the successful prosecution of the war and the establishment of a just peace. The direction of this program in Illinois has been assigned to the Director of the Division of University Extension, who acts as State Chairman.

(f) The Visual Aids Service of the Division has acquired and is distributing motion picture films for exhibition in the classrooms on subjects that portray dramatically important events in the history of our country and contribute to the understanding of and loyalty to fundamental American ideas and ideals. Films on the story of the Declaration of Independence, of the American Constitution, and of the Bill of Rights are examples. Instructional films depicting operations of milling machines, turret lathes, precision instruments, as well as a large number of films in the fields of heat, sound, light, electronics, communication, and transportation are in continuous use.

(g) The Division sponsors a research project in adult education that has been engaged in the preparation of materials and the training of teachers for the education of the foreign born under the auspices of the United States Department of Justice with whom all aliens in the United States are registered. This is part of an Americanization program.

(h) The Division conducts a number of institutes and conferences, several of which recently have been concerned with the problem of defense. The Club Women's School of Affairs this year enrolled 250 of the State, district, and local leaders of the Illinois Federation of Women's Clubs in a meeting whose program was devoted to seeking an understanding of the problems of the emergency. The Division conducted on the campus this fall an Illinois Fore-

men's Defense Conference attended by three hundred foremen and supervisors from Illinois defense industries. A leadership institute for the Illinois Congress of Parents and Teachers will be addressed to the consideration of topics growing out of the war situation. The annual meeting of the Illinois County Superintendents of Schools, which the Division conducts, will be given over to a consideration of the impact of the war on the schools of the State. The Division acts as a resource agency for the promotion of forums and citizenship training, all of which is designed to contribute to the successful operation of democratic processes.

(i) Men in the armed forces, whose education is interrupted by their calls to service, are afforded opportunity to make some progress toward college degrees by the University courses that are taught by correspondence.

(j) In conjunction with the University Library, the Division has projected a series of reading lists on the understanding of America, its aims, the war and the peace to follow.

9. The *Radio Advisory Committee* is planning programs of the town meeting type over the University Station W I L L in charge of Director J. F. Wright. These programs will be given on Sundays, a new departure for our Radio Station. Two programs already have been scheduled and approved for next semester which should be distinct contributions at the present time. The first is exclusively for radio and concerns Foreign Trade with special emphasis on South America. The second is the course especially arranged to deal with economic problems of the defense program.

In general, Station W I L L has been using all programs of a national defense nature that are consistent with its program policy. These include spot announcements for the Army, Coast Guard, Marines, Navy, Civil Service Commission, Defense Savings, etc.; transcribed programs for the Army, Navy, WPA-Defense projects; and all of President Roosevelt's recent talks, as well as the recent one by Prime Minister Churchill.

In conclusion, I again wish to refer to a statement in President Roosevelt's letter in which he said that winning the war will be futile *unless* "we lay the foundations for the kind of peace and readjustment that will guarantee the preservation of those aspects of American life for which the war is fought." Colleges and universities should be vital elements in helping to lay the foundations of such a permanent peace. Such a peace, however, will depend largely on the United States occupying a dominant position in world affairs as a powerful, fully armed nation always ready to defend and preserve that peace. Any idea that when peace comes we can then again pursue a national policy of isolationism is unthinkable. The cessation of actual fighting will not result in a Utopia in which we can "beat our swords into plowshares." Instead we will probably find ourselves living in a world more like an armed camp. Our Army, Navy, and Air Force are going to be essential to our national existence for a long time to come. We are going to live in a world in which force and the ability to defend ourselves and our way of life are going to be major factors. In such a world colleges and universities must assume a greater responsibility than ever before in the education of men and women who will be fully aware of the problems of such a post-war world and our proper place in whatever world order will guarantee and maintain a lasting peace.

TYPES OF MILITARY SERVICE

by

Colonel LEONARD C. SPARKS, F. A.

January 20, 1942

THE prospectus for these convocation lectures stated that they were to be factual. I am very glad because I have nothing to sell. Neither am I in a position to prophesy.

First, I should like to make a confession. While I have on occasion lectured before military audiences, this is my debut before an audience of this sort.

In addition to my many shortcomings as a lecturer, I have been somewhat put to it to decide just what I should attempt to cover so that at the end you would not be left completely exhausted and in utter confusion.

I have heard that many potential young soldiers are anxious to know just "what they will encounter once they actually reach the armed forces." Well, I doubt if anyone can give a very specific answer to that. I am sure I cannot.

Of course the ultimate objective of all combat training is the development of aggressive, resolute, thoroughly capable individuals and units whose skill, initiative, and confidence instill in them the desire to close with the enemy, destroy him, and thereby assure the domestic peace and international security of our countrymen.

The qualities which military training seeks to develop in the individual are: discipline; health and endurance; adaptability and teamwork; technical proficiency; initiative and leadership.

While an individual's prior experience may suggest his initial assignment to some relatively safe employment in the SOS, that is Service of Supply, all soldiers, both commissioned and enlisted, must be prepared to fight in a crisis.

There are many trees in this forest before us. It is growing every day and many new varieties are springing up.

Adhering to a sound military rule to reconnoiter a wood before becoming involved with unknown hazards which might be concealed therein, I came to the conclusion that we would all be the wiser if we confined ourselves this evening to a reconnaissance from a limited number of vantage points from without the forest.

In other words, from information that is available to me and which I am at liberty to divulge at this time, I shall attempt to partially answer some of your questions by giving you a general picture of the national defense set-up as it now exists, going into slightly more detail about those Army features which I presume are of more immediate interest to most of you. Later on, should someone have some specific point he would like to have clarified, I shall be glad to attempt to do so.

I therefore propose conducting this reconnaissance from the following vantage points:

National Defense Forces	Arms and Services
The Army	Organization
Organization	Functions
War Department	Mobilization Procedure
Territorial	
Tactical	

NATIONAL DEFENSE FORCES

The President is the constitutional Commander-in-Chief of the Army and Navy. As such he is vested with general and exclusive authority to give orders and make and publish regulations for the Army and, in the execution of the general laws for the government of the Army, may issue necessary regulations without any specific legislation.

The President exercises command through his secretaries who are charged with carrying out the policies of the President in military and naval matters. They directly represent the President and, under the law and decisions of the Supreme Court, their acts are the President's acts and their orders are the President's orders.

No discussion of the Navy will be undertaken; first, because it is not up for discussion and secondly, because I do not feel that I am qualified to cover the subject.

While there are many joint boards and committees that are charged with various cooperative activities involving both services, suffice it for the purpose of this survey if we mention only two—i.e., the Joint Board and the Munitions Board.

The function of the Joint Board is to determine the major questions of cooperative action and general strategy.

Under Section 5a of the National Defense Act, as amended, the Under Secretary of War, as directed by the Secretary of War, is charged, among other duties, with the supervision of all administration and operation functions and installations of the military establishment concerned with the acquisition and production of military supplies and with the assurance of adequate provision for the mobilization of materiel and industrial organizations essential to the war-time needs. In other words, industrial mobilization.

It is to be noted that by mandate of the Congress, the primary responsibility for this tremendous undertaking is placed upon a member of the War Department. To effectuate this mandate the Munitions Board was organized.

Attention is invited to the fact that the office of Assistant Secretary of War for Air, created by an amendment of the National Defense Act in 1926, has been reactivated since the emergency. There had been

no occupant of this office since the original appointee held office for a short time following the enactment of the amendment.

THE WAR DEPARTMENT

The Chief of Staff is the immediate adviser of the Secretary of War on all matters relating to the Military Establishment and is charged by the Secretary of War with the planning, development, and execution of the military program. He causes the War Department General Staff to prepare the necessary plans for recruiting, mobilizing, organizing, supplying, equipping, and training the Army of the United States for use in the national defense and for the subsequent demobilization. As the agent, and in the name of the Secretary of War, he issues such orders as will insure that the plans of the War Department are harmoniously executed by all agencies of the Military Establishment, and that the military program is carried out speedily and efficiently.

The Chief of Staff, in addition to his duties as such, is, in peace, by direction of the President, the Commanding General of the Field Forces and in that capacity directs the field operations and the general training of the several armies, of the overseas forces, and of GHQ, that is General Headquarters units. He continues to exercise command of the field forces after the outbreak of war until such time as the President shall have specifically designated a commanding general thereof.

A Deputy Chief of Staff assists the Chief of Staff and acts for him in his absence.

He is charged with general supervision over the activities of all divisions of the War Department General Staff.

Ordinarily in time of peace there is but one Deputy, but since the Presidential declaration of an unlimited emergency two additional Deputies have been appointed. One is primarily charged with construction and supply matters and the third with questions relating to the Air Forces.

The War Department General Staff is divided into five sections.

G-1, or the first division, is the Personnel Division. It is charged, in general, with those duties which relate to the personnel of the Army as individuals. For example, it is charged with the preparation of plans and policies and the supervision of activities dealing with the procurement, classification, assignment, promotion, transfer, retirement, and discharge of all personnel of the Army of the United States.

G-2 is the Military Intelligence Division. It is charged with those duties which relate to the collection, evaluation, and dissemination of military information.

G-3 is the Operations and Training Division. Its responsibilities

cover those subjects which have to do with organization, training, and operation of the military forces, except for a few matters which are expressly assigned to the War Plans Division. One specific responsibility with which we here are directly concerned is that of military training in civilian institutions and training camps.

G-4, the Supply Division, is charged with those duties which relate to the distribution, storage, and issue of supplies to the Army; this to include the preparation of basic supply plans which will enable the several supply arms and services to prepare their detailed plans for procurement.

The 5th, or War Plans Division, is charged with those duties which relate to the formulation of plans for the use in the theater of war of the military forces, separately or in conjunction with the naval forces. This Division is further charged with furnishing the nucleus for the formation of a General Headquarters in case of mobilization. As a precautionary measure, a GHQ was set up several months ago. It has been supervising and coordinating the training of all ground forces in the continental United States and the combined training of both ground and air forces.

In addition to the General Staff, the War Department also includes the Chiefs of the various arms and services about whom we shall speak more later on.

Those units (tactical) whose primary function is combat are handled through GHQ—except in the case of the Air Forces and the Overseas Commands, which have a dual function—while those installations (territorial) whose primary function is administration operate directly under the War Department.

TERRITORIAL

The territorial installations with which we here are best acquainted are the corps areas, because we function directly under one, the Sixth Corps Area.

The continental area of the United States is divided on a basis of military population into nine corps areas. Ours, the Sixth, comprises the states of Illinois, Wisconsin, and Michigan.

One of the primary responsibilities of a corps area commander, in time of war, has to do with the procurement of personnel and its accompanying responsibilities of feeding, housing, and clothing them. He is also charged with the supervision of the inspection, supply, training, and development of the ROTC in accordance with the policies enunciated by the War Department.

Exempted stations are establishments and activities which operate under the War Department—usually directly under some chief of arm or service—and consequently are exempt from corps area control

except for routine supply of the troops thereat, maintenance of certain fixed installations, court-martial jurisdiction, and property audit functions.

Examples of some exempted stations are the Military Academy at West Point, General and Special Service Schools, training centers, ports of embarkation, manufacturing arsenals, and supply depots.

From this you will see what is meant, when used in connection with the mobilization and assignment of personnel, by the expressions "War Department Overhead" and "Corps Area Service Command," in contradistinction to the combat or field forces.

Our small detachment of enlisted men on duty here at the University is designated Corps Area Service Unit 1615 rather than a company designation of some regiment.

In the Overseas Departments the commanders thereof have a dual responsibility, tactical—as exemplified by GHQ here on the mainland—and administrative, comparable to a corps area commander.

In the recent reorganization of the air arm, all air activities have been incorporated in an over-all organization, known as the Army Air Forces, with an Assistant Secretary and Deputy Chief of Staff for Air at the top side as previously mentioned.

There are two major subdivisions, namely, the Air Force Combat Command and the Air Corps.

The head of the Air Forces, pursuant to policies, directives, and instructions from the Secretary of War, is charged with the control of all air activities.

This covers such things as the supervision and coordination of all training, the determination of requirements in personnel, material, equipment, supplies, and facilities; the preparation of plans for the development of organization, equipment, tactical operation, supply, and maintenance. It is to be understood that the air components of overseas garrisons and task forces for theaters of operations are included in this.

TACTICAL

As previously stated, all ground forces here on the mainland are under GHQ for training and tactical control.

GHQ exercises its supervision and control of the field forces through the various Army commanders and the Commanding General of the Armored Forces. The major subdivisions of both of these commands are Corps and Divisions.

The Armored Force is of recent development, although its initial conception generally along its present lines dates back several years. It is a combined force transported in wheeled and track-laying type motor vehicles, the bulk of which is provided either with partial or complete armor. Its outstanding characteristics are its protected fire power, shock power, battlefield mobility, and extended radius of action.

In each arm or service the Company (Troop, or Battery in the Cavalry and Artillery or Squadron in the Air Force) is the basic unit. It contains all the agencies required for subsistence, interior economy, and administration. It is where the soldier sleeps, eats, and fights or works—in other words, it is his army home. It is where he meets and associates most closely with some one to two hundred other men; usually where the strongest ties of friendship are made.

The battalion or similar unit is the basic tactical unit. It is composed of a small headquarters and two or more companies. Usually it has no administrative or housekeeping functions.

The regiment ordinarily consists of a headquarters with a headquarters and service company and two or more battalions. It is the unit around which so much sentiment is generally attached in later years and around which the histories of its smaller units are centered.

Brigades are tactical organizations composed of two or more regiments of the same arm together with a headquarters company or similar operating unit.

The Division is the basic large unit of the combined arms. It comprises a headquarters, troops of the basic arm—that is, infantry, cavalry, or armored as the case may be—field artillery, and certain troops of other arms and services so organized and equipped as to make it tactically and administratively a self-contained unit, capable to a considerable extent of independent action.

A Corps is a combination of two or more divisions and an Army contains a variable number of Corps plus a few extra divisions. Each Army and Corps has its own headquarters with certain special organic troops such as artillery, observation aviation, engineer and signal troops, and service units.

The Infantry Division is the basis of organization of our field forces. News dispatches frequently mention the movement or operation of divisions.

During the last World War all of our Infantry Divisions were organized along the lines of the "square" division. All of our National Guard divisions are still thus organized. For the past several years we have been trying out the so-called "triangular" division, which very much resembles the German divisional organization.

The square division retains the brigade organization for infantry and artillery, the infantry component consisting of two brigades, the artillery, one. In the triangular division, on the other hand, there is no brigade organization. Three infantry regiments and four field artillery battalions comprise the major combat elements.

All organic transportation of both type divisions is motorized. Neither is provided, however, with sufficient transportation to move all its elements simultaneously.

The "motorized" division, about which we have heard so much in

recent months, is for all practical purposes a triangular division which has sufficient additional organic motor transport to permit the simultaneous movement of all its elements.

ARMS AND SERVICES

Reference has been made several times to the arms and services. They are as follows:

<i>Arms</i>	<i>Services</i>
Air Forces	Adjutant General's Department
Air Corps (S)	Finance Department
Armored Force	Inspector General's Department
Cavalry	Judge Advocate General's Dept.
Coast Artillery Corps (S)	Medical Department
Chemical Warfare Service (S)	Ordnance Department
Engineer Corps (S)	Provost Marshal General's Dept.
Field Artillery	Quartermaster Corps
Infantry	
Signal Corps (S)	

The arms are those branches whose primary function is to close with the enemy in combat, while the services are charged with assisting the line of the Army by performing all necessary functions of administration and supply. Some have the dual function of combat and supply—they are indicated by an "S" following their designation.

It must be understood that no one arm wins battles. The combined action of all arms and services is essential to success. The characteristics of each arm and service adapt it to the performance of its special function. It is the duty of each higher commander to coordinate and direct the action of all, exploiting their powers to attain the ends sought.

As previously mentioned, the chiefs of the various arms and services are a part of the War Department.

They prepare the mobilization plans for their respective branches under the War Department's general plan; they are responsible for the classification of the commissioned personnel of their branches and for submitting recommendations for the appointment, assignment, and transfer of same.

As chiefs of arms they are under the Chief of Staff in all matters relating to their respective arms; they furnish him with information and advice on all questions affecting their arm, such as the formulation and development of tactical doctrines; organization and training including that of the ROTC; armament and equipment, this to include cooperation with the interested supply service in research and development of the various items of equipment and armament.

As chief of a supply service, where they are charged with the

procurement of supplies, they report direct to the Under Secretary of War regarding all matters of procurement.

To decentralize and thereby facilitate procurement, the nation has been divided by the chief of each supply service into procurement districts. The number of districts varies with each service according to the requirements of the procurement problem and the geographical distribution of prospective manufacturing facilities. The number of districts is not the same for each service.

Now let us briefly summarize the principal roll of each arm and service in this great Army team which is provided for the defense of our nation.

The Air and Armored Forces have already been mentioned. In the Air Forces the Air Corps now assumes the responsibility for procuring all necessary supplies and equipment.

The Cavalry consists of highly mobile ground units both horse and mechanized. Horse cavalry is characterized by a high degree of battlefield mobility; it can operate over almost any terrain under all conditions of weather. It is equipped with weapons similar to those of the infantry; it has scout cars for reconnaissance and motor transport for supply.

Horse cavalry habitually maneuvers mounted but ordinarily fights on foot. It is not usually employed against objectives which require the sustained power of Infantry. In cooperation with units of the Air Force, it locates the enemy, maintains contact with him, and procures essential information for the higher commander which the Air Force cannot obtain.

The Coast Artillery Corps is characterized by the great amount of fire it can deliver against naval and air targets. Its armament comprises fixed and mobile seacoast artillery, antiaircraft artillery, and submarine mines.

Fixed seacoast artillery has great power and range. Its stability permits great accuracy of fire. Its elaborate and precise fixed equipment permits highly effective fire control and fire direction.

Mobile seacoast artillery comprises railway, truck, and tractor-drawn artillery. Off the battlefield these types are capable of moving long distances at fairly rapid rates. On the battlefield, however, their mobility is low and they require considerable time to emplace. In field operations these types may serve as Army or GHQ reserve artillery.

Antiaircraft artillery is equipped with antiaircraft guns, automatic weapons, searchlights, detectors, sound-locators, and the equipment required for observation, fire control, and signal communication. In cooperation with the Air Force it supports and protects the other arms and important installations against hostile air observation and attack. It can also execute antitank and other ground missions when necessary.

The Chief of Coast Artillery is responsible for the development and procurement of all submarine mines used in harbor defense operations.

Troops of the Chemical Warfare Service engage directly in combat to assist other units of the field forces by the use of gas, smoke, and incendiaries.

The prime responsibility of the Chief of the Chemical Warfare Service, however, has to do with the investigation, development, manufacture or procurement, and supply to the Army of all smoke and incendiary materials, all toxic gases, and all types of gas defense appliances, including the preparation of manuals for the instruction of all troops in the use of and protection against chemicals.

The Corps of Engineers has the primary mission of construction and demolition to increase the combat effectiveness of our troops, to facilitate their movement, and to hinder the movement of the enemy.

Combat engineers participate actively with other troops in the penetration of hostile obstacles and the assault of fortified localities; in the defense of road blocks and mine fields.

Engineer missions also include the construction and maintenance of roads, ferrying and bridging operations, the preparation of landing fields, and the elimination of obstacles to the movement of our troops. The mobility and maneuverability of our field forces, especially motorized and mechanized units, and the efficiency of their supply, depends largely on the successful execution of these missions.

The engineers make, reproduce, and supply maps including those produced from air photographs.

Special engineer missions include camouflage work, the operation of railways, power plants, water supply and sewage systems, and certain other utilities.

Research, development, procurement, and repair of engineer materials and supplies and certain other items of equipment included in which are the searchlights used by the Coast Artillery, is a responsibility of the Chief of Engineers.

All river and harbor work is under the Chief of Engineers and by a recent amendment of the National Defense Act he is now responsible for all construction work in the Army formerly handled by the Quartermaster General.

The Field Artillery contributes to the action of the entire force through the fire support which it renders other arms.

Artillery fire possesses great power and flexibility.

In addition to its weapons the Field Artillery is also responsible for the operation of sound and flash observation units.

Field Artillery weapons consist of guns and howitzers and are classified as light, medium, and heavy. The various means of transport are pack, and horse, truck or tractor drawn.

With respect to its employment, Field Artillery is referred to as Divisional, Corps, and Army.

The principal mission of Divisional Artillery is the immediate support of the Infantry (Cavalry or armored units as the case may be); that of Corps Artillery is the destruction or neutralization of hostile artillery and reinforcing the fires of the Divisional Artillery. Army Artillery includes only a headquarters and such units as are allotted from time to time by GHQ for employment by the army commander in support of the Army as a whole.

As earlier stated, all the rest of the team is built around the Infantry. While not as spectacular in its performance as some of the other members of the team, the game is never won until the Infantry moves in and actually takes possession of the ground.

The Infantry is the arm of close combat whose primary mission is to close with the enemy and destroy or capture him, or, in the defense, to hold its ground and repel the hostile attack.

The principal weapons of the Infantry are the rifle with its bayonet, the automatic rifle, and the machine gun. Other weapons include mortars, pistols, grenades, and antitank guns.

While the mobility of the Infantry has been greatly increased by the use of motor transport for the movement of troops, equipment, and supplies, there eventually comes a time when the troops must dismount and proceed on foot.

Signal Corps troops have the primary combat mission of providing signal communication for the command to which they are assigned. This includes the installation, maintenance, and operation of radio stations and telephone and telegraph service. Other means of communication are by visual signals and pigeons.

The Signal Corps is also responsible for the operation of the Army cable system, the signal intelligence, and photographic service.

Signal intelligence prepares and solves codes and ciphers. It is charged with the interception of enemy wire and radio transmission and the location, by radio position finding, of enemy radio transmitters operating on the ground and in airplanes.

The aircraft warning service for the detection of the approach of hostile aircraft is another responsibility, and a considerable one, which is now assigned to the Signal Corps.

As the chief of a supply service, the Chief Signal Officer is responsible for the research, development, procurement, storage, issue, and repair of all signal, meteorological, and cryptographic equipment and supplies; of all electrical apparatus associated with direction and range finding instruments; and of all photographic equipment. He also is charged with the preparation, publication, revision, distribution, and accounting for all codes and ciphers required by the Army.

The remaining War Department chiefs have no combat functions. They head departments that have purely administrative or service functions, and therefore will be passed over with a mere indication of their respective services.

The office of the Adjutant General is the one through which all current business is transacted and where old records are filed.

The Chief of Finance is responsible for budgeting, disbursing, and accounting of all War Department funds.

The Inspector General inquires into and reports on all matters which affect the efficiency and economy of the Army, such as discipline, living conditions, and morale of Army personnel, and the proper expenditure of funds and property.

The Judge Advocate General is the legal adviser of the entire military establishment and heads the system of military justice.

The Medical Department is charged with maintaining the health of personnel from the time they enter the Army until they leave. It provides necessary medical, surgical, and dental care, administers military hospitals, transports sick and wounded, gives veterinary service for public animals, and inspects all meat and dairy products.

The Ordnance Department is responsible for the development and procurement of all types of military weapons.

The Quartermaster General's department procures, stores, and issues all supplies common to more than one arm, where not covered by another department. These include, chiefly, food, clothing, and all kinds of transport. It also supervises the transport of troops and supplies.

The Provost Marshal General, whose office has only recently been revived, is charged with raising and training the general Military Police force of the Army.

MOBILIZATION PROCEDURE

From the place of induction selectees are sent to a Reception Center. They are corps area installations and the number varies in each corps area from two to four. It is probable that additional ones will be required. Here the men are "processed," that is, furnished certain items of clothing and equipment, inoculated and vaccinated and classified, after which they are given a tentative branch assignment preliminary to being sent to the proper Training Center. Effort is made to expedite passage through the Reception Center.

One of the important operations at the Reception Center is classification of the individual. The great demand for various types of occupational specialists makes it imperative that full advantage be taken of the individual's civilian experience to meet military needs. The

trade qualifications of many will permit their assignment to organizations or installations with little or no additional specialist training after their initial military training is completed.

Depending upon a selectee's qualifications and, as far as possible, in response to his expressed preference, individuals are sent to a designated Arm or Service Replacement Training Center.

Replacement Training Centers are under an appropriate chief of arm or service. There have been twenty odd in operation thus far; it is probable that more will be required. Each arm or service has one or more. The Infantry have had five in operation, while the Field Artillery have had three, one in the eastern part of the nation at Ft. Bragg, North Carolina, one in the central portion at Ft. Sill, Oklahoma, and one in California.

At the Training Centers replacements are organized for administrative purposes, and also for training purposes, into units similar to the basic unit of the arm or service to which they are assigned. This has the advantage of early familiarizing the individual with the type of unit which he may eventually join.

An important procedure which is continued at the Replacement Training Center is that of classification. Because of probable lack of time the initial classification, conducted at a Reception Center, is by no means complete and final. The process is continued with greater thoroughness at the Training Center.

All selectees are given an intensive course of training for thirteen weeks before being sent to their final unit or organization.

While at the Replacement Training Center, the large bulk of men will settle into their final jobs. All units, of course, need cooks, clerks, various types of mechanics, and general utility men, but in addition certain special training will be required. To mention my own arm of the service, the Field Artillery, with which I am most familiar, there are three main classifications, namely, gun crews, drivers (truck or horse), and fire control men, that is, communication operators, observers, and orientation men.

From a Replacement Training Center, groups of men, cadres, go to a Unit Training Center where new units, regiments, brigades, divisions are formed and given combined training for eventual service in a theater of operations. Some, however, may be sent direct as filler or loss replacements to old organizations already in the field.

In some instances properly qualified men may be selected for additional training in their specialty before joining a unit.

Upon completion of his thirteen weeks' basic training at a Training Center, and after an additional period of two or three months' service with a unit of his branch where he becomes identified and known—in other words, when he has become an "old field soldier" and demon-

strated his ability—the selectee may become eligible to enter the competition for a commission.

Application to enter this competition must be made through and have the indorsement of one's unit commander. In some branches it is essential that the applicant have civilian technical education or experience. In others, while educational background is important, it is given less weight. Demonstrated qualities of leadership are stressed above all.

After successfully passing a preliminary examination before a local board of officers, the applicant may enter an Officer's Candidate School for a three months' course of instruction. All arms and services have these schools. They are conducted under the supervision of the Chief of arm or service. Upon satisfactory completion of the course, candidates will be commissioned as second lieutenants.

This completes our preliminary reconnaissance. Considerable territory has been covered. I hope we have not gone too fast for you. While some of the points covered may have no immediate interest for you, I trust you now have a clearer picture in your mind of the general Army set-up for the national defense.

THE PRINCIPAL CAUSES OF
THE WAR IN EUROPE

by

Dr. A. L. SACHAR

January 6, 1942

THE first World War smashed a vicious military autocracy in Germany. The cost was of such tragic magnitude that it seemed fantastic. Human casualties included thirteen million dead soldiers, thirteen million dead civilians, twenty million wounded, nine million war orphans, five million war widows, and ten million refugees! The total immediate economic cost of the war was calculated at three hundred and thirty one billions. Those who survived this prodigious feast of death were determined that never again, while history was remembered, would such a tragedy be repeated. These were the pledges to the dead who otherwise would not rest in their graves. These were the dreams of weary millions who inherited the broken fragments of an exhausted continent.

Unhappily, both the German people who were conquered, and the Allies who had won, were incredibly short sighted. The Germans did not expropriate their Junker betrayers. They established the forms of democracy through the Weimar Constitution which was, theoretically, one of the most advanced democratic instruments in modern history. Yet Weimar became just a façade. The people who had the power to create any economic and political system which they desired, allowed a nucleus of parasites to re-establish the old regime. No attempt was made to eliminate the elements who were dangerously disloyal. The old war lords were permitted to retain their key positions in the reduced army. The civil service remained crowded with men who plotted and schemed for the day when the Republic would be scuttled. The power of the great barons, especially those who dominated coal and steel and the banking system, was left untouched. A Herrenklub, organized in 1921, included most of the wealth of Germany. Men like Hugenburg, Flick, Vogler and Luther were no friends of the Republic, and they worked closely with the discredited army chiefs. They financed private armies to embarrass the Government, to terrorize labor, and to undermine Republican solidarity. Reactionary school teachers and professors continued to teach the children to despise their present freedom in favor of a glorified feudal past. This was the heavy German responsibility for the horror that was to follow.

The Allied statesmen also showed little benign wisdom. After the

¹Economy of space makes it necessary to omit Dr. Sachar's introductory remarks. The last paragraph of that section, which immediately precedes the printed parts, should however be quoted:

I believe, therefore, that two tasks lie before us as Americans, in these critical days of war effort. The first task, and it is the most important task, is to clean out the virus which has invaded the bloodstream of the people of Germany and of Italy and of Japan, a virus which threatens to infect all of the rest of the world. And the second task, which can be undertaken only when the first task has been completed, is to make certain that the political and social and economic institutions that we establish after the war will be sound enough and wholesome enough to prevent the dangers that threaten all civilized life today. It is in the light of these two tasks that I plan to speak tonight.

Armistice was signed, the blockade against Germany was not lifted for more than a year, and there must have been tens of thousands of Germans who were hurried to early deaths because food, raw materials, and the essentials of life could not come into the exhausted country. Neither the military nor the political provisions of the peace treaty were harsh in relation to treaties that had gone before. But no attempt was made to spare national morale, national self respect, and the petty insults entered like iron into the consciousness of a high strung, proud people that had suffered a titanic humiliation. Since this was so, since the Treaty was written by hard-boiled realists like Clemenceau and Lloyd George, it was inevitable that there should be tremendous resentment among the German people. It was inevitable that the treaty should be considered as a *Diktat*, and that the passion for revenge should develop. Then a second alternative was opened to the Allies. Since their statesmanship had not reached out the hand of collaboration to the Germans, then surely it was practical and realistic, indeed, absolutely essential, to make certain that the military strength of Germany remain shorn, that no opportunity be offered to the military clique to rearm the people. Alas, here too, the Allies displayed woeful shortsightedness. They limited the German Army to one hundred thousand men. But they did nothing to prevent this small army from becoming the nucleus of a major rearmament. The one hundred thousand were trained as a select group of leaders. They organized gymnastic clubs, hiking clubs, social clubs, all apparently innocent, but in reality military in their purpose, a purpose which any intelligent espionage system could have discovered. Disarmament apparently did not carry with it the supervision of the great industrial plants of Germany which began secretly to prepare the implements for the war of revenge. The story was told of a man who ordered a baby carriage. It came in its parts from the factory. A day later he wrote back: "I cannot understand what is happening. I have tried to put the baby carriage together 37 times and each time it emerges as a machine gun!"

The rearmament continued feverishly. But France settled back to enjoy the fruits of its victory without accepting any of its responsibilities. Britain was content with the status quo and was irritated when some men discussed the necessity for taking risks to maintain it. Her statesmen consistently preferred appeasement. The United States had, from the very beginning, withdrawn from any responsibility for the victory which it had helped to win. Indeed, America not only withdrew, but built a Chinese wall of isolation about it. It set up impossible tariffs and would do nothing to collaborate with European peoples who were struggling desperately for a modicum of economic security. America moralized a good deal all through this period. It spoke with smug righteousness about the cat-and-dog fights which

ravaged Europe. But in a rapidly contracting world, where space and time shrivelled rapidly, it did nothing to play the part which its strength and its resources warranted.

The consequences, from the vantage point of 1942, were terrifying, for the future of Europe rested upon two forces, neither of which understood the implications of their policies. The German people remained blind to the menace of the native monsters who were at work among them to betray the democratic system. The Allied statesmen, confronted with the alternatives of either strengthening German democracy or of making perfectly certain that a resentful, frustrated people would have no opportunity to transmute its resentments and frustrations into military strength, did neither. They stimulated resentments and permitted these resentments to anchor themselves in powerful military bastions. There were far visioned statesmen among both the Germans and the Allies who realized the tragic implications in the situation. They pleaded that a helping hand be reached out to the struggling Weimar experiment so that government would not pass, by default, into the hands of desperate extremists. But their counsel was not accepted. The secret rearmament of Germany proceeded; the Weimar Republic was systematically undermined; France and England went about their business, neither making any attempt to rectify the grievances of Germany nor speeding up their own rearmament to be prepared to defend their victories if and when the show-down came.

II.

It was in the midst of this confusion and frustration, that the Nazi pestilence entered into the bloodstream of the German people, to poison a whole nation and, afterwards, to threaten the whole civilized world. A great deal of sentimental nonsense has been built up about Adolph Hitler. He has been called a rare genius, a newer and greater Napoleon, a brilliant leader of men. In fact, he is merely a Whirling Dervish of Hate, a cunning gangster who has risen from the garbage cans of society, combining the ruthlessness of the paranoic with an uncanny sense of timing which has enabled him to exploit the weakness and disunity of the democratic leaders. His power has been built on the frustrations of the little men of Germany, and on the willingness of the junkers and tycoons of Germany to utilize his intransigence as a means of diverting social revolution in Germany into national imperialism.

Hitler's early ranting was not taken seriously. His economics were crackpot; his social vision was primitive. But the German voters went on playing the game of "splinter" politics, watching resignedly the rise and fall of coalition governments as the Nazi party grew, drawing to itself a new Cave of Adullam—all who were discontented, all who were in debt, all who were in distress. Even the German intellectuals did

little to warn their people that, in trusting to such barbarians, they were endangering the whole fabric of national life. Archibald MacLeish has written a brilliant little volume, "The Irresponsibles," in which he denounces the philosophers, the scientists, the academicians, the literateurs, who, though sensing the menace of Hitler, retired into their Ivory Towers, refusing to sully their objectivity by contact with the *agora*.

So Hitler maneuvered his way into the Chancellorship. He promptly destroyed the institutions that had been established by the Republic. Freedom of speech, freedom of press, the right of congregation, painfully won at last by the people, were ruthlessly suppressed. The concentration camps soon echoed with the groans and the wails of all who opposed his objectives and his methods. Political parties were abolished. Protest became treason and was punished, with utter lack of squeamishness, by torture and death. The story made the rounds of the American in Berlin who suffered from a violent toothache. He went to a dentist for relief. Just as the dentist was about to extract the infected tooth, the American stopped him. "What will you charge me?" he asked. "We had better make terms first for I am a stranger and don't want any misunderstanding later." "The fee will be eighty dollars," the dentist replied. "Eighty dollars!" cried the patient. "Why I can get my tooth pulled by the best American dentist for just a few dollars." "Ah," said the dentist. "That is in America. But this is Germany. Here, pulling a tooth is a delicate operation. We have to take the tooth through the ears. No one is allowed to open his mouth in Germany!"

Meantime Hitler worked hand in glove with the barons who had helped him to power to accelerate the rearmament process. The army grew, the instruments of war poured from the factories—planes and tanks and submarines and the munitions which were later to wreck the world. The leaders of France and England slept on complacently. They now had a Frankenstein in the heart of a resentful people. They had done little to prevent his rise; they now did less to curb him, or to strengthen themselves if he should break loose.

To be sure a few English leaders understood the menace, and they pleaded, either for a union of European powers or for a speedy rearmament. Winston Churchill, from the beginning of the thirties, cried out, at every occasion, for action. Hitler, he warned in 1932, is already "the moving impulse behind the German Government and may be more than that very soon." Churchill's main anxiety at this stage was that "Britain is weaker; and Britain's hour of weakness is Europe's hour of danger." As the roll of Nazi drums grew louder and the wheels of Germany's rearmament hummed to a faster tempo, Churchill turned vehemently to the grim need of strengthening Britain's defenses. "The dictators ride to and fro upon tigers which they dare not dismount. And the tigers are getting hungry." But the governing

group "decided only to be undecided, resolved to be irresolute, adamant for drift, solid for fluidity, all powerful to be impotent." In despair Churchill predicted retribution for all of this stupid smugness. "I have watched this famous island descending incontently, fecklessly, the stairway which leads to a dark gulf. It is a fine broad stairway at the beginning, but after a bit the carpet ends. A little farther on there are only flag-stones, and a little farther on still, these break beneath your feet"

Soon all sides discovered what forces had been let loose through the advent of Hitler. The Allies found a wild fanatic, intransigent, determined by every means to break through the crust of civilization. Hitler was no longer content merely to rectify the injustices of Versailles. He meant to make a world revolution, to smash through the confines of the old continental system, to take control of Europe, the oceans, the colonial empires, the raw materials, and ultimately the world. The Germans discovered that their new master intended to do much more than build a strong, self respecting Germany again. He spoke of reorganizing completely men's way of life, of destroying democracy, liberalism, the rationalism of the western world. The shortsightedness of the Allies had raised up a new Atilla. The ineptitude and the lethargy of the German people had loosed forces of nihilism which were to sweep the nation into an endless nightmare.

Hitler meant what he said. His most fantastic utterances were no longer campaign promises. He proposed to put into effect all the gibberish of *Mein Kampf*, all the mystic nonsense of Alfred Rosenberg, and to do it with all the cunning and the ruthlessness which Goebbels and Himmler could devise, to enforce it with all the strength which Goering and his generals could command.

Democracy was stamped out, not merely because dictatorship was more effective and speedier in a time of crisis. It was stamped out as a "filthy superstition," as the "dirty invention of Jews and Marxians." A relentless war on the great religions began, not only because Protestantism and Catholicism both were indebted to Judaism, but because Christianity taught the brotherhood of man, the divinity of the soul, the virtues of kindness and humility and humaneness, qualities which were anathema to the Nazis. Their chief virtues were implicit obedience to the will of the rulers and willing sacrifice of life and limb for the glory of the state. Children were taught to worship strength, to face unflinchingly the thought of the battlefield. At Christmas time 1935 a military Mother Goose volume was enthusiastically endorsed so that babes could learn new nursery rhymes while they ate their substitute foods.

What puffs and patters?
What clicks and clatters?
I know what, oh, what fun!
It's a lovely Gatling gun!

Scientific objectivity was attacked as dangerous in a structure where everything, even men's thinking, must be subordinated to the immediate needs of the state. Only that was right or true which served the interests of the party of power. Reich Jurist leader Frank said in 1936: "Right is what serves the German people and the German race."

Foreign policy was now geared to the task of establishing Germans as the master race in Europe and in the world. There would be a *herrenschaft* and a *herdenschaft*, a world of rulers and a world of enslaved. The Germans would rule, all else would serve them. There might be collaboration with some Scandinavian peoples, with some of the Dutch and the English. But all backward peoples would serve the needs of the Germans. The great colonies in Africa and Asia and South America would become the sources of the needed raw materials, and a world of Aryan war lords would be created who would rule unopposed for at least a thousand years.

In such a world purity of blood was the primary qualification. The value of a work of art or science was measured not by its intrinsic integrity but by the blood that flowed in the veins of the author. Is he Aryan? Is his blood unpolluted? What is his grandmother? Is this good literature if it comes from the brain of Feuchtwanger? Who is his grandmother? Is this good physics if it comes from the genius of Einstein? Who is his grandmother? A revised version of the tale of Little Red Riding Hood was gleefully whispered during the early stages of the Nazi revolution, when all over Germany there were frantic explorations into ancestral records. Little Red Riding Hood goes through the woods and meets the wolf. "Where are you going?" she is asked. "Oh, I am looking for my grandmother." "So am I," replies the wolf. "Aren't we all?" After reading a long article extolling Aryan blood and Aryan science one writer was ready to lay a wreath on the tomb of the unknown Aryan.

III.

All through the tumultuous thirties Hitler dominated the international scene. There was no way of determining the reaction to him of the German people, for all legitimate means of expression had been crushed. Probably the heart of Germany was frightened, stunned, a little bewildered, but willing to follow, for there was hope that his entire program would not be implemented. There were bound to be some extravagances. But, in a revolutionary period of transition, this was to be expected. If there is planing, there must be chips. Surely, the German people said, Hitler will calm down. The Allied statesmen, too, were bewildered by the new intransigence from a nation totally conquered only fifteen years before. But Baldwin and Hoare and Simon and Chamberlain, despite the warnings from Churchill, persisted in underestimating the danger. Indeed, they wondered whether

it might not, in the long run, be best to let Germany grow a little stronger. Then there would be a fine bulwark in central Europe against the nasty Bolsheviks. Perhaps Hitler could be maneuvered into a quarrel with Russia; perhaps the two countries would devastate each other in a long and exhausting war. Perhaps the fanatical imperialism of Germany could be turned against the fanatical class consciousness of the Soviets and the two isms would fight against each other until they became wasms!

Hitler and the Nazis were quick to press home this point. Really, on the level, they were building their strength to save the world from Bolshevism. They should be left alone. Besides, as secret propagandists cleverly suggested, what was there to fear from Germany. It was a "have not" country, with a flimsy economic structure. Food was scarce, raw materials were rare. Everything was "ersatz," made of substitutes, food, clothing, shelter. The propaganda disarmed the Allied leaders. When stories filtered out that some kind of rearming was going on, they dismissed them as exaggerated. And even if true, there was no danger to England or France. German arms would never be used against powerful, wealthy countries like England and France, but most likely against the Bolsheviks.

In 1936 Hitler was ready and he struck—hard. His legions invaded Austria and took it over bloodlessly. There was a brief crisis in France and England, but it was decided to take no retaliatory action. Perhaps Hitler was right, the Allied leaders argued. The Austrians are German, and this is really an Anschluss, a union of peoples who belong together. Hitler digested Austria, destroying all of its remaining democratic machinery, liquidating all enemies, and then began terrorizing other parts of Central Europe and the Balkans. In 1938 came the great Czech crisis, and Hitler insisted upon dismembering its most important military parts. Chamberlain fumed and fussed and insisted that it would be morally wrong. He wondered whether a few personal conferences would not let Hitler see how unethical it was to settle international problems by force. He flew to Berchtesgaden, and to Godesberg, and finally to Munich, to reason with Hitler. He worked on the principle that "if at first you don't concede, fly, fly again." Hitler stormed and threatened and played on the fears of Chamberlain that war would unsettle the status quo. He persuaded Chamberlain that the Czech demand was the last territorial demand he would ever make. Chamberlain capitulated. "He came, he saw, he con-curred." The British lion, remarked the *Nation*, had become the line of least resistance. One opposition member of Parliament kept whistling, "London Bridge is falling down."

Now the great bastion on the other side of Germany had fallen. France could no longer count upon a powerful Balkan Entente. Russia, snubbed all through the crisis, certain that the whole purpose of Allied

diplomacy was to foment war between Germany and Russia, waited grimly for the right moment to follow its own best interests.

We remember all too vividly the terror of the next year—the periodic scares, the war of nerves, high tensions worked up in each nation, all skillfully planned and developed in the Nazi propaganda bureau. A powerful fifth column movement was established in each country that was singled out as the next victim. In France the growing class struggle was carefully stimulated to threaten the foundations of the country in a time when unity was more desperately needed than ever. In England, the Mosleys and other Nazi stooges avalanched the nation with the argument that the men who called for strengthening British defences were warmongers, the slaves of the Jews, international jingoes.

And then, in the fateful dull gray gloom of early September, 1939, the second World War was launched by Hitler's blitz attack on Poland. There was a ten year non-aggression pact with Poland, signed in 1934, but it was repudiated, without warning, as the planes soared out over the strategic areas of Poland and the country was blasted into submission. Stalin had outsmarted Chamberlain by signing a non-aggression pact with the Nazis in the hope of winning some immunity until Russia was better prepared. Perhaps Stalin hoped too that Germany and the Allies would exhaust themselves in a long war, from which a neutral Russia would emerge as the strongest state in the world! The second World War was under way.

IV.

From the beginning there was complete confusion in our own country. Emotionally most men of good will sided with the Allies and prayed that the Allies would win. They fully understood the implications of a Nazi victory. Yet there were misgivings. After all, the Allies had blundered after the first World War. Hitler's rise to power was due in part to Allied stupidity and shortsightedness. And anyway, was it wise to interfere in a quarrel which was basically European? It would be a great pity if Britain or France were to suffer defeat, but surely their fall could not have more than sentimental meaning for America.

President Roosevelt saw, from the beginning, the global character of the war. He recognized that Nazism menaced not only Europe but all the world. If Britain fell, the oceans would pass under the control of the Axis. South America would become, at least economically, an easy prey for the Nazis. The United States would be caught in a vice, living by the mercy of the new gangster war lords, its own standards of living smashed. It would have to carry a permanent crushing armaments program and its internal peace would be disrupted by the work of native and foreign propagandists. Roosevelt urged aid to the

Allies and the strengthening of the defenses of America. He was joined by realists in both parties, and by the majority of the American people. But the minority was powerful enough to hinder the aid to the Allies and to slow down and often cripple the attempts of the country to rearm and to become strong.

The minority was a heterogeneous one. Some could not forgive the Allies for their "harsh" treatment of the Germans after Versailles. Some felt honestly that this was a European imperialist struggle which was none of the business of the Americans. Some called fantastic the fear that Nazis could ever threaten the security of the United States. Some shared the Nazi philosophy of life. Some were agents of the Nazis and intent upon exploiting every opportunity to divide and confuse the United States until it was too late to save the Allies. It took time, precious time, to make clear the growing menace to America of the Nazi victories. The American people had never been strategy minded. Their oceans had been bulwarks, their trade had been secure, their standard of living had been high. It took time to understand that, with the oceans in unfriendly hands, most of these standards would be swept away; that the revolution in communication and transportation and military techniques had made the world a very small one. It took time to realize that it was possible, by winning approaching bases, ultimately to menace the security even of a powerful country like the United States. It took time to learn that economic warfare and propaganda could devastate America and could be as fatal as military defeats.

We were in the midst of the great debate, a debate slowly but inevitably being decided in favor of ever more aid to the Allies as a means of defending ourselves—we were in the midst of this great debate, when suddenly, without warning, Japan struck at Pearl Harbor. At the moment her ambassador was talking peace with our State Department representatives, a ruse, as we now know, to disarm the suspicions of our military heads so that a swift and crushing blow could be dealt to our armed forces. Pearl Harbor ended the debate. It proved that the choice of war or peace did not, after all, rest with us or with any democratic people. Nothing that we did or did not do, had any influence. When it paid for the Facists to strike, they struck, just as they had in Poland, in Norway, in Denmark, in Belgium, in Holland, in all the countries that had desperately tried to retain their neutrality too. It proved that there was a world conspiracy on the part of the Facists to win their way and that all appeasement efforts had not put them off. It proved that brutal, predatory forces had captured control of the German, the Italian, and the Japanese peoples, and that these forces were determined to let nothing stand in the way as they struck to win the supremacy of the world.

This brings me back to the opening statement of this address, that

our first task is to destroy the virus that has poisoned the national life of Germany, Italy, and Japan and now threatens all the world. There is little point in bewailing the mistakes of the Allies or the ineptitude of the Axis peoples which have produced the Hitlers and the Mussolinis and the military jingoes of Japan. They are in; they have power; they are waging war on every continent and the seven seas; and they intend to subjugate all the world. There is only one task before us, and that is to fight back, with every resource, with every ounce of energy, with all the dedication of our people, to rid the world of the governments that are threatening the painfully built fabric of western civilization. The war effort cannot be softened by sympathy for millions of innocent Germans and Italians and Japanese who are themselves victims of the gangsters who control their destinies. The war effort must be total, it must be thoroughgoing. It must be so complete that it will materially reduce the time that must be given over for war. It must capitalize upon the dissatisfactions of the peoples of the Axis countries, using them perhaps as a base for the inner disintegration of the powerful Facist military machine. The primary task is to root out the diseased paranoics, the egomaniacs, the leeches who now control the destinies of the peoples who have been made to fight against us.

Later when, please God, the war has been brought to a successful culmination, when the Facist terror has been destroyed, when men can live again and plan and aspire to more creative goals, then there will be other tasks to perform. Then it will become important to fashion a kind of international organization, anchored in the law, with powerful sanctions to enforce its decisions, so that gangsters with machine guns can never again get loose and take their victims one by one. Then it will become important to create social controls in our own country so that all men will have basic rights guaranteed to them—not simply to enjoy abstract freedom, but to enjoy it in concrete form, in the form of the right to work, the right to choose a career, the right to look into the future with hope, the right to be released from the fears of illness and unemployment and old age. Then it will become important to reorganize our educational system so that there will be more emphasis upon the moral motivations of living, more emphasis upon the principle that man has cosmic significance, that his life is precious, that he is not a cog in an economic system, or a robot in a nationalist discipline, or a globule in a racial bloodstream. All this for later, for the happier time when the fruits of victory are being gathered.

V.

At the moment there is the primary task of winning the war. And all of us have a part to fill in accomplishing this task. There will be specific assignments for young people of military age, for workers, for scientists, for clergymen, for teachers, for students, for older men

and women. I am sure that all groups will respond with alacrity; they will gladly give of their resources and their energy, in fullest measure, as they are called to serve.

But there will be some responsibilities which will fall upon our society as a whole, national responsibilities which must be met by the whole people, which will influence and condition our ability to fulfill individual assignments. In the first place there must be an end of our national complacency that victory is assured without strain or effort just because, potentially, we are so wealthy. Yes, this is a big country, powerful in its resources, terrifying in its might, when fully armed and trained. But we have lived so long as a peaceful, well-meaning people, throwing our energies into creative tasks, that we are not prepared, and will not be for some time, to excel in the arts of war. Potentially we are the "haves." Actually we are the "have nots." Our enemies, much poorer in resources, have the implements of war and the training to use them. And we, much richer in resources, are only at the beginning of the rearmament and the training of the skills to use them. So there can be no complacency. It is a battle where time is a crucial factor. There must be a complete subordination of all our own personal concerns to the great task of becoming prepared to defend, and then to assault.

And in the second place there must be a greater sense of realism about the sacrifices which will be required during the war and the peace that will follow. The fifty-six billions which will be asked for by the President tomorrow when he presents his budget message, is an incredible astronomical sum. It will cut into all our ways of life. Yet it is only a beginning. Far heavier demands will be made. They will affect the standards of our children's children. Indeed, I do not expect that we will ever live normally again, "normally" in the sense that we can expect to have the easy comforts, the easy securities, of the past few generations. There have been too many mistakes, too many blunders, and they must be paid for.

In this connection I think of a symposium in which I participated before our entry into the war, with our good friend, Dr. T. V. Smith. To illustrate the point which I am now making and in which he expressed complete agreement, he told the story of a traveller who had lost his way on the road to Flint. He stopped a farmer and asked for directions. "You want to go to Flint?" the farmer said. "Well, you take this road and go eight miles and there you will come to a fork. Take the right hand—Wait. You want to go to Flint? Then go the eight miles to the fork in the road, but instead of taking the right hand turn, you had better—No, let's see. You want to go to Flint. Then—good Lord, mister, if you want to go to Flint, you just can't start here!" Yes, if we want a happy ending, we just can't start in the year 1942. It is simply not possible to destroy Hitlerism and then to turn off the

faucets of hate and bitterness and to start living normally again. There will be a long period of receivership, and we must steel ourselves now, so that we may be prepared for all the sacrifices that will be required. Else we may become tired and disillusioned. We may lose sight of the evils that threaten us which, if successful in establishing themselves, will return us to centuries of barbarism.

We need not be pessimistic about the ability and the strength of the average man to assume his proper responsibilities as we strive for a better world. Such strivings, such aspirations, such hopes, are not any longer the namby-pamby clichés of the Utopians. The average man has suffered too much from the anarchies let loose in the world. The military front is no longer confined to the soldiers. Every civilian on the European continent, in England, in the four corners of the earth, now feels the impact of the destructive terror of war. Women and children who duck bombs now, face all the dangers which a generation ago were limited to the men in uniform. These common folk of the world are determined that this terror must not be loosed again. When they hear discussions of a world with collective security, of a land with enough social controls to guarantee them a modicum of economic security, they know in their hearts that these are no longer nebulous ideals. They are practical objectives which must be obtained if the world is ever to sleep in peace again.

Our society will not enjoy the pleasant amenities, the lovely luxuries of the past. Our standards of living will be driven down. There will be a twilight period of travail. But the determination of men of good will to establish international and national controls for the protection of the good society, will prevent all the lights of western civilization from going out. Ultimately the lessons of the past and the sufferings of the present will help to build a new creative and peaceful future.

THE PRINCIPAL CAUSES OF THE
WAR IN THE FAR EAST

by

Professor A. H. LYBYER

January 7, 1942

I.

THE immediate cause of the War in the Far East was for the United States of America the surprising and treacherous attack by the Japanese upon our army and navy bases in Hawaii early on December 7, 1941. At about the same time began the invasion of the Philippines and of the British possessions in the Malay peninsula. After attacking, Japan declared war on the United States and the British Empire.

No one acquainted with the history of Japan was surprised at her beginning war by a sudden attack without notice. But nearly everyone in the world was surprised that she began with Pearl Harbor and that she showed such great strength and ability for war. Surprising also was the boldness in Japan's challenge of the two great and powerful democracies, Britain and the United States.

The purpose of this discussion is to ascertain as clearly as possible the more remote causes of the war, particularly in the background of Japanese history and of Japanese relations with the United States.

II.

The chief underlying cause of the war was the vast and growing imperialistic ambition of Japan.

This rests fundamentally on a pagan religious myth, the descent of the emperor from the sun-goddess, that is, from the spirit of the sun, which shines beneficently on all the earth. Therefore to a loyal Japanese the emperor is divine, a God on earth. In a pamphlet prepared by the Japanese army for the instruction of the soldiers is this statement: "To die for the sake of the Emperor is to live forever."

Said Chikao Fujisawa, Professor of Japanese and Oriental Philosophy:

The (Japanese) Emperor as the Sage-King would think it his sacred duty to love and protect not only the people of this land, but also those alien peoples who are suffering from misgovernment and privations Nippon's national flag is an ensign of "red heart," of fiery sincerity. It alludes to the heavenly mission of Japan to tranquillize the whole world.

Americans should realize that the Japanese regard them as among "those alien peoples who are suffering from misgovernment and privations," whom moreover it is "the heavenly mission of Japan to tranquillize."

Japanese imperialism appeared in a small way in ancient and medieval times by temporary conquests in the Korean peninsula. Hideyoshi, about 1600 A.D., thought of the conquest of all China. A policy of extreme foreign exclusion was in force from 1640 until the opening of Japan by the American, Commodore Perry, in 1854. With-

in eight years the Japanese began acquiring island possessions. John Thomas Gulick wrote in his diary on April 25, 1862:

In the harbor we found the Japanese steamer commanded I believe by Manjiro. He had just returned from an expedition to the Bonin Islands, whither the Japanese Government had sent a colony to take possession. They sent several of their foreign built vessels to convey the colonists. The English flag has been pulled down and we hear that the cattle of the foreign residents have been taken on the ground that they have so long fed on Japanese grass that they have become Japanese.

This statement gives evidence not only of Japanese imperialism, but also of their unscrupulous propaganda, and of their desire to expel white men from the Far East.

In 1876 they opened Korea, imitating closely Commodore Perry's action toward themselves. They began quarreling promptly with China, which had claimed suzerainty over Korea for about three thousand years. They attacked China in 1894, defeated her surprisingly, and in 1895 compelled her to surrender all claims over Korea, to cede the island of Formosa, and to pay the whole cost of the war.

Daniel Crosby Greene, father of E. B. Greene who was professor of history in the University of Illinois for many years, wrote in 1895 that some Japanese expected to fight and defeat England within ten years; that they planned to take Hongkong and to replace the British in control of the Chinese customs service; and that Japan intended to become the mistress of the Pacific Ocean.

In 1899 the Englishman, Harold E. Gorst, said cautiously that many people

predict that Japan's ambition to become the Great Britain of the East will be realized within a measurable distance of time, and that her predominance in Asia will not only injure British trade but will prove a serious menace to her existence in the Pacific as a great Power.

Japanese dominance in Korea was delayed by the rival imperialism of Russia, but in 1904 Japan made a sudden attack on Russian holdings in the Far East, and again surprised the world by defeating Russia in every battle on land and sea. The Peace of Portsmouth in 1905 gave Japan predominance in Korea, control of the southern half of Manchuria, and ownership of the southern half of the island of Sakhalin. Within five years the Japanese extinguished completely the independence of Korea and incorporated that land as a part of Japan.

Soon after the outbreak of the Great War of 1914 to 1918, the Japanese attacked and took the German holdings at Kiaochow (freely violating Chinese neutrality). Early in 1915 they presented China with the famous "Twenty-one Demands," which included in the fifth group full control of Chinese army, police, and finances. At the time the Chinese were able to refuse this group of the demands.

At the Peace Conference of 1919 Japan demanded and obtained

from all governments except the Chinese a ratification of the transfer of all German rights in the province of Shantung to Japan. Also, the Japanese obtained the mandatory rights to most German islands north of the equator, with a total area about as large as Champaign county, spread over an expanse of ocean about as large as the United States.

About that time the Belgian professor, Augustin Hamon, wrote that "Japan is pursuing a policy of excluding the Occidental Powers from Asia, in order to bring China within her sphere of influence." He further said that Japan "has really remained in the Middle Ages as regards its moral civilization," but that China had "a pacific and industrious population, which has reached a stage of moral civilization far in advance of that of Japan, despite the European polish of the latter."

The keen and prophetic observation of Mr. H. M. Hyndman, written in 1919, might well have been heeded in this country:

Meanwhile, Japan has the lead in the Far East and seems likely to keep it. The majority of Englishmen and Americans have but a superficial idea of the possible spread of its influence in the near future (Various persons) believe that Japan is preparing, with the same relentless efficiency which she displayed in making ready for her campaigns against China and Russia, to deal with the United States when time and opportunity offer.

For most of the ten years, 1921 to 1931, Japan was controlled by a more moderate civilian group, who, while not devoid of imperialistic ambition, believed in proceeding by economic and scientific progress, and thus avoiding the losses and hatreds incurred by the forcible methods of the war party. In this time Japan agreed with other powers at the Washington Conference to let China work out her own governmental problems and to keep the capital warships of Japan within the proportion of three as against five each for Britain and the United States. A terrible earthquake in 1923 weakened and sobered the Japanese. They partook of the great apparent prosperity in the world from 1924 until the financial crash of 1929.

But in 1931 the Japanese militarists took a firm control of the government, and began the process of steady aggression which is continuing. The first phase was the seizure of Manchuria, beginning September 17, and maintained in spite of the adverse vote of the League of Nations. In 1932 they fought the Chinese at Shanghai but receded temporarily from there. In the next year they penetrated five provinces of North China. Then in 1937 they started actual war on China, which has continued until now. They pursued the fiction that it was not war, but an "incident." They claimed, with customary reversal of the facts, that they were working only for peace, which would come when they had "removed anti-Japanese elements," including the Chinese leader, Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek. By seizing forcibly ports, cities, railways, and districts they came to control

nearly half the population of China, both politically and economically. The Chinese were able to keep them away from the rest.

During 1940 and 1941 they obtained by forcible advance, diplomatic preparations, and skillful use of money, the superior authority in French Indo-China and the partnership of the government of Thailand, the former Siam. Thus the stage was set for the sudden and treacherous attack of December 7, 1941. Since then their aggressiveness has spread like a large blot of ink on a vast sheet of blotting-paper. In the first two months of war they took Hongkong, nearly all of the Philippines, and the Malay peninsula, and many positions in Borneo, Celebes, Amboina, and other islands of Oceania. At only two points was their advance slowed down, the Bataan peninsula where General MacArthur held out, and Singapore.

In the next stages of their imperialistic ambition the Japanese are known to desire all of the Dutch East Indies, Burma, the rest of China, Australia, and New Zealand. After that they have spoken of India, all of Russia in Asia, Iran, Iraq, and Saudi Arabia.

Until lately these and their further aims seemed to be fantastic, but now all must be taken seriously. They wish to own Hawaii, the Aleutian Islands, and Alaska. But this is not all: they have their eyes on the whole eastern shore of the Pacific Ocean—Western Canada, the United States to the Rocky Mountains, Mexico, Panama, and so on down; Chile they desire exceedingly because of its valuable natural resources.

All this brings the imperialistic ambition of Japan to include the control of nearly all of Asia, the island world, part of the Indian Ocean, all of the Pacific Ocean, and the western shores of North and South America: nearly half of the land, more than half the waters, and more than half the people of the world. If the Japanese were to realize this ambition, they would divide the world about equally with the Germans, and the two empires would then fight it out. But this is not to be: the power of Japan and the power of Germany will both be broken, and their imperialisms will be destroyed!

III.

The next great underlying cause of the War in the Far East consists in the Japanese justification for their imperialism. This has many phases, of which the chief ones will be considered.

The Japanese believe themselves to be the greatest people in the world. In such a delusion they are not alone; all great peoples believe that. But they and the Germans regard themselves as peoples divinely destined to rule others; they are lordly peoples, *Herrenvolk*, destined to guide or even hold in bondage the lesser peoples. The answer to this is to prove to them by all means, including superior force, that they cannot enslave the rest of the world. The terrible aspect of their

doctrine is that they believe whoever resists them to be a traitor and an infidel, deserving only death.

A more insistent argument, to which too many people have without sufficient thought agreed, is that the Japanese have a rapidly growing population for which they must have more land. This is similar to the German demand for *Lebensraum*, or living space. It is true that the Japanese have about 75,000,000 people in 147,000 square miles of homeland, a density about eleven times that of the United States, and that this number has been increasing by about one million per year. At the present rate of increase their number will reach 200 million before the year 2000. But growth of population does not give a right to take other people's land; in essence, that is the claim of the robber. The Japanese are not logical in their application of this claim; they want first of all to dominate China, much of which is more densely populated than Japan. If the Japanese claim be granted, they are entitled to Australia, which has a population only one two-hundredths as dense as that of Japan; or indeed, to the territory of the United States. But in fact, the Japanese do not wish to leave home except temporarily. They prefer to live in the temperate climate of their own beautiful islands; they wish to require other peoples to pay them tribute, and send them food and raw materials, so that they can crowd the Japanese islands further. The true answer to this demand is that the Japanese must restrict their own population, as indeed they did, too often by the cruel method of infanticide, until a few decades ago.

Again, the Japanese justify their brutal advance by the very contradictory claim that they have a mission of peace and order in the world. They talked of a "new order" in East Asia before Hitler spoke of a "new order" in Europe and Africa. They then described a "co-prosperity" sphere in "Greater East Asia." Their mission they conceived to be to set up forcibly a political and economic system to be dominated by themselves, but for the good of all. The Japanese will have the cream, but the other peoples will have so much skimmed milk that all should be eager to join; they will have better order, better education, better health, better transportation and communication, better food, clothing, and general well-being.

This aim may be illustrated by some brief quotations. Eiji Amau, spokesman of the Japanese Foreign Office, said in a famous declaration on April 18, 1934: "Owing to the special position of Japan in her relations with China . . . it must be realized that Japan is called upon to exert the utmost effort in carrying out her mission and in fulfilling her special responsibility in East Asia . . . to keep peace and order in East Asia."

A document of the Japanese Navy ministry in 1935 stated:

In view of Japan's geographical position, the powers should leave the maintenance of peace in the Orient in the hands of Japan, who is now

powerful enough to perform this duty. If the other powers fail to recognize the mission of Japan they may well be said to disobey the will of Heaven.

Prince Konoë, premier of Japan, stated Japan's basic policy in China and elsewhere as follows:

The Japanese government are resolved to carry on military operations for the complete extermination of the anti-Japanese Kuomintang regime, and at the same time to proceed with the work of establishing a new order in East Asia, together with those far-sighted Chinese who share our ideals and aspirations.

This belief in the mission of Japan has sometimes been called the Japanese "Monroe Doctrine." But it differs vitally from the genuine Monroe Doctrine. The likeness is in this, that both plans warn off third parties from the areas concerned. But whereas in the Americas the lesser states are left entirely free, in East Asia the Japanese use every device of fraud and force to subjugate the lesser peoples.

Again, the Japanese have justified their imperialism with the cry: "Asia for the Asiatics." Thus they cajole some Chinese, the peoples of Thailand and Burma, and some Filipinos. It cannot be denied that many Europeans and Americans have behaved badly toward the people of the Orient. Those Asiatics who have been brought under the rule of British, French, Germans, Russians, and the like, even though well-treated, have nevertheless resented the loss of liberty. Concealing for the time her attitude of superiority, Japan has stirred up anti-European feeling wherever possible. The slogan would more truly run: "Asia for the Japanese." Granting this, John Gunther's statement may be noted: "Japan has been ridding herself of westernization. She wishes to expel the westerners completely from eastern Asia."

IV.

Not least among the underlying causes of the War in the Far East is the Japanese tradition of militarism and victory in war.

The Japanese islands have never been conquered, except so to speak by themselves, about 2000 years ago. In the thirteenth century, with the help of storms, they beat off the Mongol invaders who had been successful almost everywhere else in the Old World. But among themselves, they were always warlike, being feudally organized even during the so-called "Great Peace," of 1640 to 1854.

Their characteristic ethical system is the Bushido, or "Way of the Warrior," which may be summed up in the tradition of absolute and utter loyalty to one's superior. Formerly each Japanese was loyal to a feudal lord above him. Now he is absolutely obedient in the army to the officer above him whose authority ascends to the divine emperor himself.

After 1854 the Choshu and Satsuma clans kept steadily alive the military and naval traditions. Beaten in the first few years by foreign

fighting men, these clans fell in with the idea of learning from westerners all that might be useful for Japan. They saw in western weapons, strategy, and tactics the only salvation of Japan from conquest by foreigners. Until now Choshu has provided Japan with generals and ministers of war while Satsuma has furnished admirals and ministers of the navy.

Although a civil government on a modified western model has existed since 1889, with a constitution, a prime minister and a cabinet, two houses of parliament, political parties, and a widening suffrage, nevertheless the army and navy have never obeyed the civil government. Since 1931 the war groups have fully controlled the civil government and the country's policies.

The series of wars since 1897 and especially the four and one-half years of constant war in China, have given to the Japanese army, navy, and air force such training as no other nation has had. The results are before our eyes in surprise attacks, in the skillful landing of troops from ship to shore, in land advances over all kinds of country, and in the constant intelligent use of the air arm. The Japanese have been open-minded research students in all things useful for war, beyond any other people except perhaps the Germans.

Some said in explanation of the attack of December 7 that having been defeated in China, the Japanese wished an honorable exit from war, which they might obtain by attacking great nations, expecting to be beaten by them. Some even went further, and said that as individual Japanese commit honorable suicide or *harakiri*, so the whole Japanese nation was doing. Such explanations of the war do not fit the facts. Let no one be deceived! The Japanese hope and expect to win! In 1894 and 1895 they attacked and beat China, 40 million against 400 million people. In 1904 and 1905 they attacked and beat Russia, 50 million against 150 million. Now they expect to beat us, 75 million against 135 million. It will not do to underestimate the Japanese. We must get ready most thoroughly. We must be prepared not only to lose Guam and the Philippines. We may have to sustain a fierce attack upon Seattle or San Francisco, with an attempt to land and establish a base for naval and air operations. Our salvation can only be in vast production of incomparable war machines, and the training of great numbers of our best men to use them successfully under all conditions.

V.

Another underlying cause of the War in the Far East is the Japanese desire to prove their racial equality. Actually this is one of their strongest motives in preparing for war and in fighting. It cannot be said to lack justification.

Americans are in the absurd position of legally recognizing the racial equality of all Africans and refusing to recognize the equality

of any Asiatics, whereas it is evident that in age and progress of civilization, in capacity to think, learn, and advance, not only are the average Asiatics clearly superior both physically and mentally to the average Africans, but they cannot be counted inferior to the average Europeans and Americans.

The people of color everywhere resent the haughty assumption of superiority by the so-called white race. As a matter of fact, nobody is really white; if one of us should suddenly become really white, he would hurry to see a doctor; there are so-called whites, as for instance many Arabs and Egyptians, who are blacker than many Africans. The Japanese wish no patronage from any whiter people, not even from their friends, the Germans.

Japan's victory over Russia in 1905—by the way, many Russians have skins far removed from white—marked a great date in the fortunes of western imperialists. From that time all peoples of color, in Asia, Africa, or where you will, have had new ambitions and energies toward proving their equality in body, mind, and spirit; or even in some cases their superiority. The Japanese publicist, Rui Kaito, wrote in 1935:

For over a century and a half the Asiatics have been pressed down by the whites and subjected to Western tyranny. But Japan, after defeating Russia, has aroused the sleeping Asiatics to shake off the Western tyranny and torture.

Within a month of their discreditable beginning of this war, the Japanese won as fighting men the respect of Americans and of the rest of the world as never before. When later they are beaten, they will perhaps count it sufficient gain to have proved in action their racial equality.

VI.

Another underlying cause of the Japanese aggression in the Far East was the success of other imperialisms in the world. These may be considered in two groups, older and newer.

The Japanese have had before their eyes in the Far East the older imperial possessions of England, France, Russia, the Dutch, and—so they think when they look at the Philippines—the Americans. Space may be taken here to emphasize only British imperialism.

The British Empire has been an example to Japan, primarily because from a group of islands of similar size and location at the other side of the Old World a power has gone forth sufficient to control a fourth of the land, a fourth of the peoples, and nearly all the waters of the earth. Within the area which Japan has come to call her own—"Greater East Asia"—the British have been holding India with its dense population; Australia with its vast area; large tracts like New Zealand, British Borneo, and Malaya; not merely Singapore at the corner of Asia, but Hongkong commanding the trade of South

China, and also concessions in Shanghai, Nanking, Hankow, and Tientsin; even for a time a saucy position at Wei-hai-wei, opposite Japan's hard won base at Port Arthur. And yet the English are little more than half as many as the home population of Japan!

If the English, believed by the Japanese to be indocile, conservative, leisure-loving, unsystematic, and even physically and spiritually decadent, could obtain and hold so much, what might not be done by the Japanese who count themselves open-minded, progressive, industrious, orderly, ever strengthening their bodies and sharpening their wits?

But what about the new empire of Hitler? Here also the Japanese find a model for imitation. Germany was beaten to her knees in 1918. She was deprived of the poor leavings which she had put together with great pains as colonial possessions. She was reduced in size at home, burdened with reparations, hindered in her trade, and restricted in her means of defense to a minimum. But Germany has been coming back under Hitler, by means which Japan is well-prepared to duplicate: a fierce militarism, unlimited personal devotion to the state, application of science to war without hindrance from tradition and blind pride, rigid and unified discipline from the cradle to the grave, a forward urge unhampered by moral restraint or altruistic inclination, uninhibited propaganda and espionage, and a capacity to produce and manipulate numberless cunning machines to move in and under the water, to crawl or run over the land, and to destroy unpityingly in and from the air.

In November, 1936, Japan joined with Mussolini and Hitler in the Anti-Comintern Pact, which professed to be aimed at the Communist idea, but actually was an evidence of common aggressive purpose aimed to despoil not only Russia, but the democratic powers as well.

In the spring of 1941 the Japanese foreign minister, Yusuke Matsuoka, renewed this pact, and ironically concluded a treaty of non-aggression with Soviet Russia. Whether he knew or not that within a few weeks Hitler would strike out fiercely against Stalin, one cannot at present say. But both Japan and Russia have in a way profited so far: Japan did not strike Russia from the other side; nor when Japan smote the United States, the British, and the Dutch, did Russia unleash her aircraft from Vladivostok against the stick and paper cities of Japan.

Another question which cannot be definitely answered now is whether Japan attacked on December 7 in collusion with Hitler, or strictly on her own account. Perhaps she was convinced that Hitler was on the eve of capturing Moscow, after which the Germans might move toward the oilfields of the Caucasus, Iraq, and Iran, while Japan might hope to join her across both southern and northern Asia. Again, even though Japan's attacks might be only moderately successful, they could be expected to draw strength away from the enemies of Germany in her Battles of England, of the Atlantic, and

of Libya. In any case Japan and Germany can be regarded only temporarily as friends, since in the longer view they are rivals for the control of the world, and thus are potential enemies.

Japan is in a very different position from Mussolini as regards Hitler. The Italian dictator has failed completely in Ethiopia, and has been rescued in Albania, Greece, and Libya only by German arms and men. His country is practically under German occupation, and Italian blood flows in Russia for Hitler and not at all for Mussolini. Japan carves for herself. She hopes to become so well-fortified in Asia that a successful Hitler could not dislodge her.

Thus both older and newer empires served Japan as models and incentives for her own imperialism.

VII.

Another underlying cause of Japan's forcible action is that she has been helped and strengthened negatively and even positively by those who are now her enemies.

The British, American, and Dutch governments have regularly allowed their citizens, unless expressly forbidden in time of actual or closely approaching war, to sell anything to anybody for profit. In this way the Japanese have been supplied with nearly all the materials they are now using in the war.

At intervals since 1931 and more frequently since Japan attacked China on July 7, 1937, the American government, through the Presidents, the secretaries of state, and other officials, has objected to Japan's aggression, and called attention to a proper course of conduct, in accordance with international law and specific treaties.

But the American government, so correct in its views, persistently shut its eyes to the state of aggressive war which Japan was making upon China, and permitted its citizens to sell to Japan vast quantities of war materials of many kinds, including especially millions of tons of scrap iron and steel and millions of barrels of petroleum products; this in spite of the fact that by all American tradition the aggressor should be discouraged, and a country which like China was defending its freedom against foreign conquest, should be assisted. A swift retribution has come upon us: we did not know (though a few of us suspected) that Japan was using only a minor portion of these materials in China, and was saving the major portion to be used against ourselves. Japan accepted, perhaps with inward amusement and scorn, our fatuous exchange of oil and iron for silk and gold. At the same time, she may be supposed to have stored up anger and vengefulness against our moral exhortations and our assumption of superiority.

Again, British and to a less extent American appeasers have more or less openly approved some of the Japanese advances. The story of the world's reaction to the Japanese aggression in Manchuria in 1931, where a small fire was kindled which now is roaring over the whole

world and threatening to burn up Western civilization, is most depressing. In a word, Japan was rebuked for her crime, but left in possession of the fruits of it. British and Americans mutually accused each other of failure to cooperate. British appeasers appear to have expected to divert the Japanese attention from Australia to the Asiatic continent. Some Englishmen and Frenchmen even hoped that if Japan should be allowed to take north China, Britain might be able to take central China, and France south China. One member of the League of Nations robbed another member; and the League investigated, reported, debated, disapproved, and left the robber in possession.

Some Americans in recent years encouraged Japan greatly by favoring a policy of "scuttle." That is to say, they recommended that the United States withdraw from the Philippine Islands, abandon their investments in the whole of eastern Asia, draw back to Hawaii, and rely on the Pacific Ocean and the providence of God for protection. Perhaps Ambassador William E. Castle held such a view when after the Naval Conference of 1930 he stated publicly:

What America must learn and can far more easily learn in this era of post-conference trust and good will is that just because Japan's interests here are vital, that just because Japan's trade with China is of paramount importance, Japan must and will be the guardian of peace in the Pacific.

Very different was the opinion of Paul V. McNutt, formerly American High Commissioner in the Philippines, as expressed on January 3, 1942:

The fall of Manila stands as an indictment of the international thinking of educated Americans. Puerile pacifism, fear of offending the Japanese we were arming for the attack, and fake economy kept us from making Wake, Guam, and Manila the impregnable fortresses they should have been.

Thus Japan has been incited toward and strengthened for aggression upon all her neighbors by some of those whom she now attacks and would despoil.

VIII.

Finally, one underlying cause of the war in the Far East is that Japan has mistakenly feared American imperialism.

Her own bellicose and predatory psychology has led her to attribute something similar to us. One cannot deny that some events might awaken her suspicions. As Professor Kenneth Latourette said in 1919:

In the course of a hundred years or so the United States had jumped the Mississippi river, crossed the Rockies, occupied the Pacific slope, and since Japan's war with China had spanned the Pacific, occupying Hawaii and the Philippines, and was seeking investment in Chinese mines and railways.

Now some Americans once thought of carrying the starry flag over the Western hemisphere, from the Arctic to the Antarctic Ocean, but I do not know of any who have wished to plant that flag in the Japanese Islands or on the Asiatic continent. The fortunes of the

Spanish war gave us the Philippine Islands, but we have solemnly agreed to let them go completely free in 1946. We have had commercial interests in China since colonial days, and missionary work since 1844. We acquired the Aleutian Islands in 1867, the Philippines in 1898, and Hawaii in 1900. In recent decades American business men have sold tobacco, sewing machines, phonographs, and petroleum products and have bought whatever China had to sell. Educators and philanthropists have staffed and endowed schools of various kinds. One may add that American business men and missionaries have worked with similar energy in Japan.

Actually, however, our westward movement of ownership practically stopped east of the broad Pacific Ocean, while our commercial, cultural, and religious interests were not thus limited. Perhaps the Japanese, with their claims of special economic interests in China and their nationalistic Shinto religion, have felt fully as much resentment against our peaceful penetration as though it had been political and territorial.

But Japan has wholly mistaken the character of the real American danger, which she has been building up through the decades. The world outlook of her militarists, with its forcible disregard of the rights of other peoples to freedom and self-rule, with its infinite brutality and nonmoral greed, with its totalitarian enslavement of even the Japanese people, and with its ingrained opposition to Christian principles, is wholly incompatible with the American world outlook. The two cannot co-exist on the same planet, now so much reduced in size by the internal combustion engine and the radio. Perhaps in a way the Japanese militarists had more foresight than we, when they prepared for all these years to fight us. But lacking more profound foresight, they have paved the way for their own destruction; they caused the conflict to seem inevitable and irreducible; one system or the other must go under.

IX.

In view of all this, the only sensible conclusion seems to be, for those whose hopes are fixed on a freer and more peaceful world, that this war, not desired nor initiated by us, must now go on, until Japanese imperialism is thoroughly beaten and destroyed. Japan must be pushed back from the Philippines, from the Dutch East Indies, from Malaya, from Indo-China, from all of China, from Manchuria, and even from Korea and Formosa since these are not inhabited by Japanese. All these peoples must be set free. (Ultimately, no doubt, they will be set free from European as well as from Japanese imperialism.) Then the air power—the air of the world is one unit; the naval power—the oceans and the seas are one unit; and ultimately the international land power of the world must be taken in hand by the United Nations, so that not Japan nor Germany nor any other aggressor can ever again rupture the peace of mankind.

WHAT IS TOTALITARIANISM?

by

Professor A. E. MURPHY

January 13, 1942

THE question propounded in the title is not merely rhetorical. By setting the topic as a problem those who arranged this convocation meant to suggest, I suspect, that there really is some doubt and some confusion among us as to the nature and implications of the "totalitarian" philosophy, and the aims and methods of the "totalitarian" states. "Totalitarianism" is a word of many syllables and more than one meaning. It stands, in its ordinary use, for something we mean to contrast sharply with the methods and aims of democracy, something which is profoundly hostile to our democratic faith and practice. But since it is a word of strong emotive content, it can also be used as an epithet to arouse honest but ill-defined animosity against governmental procedures that are both proper and necessary to the defense of democracy. In fact, like other abstract terms that combine emotive potency with vagueness of reference, it is a word to conjure with, and therefore peculiarly liable to misinterpretation. That does not mean that we ought not to use such words; quite the contrary. If we are to refer to long run aims and purposes at all, we must use terms that stand for principles and ideals, and it is altogether proper that our attitude to such ideals should be emotionally emphatic. If the time ever comes when men cease to care greatly for what the word "freedom" stands for, as an ideal in political organization, it will be a bad day for the human race. What it does mean is that we ought to take particular pains in such cases to make our words precise and our ideas clear, so that slogans and general terms will be reliable tools in thinking, not its masters, and so that our talk of "isms," aims, and ideas may lead to the shaping of comprehensive purposes, commonly understood, and to actions in which those purposes can find their reasonable satisfaction. It is this work of clarification, preliminary yet necessary for intelligent action, that I invite you, as cooperating members of the University community, to share with me this evening.

What, then, is totalitarianism? This is not, for our purposes, a problem of laying down a dictionary meaning for a word but of using the word in such a way that it accurately identifies something which is at present, and rightly, an object of our common concern. I shall use the term "totalitarian state" to designate the type of political organization now existing in Germany and Italy, and "totalitarianism" to refer to the ideology or philosophy in whose terms this sort of political organization is justified by its adherents. I take it that Japan shares the main characteristics which we shall be able to discern in this sort of state though it has not developed an "ism" to justify them which is comparable in its scope and pretensions with the Nazi and Fascist doctrines. Whether Russia is also in this sense a "totalitarian" state is a question we shall need to answer later. Finally, we shall have to

ask whether the democracies, in waging "total" war against their enemies, must themselves become "totalitarian"—in the sense in which the term applies to the Nazi and Fascist practice and ideology. But first we need to see what totalitarian organization, practice, and ideology are, in the instances where we can clearly identify them—those of the Axis powers opposed to us in the present war. It will then be time to ask what further applications of the term are consistent with this usage.

A totalitarian state is, first, an absolute or total state, and this totality of its scope and absoluteness of its power are best understood by considering it under three related aspects; first, in the relation of the existing government, the party in power, to other political interests and forces within the state; second, in the relation of the political state to the main non-political organizations within its boundaries; and third, in the relation of such a state to other states or nations. It is not the set-up of the "totalitarian" state in any one of these contexts, taken singly, but its combination of the three, that we shall find to be distinctive.

The totalitarian state, as Germany and Italy exemplify it and proclaim its doctrine, is first of all the one party state. There is no room in it for an opposition to persons or party in power which is not at the same time an attack upon the state itself. Those who oppose the persons in whose hands governmental power is concentrated are treated as enemies of the state. In such a state "his Majesty's loyal opposition" would be a contradiction in terms. The will of the community is held to be totally expressed in the decisions of the actual governing authorities, and the only alternative to acquiescence in the regime which the party in power embodies is rebellion against the state itself. Hence the contrast of the totalitarian system to those of Britain and America, in which it is legally and practically possible, when the voters desire it, to substitute one party in power for another and to remove leaders from office peaceably and with underlying good will on both sides for the political institutions which make this peaceable transfer of power possible. On this point the resemblance of the Nazi and Fascist principle to that of Soviet Russia is apparent. Each is an instance of a single-party state, denying political status to any opposition that would seek by legal means to alter the personnel of the government. It is obvious that such an elimination of political opposition and restraint makes for an impressive concentration of power in the hands of the existing government. It identifies the shared purposes of the members of the political community with the *de facto* will of its political leaders, leaving these leaders without political restraint or responsibility, save that which they choose to impose on themselves as the "spiritual" incarnation of the aspirations of the "Folk" or people. It is a matter of record that such restraint has, in the past, been slight.

Secondly, the totalitarian state is absolute and unlimited in its claims upon family, church, workers' organization, and every other sort of non-political social group within its territorial boundaries. For the defenders of this sort of absolutism, man is essentially a citizen or subject, his political allegiance is the primary fact of his social life, and all other loyalties must be put at the service of a government in whose commands the will of the state is fully and without qualification embodied. This does not merely mean that a man must be a good citizen as well as a good father, or Christian, or scientific researcher, and that his political loyalty may rightly, in times of national peril, be his paramount concern. It means that his non-political interests are essentially secondary to the political, and are legitimate only in so far as they contribute to the well-being of the state—as this is defined by the will of those in authority. There are no interests that transcend this political obligation, and none that are irrelevant to it. There must be a German Christianity, if there is to be any Christianity at all in Germany, and a religion that will not submit its conscience wholly to the political authorities is not, in principle, to be tolerated. If it is tolerated in fact, it is only because the authoritarian regime has not yet been able to reach its goal of reducing every social value to a tool of the political authorities. But there is no doubt about the end-in-view, it needs no discovery of secret documents to tell us that a government professing this faith is hostile to the Christian religion or, indeed, to any religion whatever that claims to reserve even a corner of a man's soul from total regimentation. There is now a racially purified science for Germans, and woe to those professors whose old-fashioned devotion to objective truth might tempt them to ignore its claims. The subordination of what elsewhere would be regarded as a normal and decent family life to the requirements of breeding for the state, the reshaping of the arts to serve the needs of national egotism, the grim reduction of every social value to its political and, finally, military equivalent, are not merely unhappy incidents in the political life of the totalitarian state, they are clear instances of the goal it sets itself and the principle on which it is bound to operate—"everything for the state, nothing against the state, nothing outside the state."

The totalitarian state is thus the explicit negation of what in this country we have prized as tolerance, the recognition of the right of men to differ in race, religion, and ideology, while maintaining a common political allegiance. This tolerance has often been misunderstood by our critics, set down as mere laxity or unconcern for other men's belief and behavior. And there can be no doubt that a very shrewd insight into the utility for government manipulation of rigidly imposed and fanatically held ideas about everything from truth, goodness, and God to the Aryan origins of culture is behind this new glorification of intolerance. To reduce all varieties of belief to a uniform "view of

life" pervading and dominating every aspect of social behavior is a considerable achievement. Such a view of life, as Hitler has told us, "demands dictatorially that it be acknowledged exclusively and completely and that the entire public life be completely readjusted according to its own views." Hitler admired this method of achieving social uniformity in Marxism and carried it over into his reconstitution of the German soul. "The nationalization of great masses can never take place by a weak emphasis upon a so-called objective viewpoint, but by a ruthless and fanatically one-sided orientation as to the goal to be aimed at." This method has been remarkably successful in molding the German people into a willing and efficient instrument of its leader's will. It carries a long step further that absolute concentration of power in the hands of irresponsible political leaders which is the aim of the totalitarian state.

On this point, again, the practice of Soviet Russia has been, on the whole, in harmony with that of its totalitarian neighbor. It was, indeed, the Communists who taught Hitler this sort of political tactic, though he also professes to find suggestions of it in early Christianity, and if he has bettered the instruction in intolerance, it is along a line that his predecessors had laid down.

We come now to the third aspect of this absolute concentration of irresponsible power which is the dominant characteristic of the totalitarian state. The individual exists for the state and must surrender every non-political value and human decency to its commands, but for what does the state exist? When men give up so much, what is it that they gain? If they are to lose their own souls, they ought at least to be promised that they will gain the whole world in return. And that, in fact, is what they have been promised. A state so organized, embodying the unified will of its superior racial consciousness in a political power unit of maximum efficiency, can become a wonder and terror to the nations of the world. Its racial "superiority," purified of extrinsic and debasing elements by its "folkish" leaders, will justify its claim to the dominating position on the international scene, and its power, or the threat of power, forcing the submission of its weaker or more pusillanimous rivals, will give the demonstration of its superiority. It is not that might makes right, exactly, nothing as clear as that—but that the inner sense of superiority enables its possessors to dispense with those scruples which would otherwise serve as impediments to the ruthlessly effective destruction of adversaries, while the effectiveness of this destruction happily confirms the inner sense of superiority and proves nature, which honors power and success, to have been on the side of national egotism. The totalitarian state claims to be absolute, then, in its capacity and intention to impose its will upon other and inferior states, and to use these as the instruments of its purpose and the servants of the higher culture which it alone

is qualified to establish. This is not a tactful doctrine and it has not been thought advisable to emphasize it on all occasions. There will be some nations with whom it is politic to cooperate temporarily on a basis of ostensible equality—brother Aryans, like the Japanese—and there will be others who ought not to be alarmed until their time for incorporation in the higher purpose has arrived. But these are measures of makeshift and expediency and the “higher” state is bound by them only so long as they serve as useful means to its widening power and domination. The principle of the arrangement is quite clear. The totalitarian state recognizes no limit, internal or external, political or moral, to its own appetite for power, and acknowledges nothing as good save in so far as it can be used to feed that appetite. It is justified in its own eyes, and in those of its followers, in so far as such power is actually achieved at the expense of rival states, thus confirming the sense of its own natural (racial) superiority. It seeks no other justification.

It is on this third point that the Soviet state differs significantly from Germany, Japan, and Italy. The goal it sets itself has been primarily the economic reorganization of its own country. And this, we are told, is to have its climax in the bringing in of a system of production in which the dictatorial state will no longer be required. We may smile at the optimism of those who suppose—following the Marxian model—that when the “dictatorship of the proletariat” has done its beneficent work the dictatorial state will “wither away,” leaving freedom and brotherly love in its place. Men do not normally gather grapes from thorns and unlimited political power has not usually been thus self-effacing. But the fact remains that the Soviet government has in the main used its power to bring about the internal reconstitution of its own country and that it has not in the main used that power as a threat to the safety of others save where, and sometimes with good reason, it felt its own boundaries to be threatened. It fights today a defensive war, and it has shown in waging it a level of internal cohesion and political morale which we rightly admire.

The totalitarianism of which Hitler and Mussolini are the spokesmen, on the other hand, has national prestige and dominance, at the expense of others labelled inferior and proved to be so to the extent to which it is possible to intimidate or enslave them, as its explicit goal and its measure of justification. All that the efficient creation and use of the tools of violence could give a nation shaken and demoralized by defeat in war and by economic insecurity, Hitler has given his people. They have surrendered much, as citizens and as men, to the power that rules their lives, but they have had their reward. Half of Europe has been looted of all that organized violence can snatch from weaker peoples, wounded national pride has been assuaged in a series of victories the like of which history has rarely recorded, and

even insecurity seemed for awhile to be banished in the triumph of the greatest military machine in the world. Those are the goods the totalitarian state can give, and is designed to give, to those who serve it.

All that I have said so far is meant to be a descriptive, factual report of the totalitarian doctrine. I have said nothing, I think, about these doctrines which their devotees do not at times proudly and emphatically profess to be true. Yet I have not concealed the fact that I find these doctrines profoundly repulsive—hostile, not merely incidentally but in their central animus and direction, to the values without which a life of human dignity cannot be lived. These doctrines, however, do not appear in such a light to their devotees. The surrender of individual conscience and judgment to the “leader” is regarded as a “noble” thing, a manifestation of “idealism,” of a regard for spiritual values which the selfishness and materialism of our democratic societies could hardly be expected to appreciate. And the glorification of the exercise of power, or organized violence, as the true measure of the superiority of those whom God and Nature have marked for mastery, is perfectly sincere in many, at least, who profess it. If we are to understand totalitarianism, as an ideology, then, we must look behind the political doctrines themselves to the underlying preconceptions and wishes which lend those doctrines their plausibility.

It may seem at first surprising that the attitude of subservience to *de facto* political power, exercised by irresponsible political leaders in the name of national and racial superiority, should be described as “idealistic.” But Hitler himself has explained the sense that “idealism” has in this usage. Idealism he tells us is “only the individual’s ability to sacrifice himself for the community, for his fellow-citizens.” It is a peculiarly Aryan attitude, and fully in harmony with the nature of things. For “as true idealism is nothing but subjecting the individual’s life and interest to the community, and as this again represents the presumptions of any kind of creative organizing forms, therefore in its very heart it corresponds to the ultimate will of nature. Idealism alone leads men to the voluntary acknowledgment of the privilege of force and strength and thus makes them become a dust particle of that order which forms and shapes the entire universe. Purest idealism is unconsciously deepest knowledge.”

This is rather heavy going philosophically, and would require the remarkable powers of Dr. Rosenberg, officially designated director of *Weltanschauung* for the Third Reich, for its full elucidation. But it contains one phrase of startling clarity: “the voluntary acknowledgment of the privilege of force and strength.” It is this which “idealism” is alleged to achieve, and the process is sufficiently remarkable to warrant further inspection. To lick the boots of power is a nasty habit at best, but to do it soulfully, idealistically, with a vicarious thrill at the prowess of the bully and one’s own “inner” identity with the

success of the bullying, is morally repulsive. Yet this is in fact what "idealism" comes to when the totalitarian transformation is made complete. For the idealist subordinates himself freely and heroically to "the community" and the community is the state and the will of the state is the will of its leader, and the goal of the state is that arbitrary exercise of power in which the inevitable law of nature—the "right" or "privilege" of the stronger—is made manifest. The free man's self-sacrifice for a common good will then become the "folkish" man's acknowledgment of the "privilege" of power. There is a familiar proverb which tells us that the corruption of the best is the worst. It seems peculiarly applicable in this instance.

Yet this doctrine would not have had the success it has enjoyed unless it appealed to something insistent in human nature. There are many who have been forced to accept it against their wills, but there are many others who have heard it gladly, who have made haste to prostrate themselves before there was any need or occasion for so doing, who have gloried in their subservience. Hitler has claimed to represent the will of the German people, and it is by no means clear that he has not done so. It is a will expressed in submission, not in responsible self-determination, that compensates for individual frustration and insecurity in mass or national and racial egotism, that can escape from bewilderment and personal defeat into the all-embracing arms of irresponsible power and therein be satisfied. We need not look to Germany for an instance of it. The look I saw on the faces of a crowd in Vienna watching the bullying of some helpless Jews in the early days of the Anschluss has been duplicated, I suppose, in more than one race riot in the United States. It is the distinction of Hitler that he has known how to organize that mean spirit latent in all of us as an instrument of political power and has given it the honorable name of idealism.

The totalitarian faith seems, therefore, to be more substantially based than we might at first have supposed. It does not ask for approval by our standards of morality—it has its own. It does not ask us to love it, or even to understand it. On the contrary it finds in animosity or "creative enmity" directed against ourselves and all we stand for a unifying basis for its own internal cohesion. It does claim, however, and with a measure of truth, to be sanctioned by something in human nature itself, something that is deeper than reason and more insistent than moral persuasion—by the will to power of people united by a sense of racial superiority and solidarity against alien and inferior rivals, people who, as Hitler said, "detest being dragged into majorities—detest being pestered with projects—who yearn for a direction in which they can believe and nothing more," and have found that direction in the aggressive prowess of their national government.

Insofar as a state can be unified by fear, national egotism, and

greed, the totalitarian state, where its concentration of power is efficient as well as ruthless and its use of that power effective, can be a unity, not merely of force, but of will and purpose—the will that can be satisfied by individual submergence in the leader's prowess and can find in its vicarious share in the arbitrary exercise of national power the sufficient means of its self-expression. Such power has its rewards, for those who honor it, and the totalitarian state is an amazing concentration of power. And if life, as Nietzsche tried to teach us, is essentially will to power, and mastery in the struggle the sufficient demonstration of superiority, what more is there to say? What answer are we to make to such a claim?

In the first place we may observe that on the level of power itself the estimate of totalitarian success has perhaps been premature. Men will fight well in fanatical devotion to a leader in whose person their frustrated egos find satisfying expression, but they will also fight for other things—for their homes, as the Russians have fought since their country was invaded, or for their self-respect as the Serbs fought (and are still fighting) when they were told that they must acknowledge the privilege of force and strength and were not convinced. And it may even be, as Socrates argued long ago, that men and nations that keep their word and are prepared to live with others in terms of mutual respect for order and law are stronger than their enemies, for there can be a harmony among them that endures, while the showy force of arbitrary violence is, in the long run, self-destructive. That is something that must be proved, on the level of stamina, staying-power, and concerted effort, and our own country will have its part in that proof.

Meanwhile it will be instructive to see how consistently the apostles of violence are willing to accept the verdict of the natural superiority of power when the battle begins to go against them. So far there has been a marked tendency on the part of those who scorn the rules when they are breaking them, to cry out to heaven that they have been fouled when their opponent lands a blow—an intimation, perhaps, that their advertised ruthlessness is borrowed less from the "noble" beasts of prey whom they profess to emulate than from the all-too-human gutter quarrels and street brawls in which their movement had its inception. Power in itself is ethically neutral. It can be used by violent and ambitious men to destroy all that stands in the way of their appetite for personal prestige and national aggrandizement. It can also be used by normally peaceable but determined men to make secure the conditions of a free and self-respecting life. It has not yet been shown, and I think it will not be, that a society organized for power in the first sense has a greater staying power than one which follows the model of the second.

But it is not enough, if we are to justify our faith against its totali-

tarian critics, that we should win this war. It needs further to be shown, not by argument but in a practical demonstration, that the concentration of effort required for victory can be attained without resorting to totalitarian methods, that total war—and nothing less will suffice to meet the present danger—need not be totalitarian war. There is a specious case for the opposite point of view. For war brings us nearest to the sort of situation in which the slogan "everything for the state, nothing outside the state" comes nearest to making sense. In time of war, or the threat of it, a man may reasonably be asked to be—not all citizen, as the totalitarian would make him—but a citizen first of all, subordinating his other interests, in the face of the immediate danger, to the defense of his country. Hence there were moral defeatists who were telling us, just a few months ago, that a democracy could not defend itself without being transformed into the likeness of the thing it opposed, and that in a war for the defense of freedom, freedom itself would be the first casualty. We knew then that they need not be right—there was the example of Britain to prove it—and we are determined now that they shall not be right as prophets of America's war behavior. But since there has been much loose thinking and loose talk on this subject it is desirable to say plainly in what way the concentrated effort of a democracy embarked on total war differs from a totalitarian state.

It differs, first, in the extent to which unity of purpose and action results from cooperation, not compulsion, from the willing sacrifice of free men for an end they judge to be worth the cost of securing it. No man is asked to sacrifice his religion, or what he knows for true, or the decencies of family life, for the greater glory of the nation and its leaders. He is asked not to sacrifice these but to give his labor, his comfort, and if need be his life, for the sake of these, to the end that free men may return, with security and self respect, to the enjoyment of these and other goods when the power that has wiped them out in half the world has been eliminated. The difference, in theory and in practice, is not a slight one.

It differs, second, insofar as the agents in whose hands power has been placed are removable, even during the period of the war, legally and by peaceable means, whenever the qualified voters, working through guaranteed legal channels, care to remove them. It is not power to act, which any effective government must possess, but politically irresponsible power which is a menace to freedom. So long as power remains in the hands of those whom the voters have placed in office, and can be withdrawn at their decision, the state is not totalitarian in the sense in which Germany, Japan, and Italy are so. And this difference is fundamental.

Thirdly, it differs in the end to which it is directed. It is the essence of totalitarianism that it attempts to treat the crisis condition of

war, or the immediate threat of it, as the normal and desirable situation in the relation of citizens to the state and of states to each other. Its advertised "new order" is nothing but old and familiar dictatorship, with military prowess guaranteeing to the superior race all that force and fear can extort, and the fighting ceasing only when the vanquished have so fully acknowledged the "privilege of force and strength" that the threat of violence will serve as a substitute for the exercise of it. It is the avowed aim, on the contrary, of our own country and some of its Allies, to make secure an order in which nations can live as good neighbors and in which the economic and political chaos that bred the disease of Hitlerism will not recur. To wage war for the sake of peace has seemed to some men a curiously paradoxical proposal. Yet it is now the plain necessity of the case. For we have learned that peace, on the level of freedom and self-respect, does not come by wishing or fervent declarations of intention to offend no one, especially not those whose avowed aims threaten our national existence. Peace rests on foundations that must be built, on security and mutual respect, foundations that will not be made firm until not only the present threat to our liberties but the causes that brought that threat into being have been removed.

I come then to what seems to me the final and conclusive answer to the totalitarian claim. But it is not an easy answer, nor one that can point to an accomplished fact for its verification. The totalitarian claim rests, as we saw, on an estimate of human nature to which the totalitarian state and methods are held to be peculiarly suited. It tells us that men do not want to be free, that their will can be satisfied by a leader who gains for them, through the morally unrestrained exercise of power, all that national egotism and avarice can desire. It tells us further that those who cannot be persuaded by what it promises can be intimidated or wiped out, so that a state thus governed can become, in a short time, a conquering expression of military and political power. And we know that its practice to a considerable degree has verified its pronouncement. Is this, then, what human nature is like after all? Yes, sometimes and under some conditions. Where men are bewildered and afraid, where the breakdown of old standards has left them without faith even in their own integrity, they will find release from fear and satisfaction for their pride in just such an "order" as this. Nor need we suppose that only Germans, Japanese, or Italians are liable to this spiritual disease. There, but for the grace of God and the great good fortune of our geographical, economic, and political situation, go we, or any other people. Human nature is not a simple thing nor in all respects a lovely one. The virtues on which democratic government is premised make a high demand on human behavior. That men will exercise good judgment and manifest good will in their political relations, that they are willing to accept responsibility for what they

do and to make freely the decisions in terms of which they can live well and justly together, is an assumption not always and everywhere true. It represents a possibility for good in human nature, actualized more or less and under favorable conditions. We have been able to enjoy a good measure of democracy in this country, though not enough as yet to give us an excuse to be self-righteous about it, or complacently at ease in Zion. We had thought, at an earlier stage, that the advancement of knowledge and economic well-being would conveniently and without much trouble bring all other nations to a like happy state. We know now that we were wrong. The struggle to "make the world safe for democracy" is a longer and more bitter one than we had believed and the end, decidedly, is not yet. Yet President Wilson's words, which have occasioned much cynical amusement in the last 20 years, have a ring of authenticity, of sober realism, today, that cannot be denied. "The world must be *made* safe for democracy," or it will never be safe for peace and decency and human happiness. And to make it safe is to construct an order, economic, political, and moral, among the nations of the world in which the forces that gave rise to totalitarianism will not again be let loose upon us because men will not again be reduced to a level on which a Hitler can in fact be their spokesman and express their will. The answer to totalitarianism, finally, is the construction of an ordered society in which its cynical assumptions about human behavior will be false, where they are only partly false today in the chaotic world we live in. To believe that totalitarianism is wrong about what human life is, and can become, is to believe that we have the resources in stamina, intelligence, and good will to build the society in which democracy can be safe because men and nations accept the responsibility of their freedom.

Nothing more than this is required to justify the democratic faith. For it is this order that commands the human will when it has a chance to express itself without fear and to know its purpose clearly. Compared with the order of human happiness which such a society can secure, the mindless violence of the totalitarian ideal is seen for what it is—"a fever and not a faith," the dreary imagining of twisted and unhappy souls who have never understood what life is, and can become, when it ceases to be violent and fulfills itself in art and knowledge and human friendship, the goods which violence has never had at its command and never will. It is this fulfillment of life that political freedom must make possible, this generous development of human capacity, not as the privilege of a master race or a political or economic elite, but as the shared concern of all of us "standing with free men on a soil that's free." It needs no other or higher justification.

Yet if nothing more than this is required for the long run justification of our cause, nothing less will suffice, and that will be a hard saying for many. The lesson Faust learned only at the end of his

life many of our brighter contemporaries have never learned at all. Yet it is profoundly true and pertinent at this time.

This word high-throning Wisdom knows for true,
That only he deserves his life, his freedom,
Who wins them every day anew.

We had been assured that the last war had made democracy safe for us at least, and we were bitterly disillusioned when we found that this was not the case. As a result of mistakes then made and of the collapse of all international order to which they contributed, we find ourselves today fighting again to protect the very rudiments of a decent civilization against the enemy that has come so near to destroying it.

It is not an easy time to talk of ideals, and of new building, and of a better world that is to be. We heard all that before, and look at us now. Yet the cynicism of this easy disillusionment is hardly less sophomoric than the earlier optimism against which it protests. We must have known very little of the sluggishness and greediness and stupidity of the human animal if we supposed that the battle for freedom would not have to be fought again, and many times—not always with the same weapons, perhaps, or on the same fronts, but against the same enemy, greed and arrogance and fear, and with many defeats and disappointments. Yet it is the glory of the constructive forces in human life, not that they have ever triumphed completely, or ever will, but that in the face of failure and cynicism, the collapse of old assurances, and the disappointment of long held hopes, they go on building, in art and knowledge and just social relationships, the goods in which life is justified and made complete. If that be "idealism"—and it is assuredly not the Hitlerian variety—it is the idealism of the earth itself that after many winters blooms again and is alive and beautiful. If totalitarianism is wrong, it is because there are still forces in human nature that can grow and build like that, and can shape life reasonably to fulfill the good of which it is capable. I believe that there are such forces, and I hope that you believe it too, and are prepared both in this war and the peace that is to follow to act on that belief.

WHAT IS DEMOCRACY?

by

Professor ERNEST BERNBAUM

January 15, 1942

IN THE twenty-five years of my service in the University of Illinois, I have not been asked to undertake a task more difficult, or more welcome, than the one I shall try to perform this evening. Several members of our Faculty are better qualified to explain the meaning of Democracy than I am, and they would give you a more learned explanation.

One reason why I thank the University for having assigned me this difficult subject is that I am the first of my family to be born in the United States. My father, then a young Danish sea-captain, sailed his vessel, in which he owned a half-interest, into New York harbor ninety years ago. He became a Captain in the Federal Navy, and fought in the decisive battle of Fort Fisher. In the service of his adopted land, he lost his health, his property, and (owing to the prostration of our mercantile marine after that war) his occupation. Yet never did I hear from him any regret or complaint. In the last talk I had with him before his death, he said, "My son, for fifty years I have sailed the seven seas. I have lived in all the great ports of nearly all the nations of the world. I am glad and proud that I became an American citizen. My Commander-in-Chief, Mr. Lincoln, was the best captain of a ship-of-state in a big storm that any crew ever had. My boy, there is more liberty and more kind fellowship in this country than anywhere else—more even than in my own Denmark and in that fine country England. My boy, if you ever get a chance to repay what this country has done for me and you, do it as well as you can and as hard as you can!" "More liberty and more fellowship." When he wrote "fellowship," he spelled it with one "l" and no "w," but he knew what it meant. My father died penniless, yet I treasure his last words more than great possessions. If I were not sustained by memory of them, I could not attempt to answer the question: "What is Democracy?"

Democracy is an even higher concept than national patriotism. Patriotism was manifested recently when Joe Louis, risking his championship, before the battle donated his possible winnings to the Navy Relief Service. He was asked: "Joe, are you doing this for nothing?" He replied, "No, I ain't doin' it for nothin'. I'se doin' it for ma country!" We applaud that sentiment and action, and honor the man who feels it, but we crave an even deeper reason for our allegiance than nationalism.

What is Democracy? Consult the dictionaries, and you will be informed that Democracy is "government by the people, government in which the supreme power is retained by the people, and exercised by representation," "delegated authority periodically renewed," "the rule of the majority, the minority being protected against abuses of that rule, by the guarantees of the Bill of Rights," and "everyone being

protected against the tyranny of the Executive, or the Legislature, or the Courts, by a system of checks and balances." These definitions are clear, they are true as far as they go; but they do not go far enough and deep enough. They miss some features of Democracy that you and I are willing to die for—and, what is sometimes harder, willing to live for.

A dictionary can successfully define certain types of things—such as a triangle; or a pistol, shotgun, and rifle; or a butcher, baker, and candlestick-maker; in other words, mathematical concepts, mechanical things, practical occupations. But as soon as you rise into levels of being which involve complex vital, emotional, intellectual, and spiritual elements, your dictionary is likely to fail you. It can only partly suggest the full meaning of such words as "consciousness," "love," and "virtue." Look at Webster's definition of "man,"—"the male human being, an adult male person." That does not get us very far into the mystery of human nature. We prefer Shakespeare's attempt:

What a piece of work is man! How noble in reason! How infinite in faculty! In form and moving how express and admirable! In action how like an angel! In apprehension how like a god! And yet, to me what is this quintessence of dust?

We prefer Pope's:

A being, darkly wise, and rudely great,
 He hangs between; in doubt to act, or rest;
 In doubt to deem himself a god, or beast;
 In doubt his mind or body to prefer;
 Born but to die, and reas'ning but to err;
 Great lord of all things, yet a prey to all;
 Sole judge of truth, in endless error hurl'd:
 The glory, jest, and riddle of the world!

Webster does even worse with "woman," defined as "pertaining to the sex that bears offspring, an adult female person," which seems to leave some essential things unsaid. We prefer Wordsworth's:

A spirit, yet a woman too!
 A creature not too bright or good
 For human nature's daily food
 A being breathing thoughtful breath,
 A traveller between life and death;
 The reason firm, the temperate will,
 Endurance, foresight, strength, and skill;
 A perfect woman, nobly planned,
 To warn, to comfort, and command:
 And yet a spirit still, and bright
 With something of angelic light!

In whatever concerns human life, the poets are better interpreters than are the lexicographers, who may grasp the tangible and the formal but whom the vital eludes.

Even our greatest statesmen, when they fall into a legalistic vein, may prove disappointing; e. g., Jefferson when he terms Democracy "acquiescence in the decisions of the majority," and Lincoln when he calls it "a majority held in restraint by constitutional checks." The statements are true, but they do not disclose the essence of Democracy. They define our methods, but not our aims. They describe the skeleton, but not the body in its full throbbing vitality. And it is Democracy in this fuller sense that we crave a better understanding of. In this hour when Democracy is imperilled we do not want to be like the vague-minded young man who, when asked to state what his religion was, declared it was that of his fathers; and, when asked what their religion was, could only reply that he wasn't quite sure, but it was something very solemn. We seek something that is positive, without being narrow and formal. As educated men and women, we seek to *clarify* our faith, in the hope thereby to strengthen it.

To the gradual understanding of the full meaning of Democracy contributions have been made not only by political scientists and statesmen but also by philosophers, divines, poets, men of letters, and even (I hope I shall not shock some of my grave and reverend colleagues by adding these) by humorists. I venture to maintain that if we are truly to appreciate the nature of Democracy, we need a sense of humor as unflinching as Abraham Lincoln's and Mark Twain's; and I believe that our ability to understand and love it suffered a considerable loss when Will Rogers died. Our way of life is often comical; and to understand ourselves we should keep aware of that. The totalitarian states take themselves with fanatical seriousness, like the inmates of insane asylums; but that has never been our way.

For authentic interpretations of Democracy we look on the one hand to leaders like Cromwell, Burke, Washington, Jefferson, Hamilton, Lincoln, and Woodrow Wilson; and on the other to inspirers like Bishop Hooker, John Milton, Rousseau, Wordsworth, Emerson, Thoreau, Walt Whitman, and Mark Twain. Men of letters have largely helped to form and transmit our traditions; hence Wordsworth's lines:

We must be free or die, who speak the tongue
That Shakespeare spoke; the faith and morals hold
Which Milton held.

More than a sense of fact, more than insight into the present, is needed to comprehend Democracy. Imagination is also necessary, and memories of our long past, upon which may rest strong faith in our future.

Democracy is a certain vital relationship between human beings—a relationship which originated in an idea (or ideal), and which has developed through a long course of historical experiences. Its essential character, being ideal, is permanent; but its manifestations, being temporal and local, are richly varied and never stationary.

Thoroughly to comprehend the meaning of Democracy, it would be necessary to study

1. its definable permanent traits
2. its origins or roots
3. its formal constitutions and institutions
4. its history
5. its impress upon the personal character of its citizens
6. its economic and social successes and failures
7. its ultimate aims and objects—local, national, and international.

Such a study would require a long and elaborate series of lectures. Here I can pursue only a few of these pathways a very short distance.

The permanent traits of the democratic outlook on life are many, and probably to each of us some one of those traits is especially dear. After this lecture was announced I received a postcard, reading:

Dear Prof. BERNBAUM:

I believe that democracy is man's noblest political expression of his attempt to justify a faith in human nature.

What do you believe?

A STUDENT

I heartily agree that that is *one* of the permanent characteristics of Democracy. (The only thing that struck me as not quite democratic about that card was that it was anonymous.) Certainly "Trust your Fellowman" is a democratic motto.

Another permanent democratic ideal is self-reliance. The true democrat prefers freedom, though threatened with privation and danger, to security and prosperity bestowed by benevolent despotism. American literature is insistent upon the value of an out-and-out individualism. Hear Emerson:

If the single man plant himself indomitably on his instincts, and there abide, the huge world will come around to him.

Whoso would be a man must be a non-conformist.

Hear Walt Whitman:

What do you suppose will satisfy the soul—except to walk free and own no superior?

They are echoed by Squire Perkins to-day, saying:

No two fellows is alike, an' both of 'em is glad of it!

Faith in one's fellowman, self-reliance, and individualism are not the only permanent traits of Democracy; but they are probably the most important.

The tap-root of Democracy is Christianity. A religion which declared the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, was sooner or later bound to result in democratic political and social relationships. "The Bible," said Daniel Webster,

is a book of faith, and a book of doctrine, and a book of morals, and a book of religion, of special revelation from God; but it is also a book which teaches man his own individual responsibility, his own dignity, and his equality with his fellow-man.

Even the agnostic Huxley admitted that the Scriptures were "the Magna Charta of the poor and the oppressed." It does not astonish us to hear the Nazis call the Sermon on the Mount "the first Bolshevist Manifesto." We recall that William Penn observed: "Men must be governed by God, or they will be ruled by tyrants." President Roosevelt, in his address of January 6, 1942, re-affirmed an age-old article of our American faith when he said: "We are inspired by a faith which goes back through all the years to the first chapter of the Book of Genesis: 'God created man in his own image'." To the man of religion, Democracy is thus based upon eternal foundations.

But not all of our fellow-citizens are men of religion, and we should not evade that fact. Hence it is of high importance to realize that to modern men of science there is no disharmony between Democracy on the one hand and the constitution of our physical universe on the other. There are two outstanding features in the life of Nature. First, Nature encourages variation and individualization to the utmost. It detests duplicates. Among thousands of snowflakes, or grains of sand, or leaves of huge trees, you will find no two that are exactly alike. As Mendel showed long ago, the proverbial expression "as like as two peas in a pod" is silly. Secondly, Nature has for ages been developing systems of co-operation and interdependence between different forms of life. Such co-operation—which the biologists call symbiosis—is familiar to us in the relationships between flowers, birds, and insects; and between mistletoe and maple-tree. It is far more extensive than commonly realized; indeed, in one symbiotic way or another, all organisms are part of a vast web of life. Professor Alfred E. Emerson of the University of Chicago, in his presidential address before the Ecological Society of America, recently said:

The principle of co-operation is found working in all living organisms, and is far more important in the evolution of human society than is the struggle for existence between human individuals or human groups. Over-emphasis upon the principle of natural selection proposed by Darwin, and failure to keep abreast of later scientific concepts, are responsible for the persistence of this over-simplified, over-sanguinary outlook.

Democracy, which fosters both individualization and co-operation, is accordingly to the man of science not an artificial theory which we seek to impose upon Nature against its will, but rather an outgrowth of life itself. Whether you are a man of religion, or a man of science, or happily both, you must conclude that Democracy is a system of human relationships based upon permanent and universal laws which no merely human power can abrogate.

This relationship, Democracy, though it is rooted in ancient foundations, we shall not thoroughly understand unless we bear in mind that it is a *developing* relationship, one which has a confused and turbulent history behind it, marked with many successes and many failures, with moments of hope and moments of dejection (though, on the whole, with a predominance of confident aspiration). Democracy is an ideal with a history of attempted realizations. "It is always in the process of *becoming*, aiming at giving more and more reality to the ideal of equality and the best life for all." The magnetic pull of the future—what Aristotle would call its final cause—affects it strongly. As Wordsworth says,

Through love, through hope, and faith's transcendent dower,
We feel that we are greater than we know.

Democracy did not spring, full-grown and panoplied, from the head of any of our founding fathers. It is not a *fait accompli* of our past. In its beginnings it was in large part merely a desire, an aspiration. Perhaps that is why James Truslow Adams calls it "the American dream;" though I myself, since the word "dream" suggests something unreal and unrealizable, prefer to call it "the American vision." First our Democracy needed independence, and Washington won it; then it needed sufficient power to grow, and Jefferson, through the Louisiana purchase, secured that. Thereafter, down to our own times, it has needed the progressive application of its avowed ideals to all aspects of life—political, economic, and social—at home and abroad. And much of that is yet to be.

Anyone who assumes that we became a real democracy immediately upon attaining independence, should read studies like Charles A. Barker's "Background of the Revolution in Maryland." To be sure, the *forms* of Democracy were then politically established; but in other respects the colonies remained aristocracies in which unequal advantages were conferred by birth, ownership of landed property, or wealth of any kind. As Dr. Barker says, "the idea of democracy in any full sense did not dawn on colonial Maryland." Thomas Jefferson himself did not believe that everything had been satisfactorily established for good and all by the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States. He was keenly aware that undemocratic systems and attitudes of mind lived on after 1789. In his "Notes on Virginia," he courageously denounced slavery as a vicious institution, depraving master as well as slave, and flagrantly inconsistent with our professed belief that liberty was a natural right as well as a right sanctioned by God. "Indeed," he added, with apprehensive foresight, "I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just."

Our undemocratic treatment of the Negro has not been much worse than our treatment of the Indians and of various economically underprivileged groups. The workings of pride and greed and inhumanity

have furnished many dark pages in our history. The sentimental democrat may try to ignore these ugly facts about our past; let him beware lest, suddenly awakening to their truth, he may swing to the opposite extreme, fall into cynical despair, and think the attainment of democracy impossible. The true Democrat will honestly admit the grave imperfections and injustices in our past and present. Recollecting them, he will sometimes feel humiliated and sorrowful; but he will not lose his faith that penitent confession may evoke inspiration from above and renewed resolve. In the words of Kipling:

Still stands Thine ancient sacrifice,
An humble and a contrite heart

If, drunk with sight of power, we loose
Wild tongues that have not Thee in awe,
Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet,
Lest we forget—lest we forget!

For heathen heart that puts her trust
In reeking tube and iron shard,
All valiant dust that builds on dust,
And guarding, calls not thee to guard,
For frantic boast and foolish word—
Thy mercy on Thy People, Lord!

Since I have thus confessed the failure of Democracy to attain as yet its ultimate objects, I may perhaps be allowed to record some of its successes. In material affairs these, as everybody admits, have been astounding. Under our democratic system of free enterprise, we have become the wealthiest people in the world. Being only seven per-cent of the world's population, and occupying only six per-cent of the globe, we own forty-five per-cent of its riches. Fourteen million of our families occupy houses owned by themselves; 38,500,000 of us carry life insurance; and 44,500,000 have savings accounts. Seventy per-cent of all the automobiles in the world are ours.

Among us wealth is more evenly distributed than elsewhere. The wages of the American worker have increased fourfold during the past century, and his hours of work have been reduced from an average of sixty hours a week to forty. More than two-thirds of our national income is disbursed in wages and salaries. In America one hour's wages can buy seven times as much food as in Soviet Russia, and two-and-a-half times as much as in Great Britain.

Nine times as many American children are now going to high school as went one hundred years ago. More American boys and girls are going to college than in all of the rest of the world. The health of our people was never better; the death-rate from formerly dangerous diseases has greatly fallen. Even if Democracy were to be judged only by these material, economic, and educational results, I believe

that, despite its admitted errors, any fair-minded tribunal would pronounce it on the whole successful.

But there is something else—in my opinion, of at least equal value—to be thrown into the scale; namely, the effects of a democratic way of life upon our personal and social characteristics. The democratic spirit fosters informality, neighborliness, and friendliness. It means less reserve and suspicion between the old and the young. It means teachers who are less concerned about standing on their dignity and laying down dogmatic laws than about inviting frank and fearless inquiries. It means cordiality towards strangers. It means lending a helping hand, without condescension, to any fellowman in time of need. It makes against the feeling that one kind of occupation is far superior to another. Anyone who renders honest and competent service of any sort is to be respected: the banker is not to feel himself greatly superior to his postman, his iceman, his grocery-boy, or his barber. But the finest result which Democracy has achieved in the improvement of human intercourse has been the radical change which it has gradually brought about in the attitudes of men and women towards each other. There has arisen among us a more wholesome and happier relationship between young men and young women, between older men and older women, than anywhere else in the world. It is characterized by complete equality, happy comradeship, utter sincerity—by a minimizing of pretense, slyness, coquetry, and maneuvering; and yet it is a feeling which does not necessarily exclude mutual admiration or even loyalty unto death. The grandeur of our Constitution and Bill of Rights is imposing; but in my opinion an equally precious result of Democracy is found in the kindlier and more humane attitudes of men, women, and children towards one another.

I should be untrue to my New England nurture if I did not mention another effect of a genuinely democratic way of life. When Tolstoy, said “there is no greatness without sincerity and simplicity,” he struck this chord. Abraham Lincoln was an incarnation of that truth. Sincerity, simplicity, and, I should add, frugality, are integral features of the democratic character. Democracy has no greater enemy than ostentatious luxury. If all our fellow citizens are to have equal opportunity to acquire their fair share of our resources, wasteful extravagance is wanton wickedness. Hence we applaud Wordsworth’s protest that “getting and spending we lay waste our powers,” and his summons to return “to homefelt pleasures and to gentle scenes.” The association of a simple, economical way of life is deeply ingrained in our traditions. One of the most typical of Americans, Henry Thoreau, said, “Beware of all enterprises that require new clothes!” When I quoted that sentence to the lady who is my best and severest critic, she remarked, “Then nobody could get married.” It seemed to me a womanish reaction to a rugged manly thought, but I could only reply

that Thoreau would not have considered her inference a necessary one. In Concord frugality was practiced, not because it was always necessary, but because it was righteous. While Ralph Waldo Emerson was hitching his wagon to a star, the admirable Mrs. Ralph Waldo was guiding her household according to the following three rules, the recollection of which may be useful in the days which now confront us: Eat it up—Make it do—Wear it out. These counsels to avoid waste of any kind *for the sake of the common welfare* seem to me an essential part of the principles of democracy.

Democracy gives its citizens so much, and forces from them in return so comparatively little, that patriotism should among us be spontaneous. If we fully realized our true position, our loyalty would be far deeper than that of the subjects of totalitarian rulers. In 1790 George Washington expressed the attitude of our government as follows:

The government of the United States, which gives to bigotry no sanction—to persecution no assistance—requires only that they who live under its protection should demean themselves as good citizens in giving it on all occasions their effectual support.

None had a better right than he to expect his fellow citizens to stand ready to serve, for he had always stood ready. During the Revolution he had for good strategic reasons stationed a part of his army in New York and Pennsylvania, and the rest of his forces in the Carolinas and Georgia. Suddenly he and Thomas Jefferson, then Governor of Virginia, were assailed by frantic demands from Virginian landowners, who pointed out that their estates were exposed to raids by the British, and who demanded that the Virginian regiments should be called home. To both Washington and Jefferson their estates were their largest and dearest possessions. But the owner of Mt. Vernon refused to yield to the demands; likewise he of Monticello. To them, the general interests, not the personal or local, were supreme. When they had signed the Declaration of Independence, they had pledged to the cause "our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor." Observe that it was not their fortunes, their estates, which they termed sacred, but their honor—by which they meant their fidelity at any cost to the dictates of conscience, to the pledged word, and to the avowed principles. They had faith in Democracy, they understood it, they were grateful for it; and thus they inevitably became exemplars of patriotism.

Since ingratitude is probably the commonest of the meaner vices, Democracy is often disappointed by the lukewarmness or disloyalty of those who should be its supporters. Conversely, its most valued servants are those in whom the sense of gratitude is strongest, whose generous spirit is like Wordsworth's

Give all thou canst; high Heaven rejects the lore
Of nicely calculated less or more.

Recently Professor Albert Einstein became a citizen of the United States (whereupon the national intelligence-quotient rose perceptibly). He is so supreme in intellectual power that no one in our time could have a better excuse for feeling proud and self-sufficient. Yet he is reported as remarking: "Every day of my life I remind myself that all I am and all I know I owe to the labors and sacrifices of my teachers and of others who went before me." Such sentiments are the true and inexhaustible source of patriotism, and Democracy should foster them in all ways possible. Remember that Americans have died for you and yours at Pearl Harbor and in the Philippines; but remember too that thousands of Americans have *lived* for you and yours for generations. Inspired by this sense of obligation, no sacrifice that Democracy calls upon you to make will seem too great. In the words of Swinburne:

That which was weak shall be strong,
That which was cold shall take fire,
That which was bitter be sweet.

The memory of our past is, however, not the only source of our high resolve; faith in our future is another. Our enemies wish us to believe that though Democracy may have formerly served a purpose, it is now antiquated, and that theirs is the wave of the future. We retort that Democracy is not falling behind the times, but advancing with them. It meets the crucial test that only living things can meet: it is still growing. By that test it was never more alive than it is to-day. In our domestic affairs its basic principles have been applied to many new problems, and extended to innumerable new domains. In foreign affairs, democracies have found it necessary for their survival to enter into international agreements wider in scope than even Woodrow Wilson contemplated, and to expand the aims of Democracy into reaches that our predecessors hardly envisaged. The Atlantic Charter, our covenants with the other American republics, the speeches of Roosevelt and Churchill, the bold statement of objectives as wide as "establishing and securing freedom of speech, freedom of religion, *freedom from want*, and *freedom from fear everywhere in the world*," and "maintaining the *security of the peace* that is to come"—all show that Democracy is wide awake in a changing world, that Democracy is on the march. It has not altered its essential ideals, but it is applying them to new circumstances with a resolute determination that thus they shall survive.