

The American Political Science Review

VOL. XXXV

FEBRUARY, 1941

NO. 1

REFLECTIONS ON THE "WORLD REVOLUTION" OF 1940*

ROBERT C. BROOKS

Swarthmore College

I

So controversial is the subject of this address—"Reflections on the 'World Revolution' of 1940"—that a few words of justification are in order. You may be assured that it was not chosen without considerable thought and trepidation. To begin with, I made a study of the addresses of my thirty-four predecessors, as presented in the pages of the *AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE REVIEW*. Without exception, these papers impressed me as wise, scholarly, finely stated, and cogently argued. Occasionally they were lightened by the lambent play of humor. On the other hand, several of them were decidedly dry—a quality less refreshing in discourses than in wines. Many of my predecessors dealt penetratingly and profoundly with topics taken from the fields of specialization wherein they were masters, often the greatest of American masters. Others discussed broadly and philosophically the nature of political science, its relations to the social sciences in general, or the problems encountered in teaching this science.

Of course so brief a summary cannot do justice to the almost infinite variety of materials presented by past presidents of our Association. There was, however, one type of subject which as a rule they avoided—that of contemporary, controversial political affairs. Even during the years of the First World War and immediately thereafter, this proved to be the case with only one or two exceptions. No doubt the motive which prompted most of my predecessors to avoid issues of the day was a sound one. Dignified

* Presidential address delivered before the American Political Science Association at its thirty-sixth annual meeting, Chicago, Illinois, December 28, 1940.

presidents of the American Political Science Association (and if they were not dignified, how did they come to be elected to that high office?) should concern themselves with truths eternal, not with the fustian and the rattle of commonplace, partisan squabbles.

If the topic of the present discourse thus breaks with precedent, the justification must be that the year under consideration has brought forth most unusual, even world-shattering, events. These events constitute a challenge to every citizen, particularly to every political scientist. We of the Association could not escape them if we would. Literally, they have forced themselves into the center of our thought by day and by night, thrusting other matters aside; nor is it too much to say that they have profoundly modified our basic conceptions during the critical later half of this fateful twelvemonth. Indeed one might inquire: What else is there to talk about so long as we confront this riddle of the political Sphinx under the injunction: "Answer or die"? Admitted that the topic of this address is too vast for adequate discussion in one short address. Obviously no one can now speak with finality upon it: the events which 1940 brought forth are too close to us. In their leisurely fashion, historians will be engaged for the next half-century accounting for some of these events, the downfall of the Third French Republic for example. Political scientists, however, live for the most part in the here and now. Consequently, to the limit of their powers, they are obliged to attempt a working interpretation of world conditions. Furthermore, both as citizens and as teachers they must act upon that interpretation.

II

One query remains in my mind regarding the title chosen for this address; hence the ironic quotation marks surrounding the words "World Revolution."¹ Usage stemming from authorities so diverse as Rauschnig and Roosevelt may justify the use of that phrase.² On the other hand, revolt must be successful before it becomes revolution, whereas so far—thanks to Britain's sturdy re-

¹ Edmund Burke might have raised the same question, but did not, when in 1790 he published his famous *Reflections on the Revolution in France*. If a definition of revolution in the political sense be desired, the following is hazarded: A political revolution is the sudden overthrow of one type of government and the setting up of a distinctly different type in its place, by violence or the threat of violence coming largely from internal sources.

² H. Rauschnig, *The Revolution of Nihilism; Warning to the West* (1939); Franklin D. Roosevelt's speech, July 19, 1940, quoted later in the text.

sistance—Herr Hitler is not master of Europe. It is true that he has overthrown eight or nine governments; but the violence (or threat of violence) which brought about their downfall was applied from the outside, rather than from the inside. If the external pressure which has created the new régimes in the occupied territory were relaxed, in all probability they would collapse promptly. Certainly then it may be questioned whether so good a word as "revolution" deserves the ignoble use to which it is now being put by Nazi apologists. To be sure, there was a revolution, perhaps two revolutions, in Russia during the single year 1917. The upsets that occurred in Italy in 1922 and in Germany in 1933 also probably deserve that designation. But so far as Germany and Italy are now concerned, the process upon which they are engaged is not so much a revolution as a war of conquest pure and simple, accompanied by demands for the surrender and break-up of empires, for the annexation of weaker states, for the seizure not only of territory but of private property as well, for the abolition of all the political rights of citizens of the vanquished countries—in short, demands for *Lebensraum*, demands utterly without fixed limits, political or economic. That process, known as "total war," is veneered only to the thinnest possible degree by revolutionary theory; in particular, the use of the word "socialist" as part of the title of the dominant one-party system in the Third Reich is utterly misleading. Moreover, this alleged "world revolution" is in no sense new or forward-looking; on the contrary, it harks back to the most primitive of all political conceptions, dominance supported by the *Führerprinzip* inside, domination by violence everywhere outside. "It is a revolution," as President Franklin D. Roosevelt has so aptly characterized it, "imposed by force of arms which threatens all men everywhere. It is a revolution which proposes not to set men free but to reduce them to slavery." In the last analysis, choice of terms is left to the members of this Association. Call what is going on in Europe "world revolution" if you will, but remember that it presents all the outward aspects of a gigantic plundering expedition, perhaps the most vicious and sordid that has been attempted in the history of mankind.

III

With regard to the method of treating a topic which is so highly controversial, you must not anticipate from me that cool detach-

ment usually expected from, but not always exhibited by, those who are called scientists. No matter how judicial we may seek to be in dealing with absolutism, it is worth recalling that many political philosophers of the past have reached adverse conclusions on the subject. How could it have been otherwise? Being not only philosophers, hence attached to the principles of truth, justice, and humanity, but also men and citizens of strong, independent convictions, it was inevitable that they should mingle sharp sarcasm with blunt condemnation in their reflections upon despotism. Plato, poet as well as philosopher, was outspoken, even vitriolic, in his references to the petty tyrants who frequently dominated Greek city states. To him, they were the most depraved of men, moral as well as political perverts; the cities under their control he considered the most miserable of cities. Catholic in his treatment of the subject, Aristotle was perhaps less caustic; nevertheless his characterization of the baser type of tyrant was factual and complete, also because of its restraint somewhat more effective.³ Machiavelli, who was a realist rather than a philosopher, is popularly considered to have been an apologist for despotism. And indeed many pages of *The Prince*, uncritically read, lend themselves to such an interpretation. It must not be forgotten, however, that the author of that brief work, immortal as it is and deserves to be, had been a devoted servant of the Republic of Florence and was at heart a sincere republican. At the time, Machiavelli found himself unemployed because of the return to power of the Medicean tyrants. To state the matter frankly, then, *The Prince* is a somewhat servile application for a job under the new régime in Florence, therefore unlikely to include anything displeasing to the magnificent Lorenzo or to his ilk. Nevertheless, Machiavelli does not hesitate to condemn those "who have obtained a principality by wickedness."

³ Aristotle's great tolerance is revealed in his dictum (*The Politics*, translated by William Ellis, Bk. III, ch. ix) that "in all disputes upon government each party says something that is just." Unfortunately, however, this provides neither for quantitative measurement nor for consideration of the negative as well as of the positive factor involved. To illustrate: we must all repeat with Aristotle the phrase "something that is just," but the question immediately rises: How much of what a given party to any dispute upon government says is just? The next question, involving the negative factor—certainly a much more pertinent one in the case of a party arguing in favor of dictatorship—must be: How much of what it says is unjust? My own estimate based upon long reading of the apologists for totalitarianism would be that they say less than five per cent that is just and more than ninety-five per cent—perhaps exactly 99 44/100—that is unjust.

In words strongly suggestive of the methods of contemporary dictators, he concludes his discussion of these unsavory personages as follows: "It cannot be called talent to slay fellow-citizens, to deceive friends, to be without faith, without mercy, without religion: such methods may gain empire but not glory."

Prior to the advent of modern democracy, no political thinker was more bitter in his condemnation of despotism than Montesquieu. "We cannot mention these monstrous governments without horror," he observes—a sentiment which finds expression in every passage he devotes to the subject. "The principle of despotic government is subject to continual corruption, because it is even in its nature corrupt. . . . A government cannot be unjust without having hands to exercise its injustice. Now it is impossible but that those hands will be grasping for themselves. The embezzling of the public money is therefore natural in despotic states."⁴ Thus Montesquieu saw clearly both the injustice and the corruption, which no matter how they try to conceal them, are as characteristic of contemporary dictatorships as of the "monstrous governments" he had in mind.

What these citations prove (and they might have been multiplied indefinitely)⁵ is that philosophic detachment does not go the length

⁴ *The Spirit of the Laws*, Bk. III, ch. 10; Bk. VIII, ch. 10; Bk. V, ch. 15. Two other passages are also pertinent: "A despotic government does all the mischief to itself that could be committed by a cruel enemy, whose arms it were unable to resist" (Bk. IX, ch. 4); and "when the savages of Louisiana are desirous of fruit, they cut down the tree to the root, and gather the fruit. This is an emblem of despotic government." These last two sentences constitute the whole of Chapter 13, Book V, which is one of the shortest in a great book of mercifully short chapters. Doubtless Montesquieu made it thus brief for purposes of emphasis. What he said therein came true for France after the fall of Napoleon. It will be true of Germany after the fall of Hitler.

⁵ Rousseau's writing, for example, is one long protest against despotism. Characteristic is the following passage from *The Origin of Inequality*: "It is from the midst of . . . disorder and . . . revolutions, that despotism, gradually raising up its hideous head and devouring everything that remained sound and untainted in any part of the State, would at length trample on both the laws and the people, and establish itself on the ruins of the republic. . . . At length the monster would swallow up everything, and the people would no longer have either chiefs or laws, but only tyrants. From this moment there would be no question of virtue or morality; for despotism *cui ex honesto nulla est spes*, wherever it prevails, admits no other master; it no sooner speaks than probity and duty lose their weight and blind obedience is the only virtue which slaves can still practice." And Locke, in his *Second Treatise of Government*, ch. xv, writes: "despotic power . . . is a power which neither Nature gives, . . . nor compact can convey. . . . Absolute dominion, however placed, is so far from being one kind of civil society that it is as inconsistent with it as slavery is with property."

of ignoring or minimizing the defects of any type of government, despotism included. No matter how successful it may be temporarily, no matter how weak or unsuccessful its opponents, the assumption clearly is that there are other factors which must be taken into account. Truth, justice, humane conduct, may be "imponderables," but they weigh heavily in the scales of philosophic appraisal. One of the grossest errors committed by the dictators of today is their open and blatant contempt for these imponderables. As a result, no one can trust them, neither friends nor enemies, neither their citizens nor foreigners; least of all can they trust each other. They even ignore Machiavelli's sage and cynical advice that "while it is unnecessary for a prince to have all the good qualities I have enumerated—it is very necessary to appear to have them."⁶

IV

How, then, have the events of 1940, particularly the military successes of Hitler, affected popular thinking on contemporary despotism? Manifestly in two principal ways: first, estimates of the strength of democratic institutions have been weakened; second, estimates of the power of dictatorships have been exaggerated. As to the former, we can scarcely plead surprise. The defects of democracy, both economic and political, have long been under consideration by American political scientists. Indeed, in all probability we overemphasized them. Yet there was enough to give us pause. To illustrate, what must Montesquieu (now, of course, looking down from the battlements of heaven upon this assemblage) think of his American children? With approbation, to be sure, in so far as we accepted his limited principle of separation of powers, of check and balance. With apprehension, certainly, because of the extremes to which we have carried that principle. For not only did we incorporate it in our federal government; we employed it also in state and municipal governments, to such an extent indeed that often the boss and his machine became necessary to make the latter loose-jointed structures work. Our federal system introduced another area of friction; today forty-eight state governments check and balance the national government. In party politics alone have we shown a measure of restraint; at least we avoided the multi-party systems formerly characteristic of continental Europe.

⁶ *The Prince*, ch. xviii. The good qualities referred to are mercy, faithfulness, humane feeling, uprightness, and religion.

Taking American political structures as a whole, it is not at all strange that they operate with "celerity contempered by cunctation," as Governor Pennypacker quaintly phrased it, emphasis normally being placed on "cunctation" rather than on "celerity."

In the economic and social life of the country, a development roughly similar to that of separation of powers, check and balance, has been carried to an even greater extreme. Although class antagonism, class struggle, have been phrases of ill-repute among us, Madison frankly recognized their existence in the pages of *The Federalist*.⁷ That they have persisted ever since, sometimes flaring up in outbreaks of violence, every reader of American history is aware. Regional differences have always been with us. Regions themselves are more numerous than most of us are inclined to admit.⁸ Racial antagonisms also persist. Abolition of the privilege of slavery cost us a devastating civil war. But the Negro problem survived abolition, bringing forth the black disgrace of lynching which, fortunately, now seems to be disappearing. What Madison called the "moneyed" interest has possessed a high degree of cohesiveness from the start; nevertheless it found itself in a minority politically in 1932, 1936, and 1940. The increasingly sharp confrontation between "haves" and "have nots" which characterized the campaigns of these years is far from being resolved. Recently the forces of organized labor have permitted themselves resort to every measure short of war—civil war, that is—as between the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations. Of religious sects, the country boasts some two hundred and thirteen sufficiently large to be counted for census purposes, to say nothing of innumerable sectlets as noisy as they are insignificant. With the intent, not of building a Tower of Babel, but rather of acquiring canals, railroads, and skyscrapers as rapidly as possible, we held our doors open to floods of immigrants from their first coming more than a century ago to the passage of the quota acts of the 1920's.

⁷ "The most common and durable source of factions has been the various and unequal distribution of property. . . . A landed interest, a manufacturing interest, a mercantile interest, a moneyed interest, with many lesser interests, grow up of necessity in civilized nations, and divide them into different classes, actuated by different sentiments and views." *The Federalist*, No. X (Nov. 23, 1787).

⁸ According to an eminent economic geographer, the continent has no fewer than forty-five "economic, or human-use, regions," of which all except seven are wholly or partly under the sovereignty of the United States. Some of these regions are larger than Germany, some as small as Belgium. Cf. J. Russell Smith and M. Ogden Phillips, *North America: Its People and Resources* (1940 ed.)

The canals, railroads, and skyscrapers were delivered promptly, but during the First World War disloyal activities carried on by minorities among the foreign-born embarrassed us seriously. Thanks to Herr Hitler's numerous and breath-taking improvements in the fine art of Fifth Columnism, we are likely to be much more seriously embarrassed by similar alien activities if we are drawn into the present conflict. Today Communists and Bundists, few in number but potent in capacities for mischief, attempt to stir up dissension among us in the hope that it may redound to the benefit of their respective fatherlands. Closely related to this difficulty, the last decade has been prolific of demagogues: Huey Long, Father Coughlin, Grandfather Townsend, and innumerable lesser figures of that ilk.

As if check and balance between groups, political, economic, and social, were not enough, we must cope also with the whimsies and aberrations of some fifty million voters, each a "sovereign." Many of our "sovereigns" are politically illiterate, but they are none the less cocksure on public issues because of their lack of information. Among this element, propaganda frequently makes intoxicated lions out of meek guinea-pigs. Nearly all our "sovereigns" are largely engrossed with their private interests; paraphrasing Shaw's bitter aphorism, we may say that to them, food, clothing, sex, and other forms of recreation come first; religion is a remote second; the interests of organized society as a whole are nowhere. Considering these innumerable divisions and antagonisms of American life, it is evident that while in practice our national motto, *E Pluribus Unum*, leaves much to be desired so far as "*Unum*" is concerned, it is wildly exaggerated on the side of "*Pluribus*."

Contrasted with streamlined dictatorships—especially streamlined on the military side—how inchoate, contradictory, and soft our American democracy appears to be! To build a military machine out of such disparate materials is a task comparable to the building of a new firmament over the earth. Yet such a machine was built, first in 1860 and again in 1917: if need be, it can be built again. From a civilian angle, no matter how great the conflicts in our American life, that life is the *milieu* from which we sprang; it is the basic material upon which we as political scientists must work professionally. Let us give thanks that while it has the defects of its qualities, these same qualities are of priceless value. Nowhere upon earth is there so great a reservoir of individual energy, of

individual skill. Instead of one *Führer* surrounded by a small coterie of "big shots," we have scores of thousands of leaders, great and small, in every line of human adventure. Nowhere upon earth is there so great a reservoir of good will, of belief in progress, of hope for the future. With all its defects, America possesses both the energy and the idealism which may bring forth a life worthy of free men, upon which may be erected a truly great civilization. Even if totalitarianism conquers the world, it can offer humanity nothing more than the rule of force, with hundreds of millions of men reduced to slavery, with civilization dying of paralysis as the wills of individuals are broken and subjugated to the sway of the omnipotent state.

As noted above, the second marked consequence of the events of 1940 has been a considerably enhanced estimate of the strength of dictatorships. It would be fatal to underestimate that strength. We are not likely to do so now; it would be far better with us if we had recognized it earlier, as did President Franklin D. Roosevelt in his Quarantine speech at Chicago on October 5, 1937. On the other hand, perhaps we rate too highly certain phases of the power of Hitler, Mussolini, and their confederates. Thus, in the case of the *Führer's* power, it is clearly based upon the rigid subjection for seven years of all German interests to the sole end of military might. Immense exactions were demanded of the people in achieving this end; the broad liberties granted them by the Weimar Constitution were ruthlessly destroyed; propaganda and terror became major instruments of policy. Worst of all, fiendish injustices were practised against Jews, Socialists, Liberals, Democrats, pacifists, and others. Nevertheless, the end—the creation of stark overwhelming and military power—was attained, power sufficient not only to wipe out half a dozen small neighbor nations but also to overwhelm France in a campaign of forty-three days. Candor compels the recognition that behind Nazi Germany's conquests there were other motives of slightly higher character than mere lust for power and booty. Certain elements of the population were moved by nationalist feeling; others by belief in some sort of "world revolution." Nothing succeeds like success, a maxim particularly true of military success. Victory so far has no doubt strengthened Hitler's popular following, adding for the time being to the number of those who support him voluntarily or only *der Noth gehorchend, nicht dem eig'nen Trieb*. Whatever the motives of the "heiling" con-

tingent, the fact remains that a colossus has been erected so mighty that it threatens to bestride the narrow world. Now it is of the nature of such power that it cannot be reasoned with; appeasement merely whets its appetite for more. There is only *one* answer to it, the answer given during the First World War by a former President of this Association, then President of the United States, in ringing words that may soon become our rallying-cry again:

“Germany has once more said that force, and force alone, shall decide whether Justice and Peace shall reign in the affairs of men, whether Right as America conceives it, or Dominion as she conceives it, shall determine the Destinies of Mankind. There is, therefore, but one response possible from us: Force, Force to the utmost, Force without stint or limit, the righteous and triumphant Force which shall make Right the law of the World, and cast every selfish dominion down in the dust.”⁹

V

Prudence dictates, however, that for the time being we must direct our attention to the strength of dictatorship rather than to its weaknesses. Not until Hitler and his associates have been overthrown will this consideration lose its force. On the other hand, it is worth while even now to examine some of the defects of the dictatorial establishments. Powerful as they appear to be militarily, there are, of course, limits to that power. To regard Nazi Germany, for example, as both omnipotent and invulnerable is to be guilty of gross error, an error that can lead only to defeatism on our part. Further, we must recognize clearly that there are dictatorships and dictatorships. Of the lot, Hitler's Germany alone gives the impression of any real vision, determination, and fighting spirit; there is something of the leonine as well as of the lupine about it. In the international menagerie, Russia and Italy are jackals, second and third class jackals at that. If the *Führer* wins the present war, both are doomed to become his vassals. As for Italian soldiers, the chief distinction which they won during the First World War was that of being champion long-distance runners—witness Caporetto. Three years ago they renewed their claim to this distinction at Guadalajara in Spain; and only last month in Greece, although hampered by snow and mud on mountain roads, they nevertheless displayed conspicuous celerity in reaching—and distancing—their

⁹ Liberty Loan Address by Woodrow Wilson, Baltimore, Md., Apr. 6, 1918.

rear-guard outposts. It is quite in keeping with the national character, therefore, that the Italian navy should have been built for speed above all else. On the other hand, Russian soldiers once knew how to fight. Napoleon Bonaparte found that out; they proved it in the Crimean War, and again during the First World War. Since September of last year, however, they have been engaged largely in mopping up the crumbs that fell from the *Führer's* table. In the disastrous, even if finally successful, campaign waged against diminutive Finland, the Red Army exhibited a stupidity, inefficiency, and lack of spirit that reflect discredit upon the whole Communist régime. No one doubts now—probably not even Joseph Stalin himself—that in the event of a Nazi victory in the west the Russian bear will soon become Hitler's meat. As for the ambitious and somewhat conceited Japanese, they are lucky in their geographical isolation, also in the fact that those who might set a limit to their designs are busy elsewhere for the time being. Even so, with their resources strained to the utmost after three years of frantic effort, they have not been lucky enough to overcome the vast inchoate Chinese people.

Various conclusions may be drawn from the foregoing. First, Hitler is the keystone of the arch of despotism. If Germany had remained under the Weimar Constitution, it is not unlikely that both Mussolini and Stalin would have been on their way out long before this. Even now, were Hitlerism to be overthrown, it is probable that they would soon cease to be menaces of any real consequence. The same is true of Japan, which turned totalitarian last July—as if that could increase its capacity for mischief. Second although morally as guilty as Germany and many times more contemptible, both Russia and Italy are accomplices, not the principal, in the present assault upon Western civilization. Hence, as opportunity offers, every effort should be made, every possible bribe be offered, to detach them from their alliance with Hitler. Recent events indicate that Italy in particular may soon be softened up sufficiently by bombing raids to induce her to betray the Axis—that famous "band of steal." Third, since Nazi Germany is the sole really effective totalitarian state, its overthrow should be the one great desideratum of democratic world politics. Nothing should be allowed to obscure that end. It was the tragic, nay criminal, blunder of Neville Chamberlain that he did not perceive this fact, that he believed in the possibility of gaining concessions from the

insatiable Hitler by a policy of appeasement. For Britain, the consequences of this blunder have been tragic beyond all reckoning. Fortunately, in Winston Churchill a prime minister has been found who knows how to keep his eye on the ball. Let us hope that the President of the United States will follow his example. Incredible as it may seem under such conditions, there are still said to be some appeasers on this side of the Atlantic, gentlemen willing to make a neat little loan—five billion dollars is the figure most frequently mentioned—to Germany as soon as her victory over Europe is complete. This, it is assumed, will soften any ill-feeling Hitler might cherish against us because of our earlier mistaken sympathies for the Allies. Also, poor fellow, he would need the money to buy our goods wherewith to repair the ravages of war and to feed the starving German people. Of course, once the loan were made, we would be too polite to inquire how much of it was spent, not for butter but for guns, the latter to be used against the United States. If political scientists cannot scotch so obviously ruinous a policy, one may well despair of the future of our profession. What is far worse, one would have to despair of the future of free government.

The essential characteristic of totalitarian policy, then, is to subordinate everything to the creation of maximum military power. Behind the imposing façade of armed might which they are thus able to exhibit to the outside world there are abundant evidences of decay and disintegration. Taking Nazi Germany as distinctly the best organized of these régimes, the assertion is widely heralded by Dr. Goebbels and his propaganda machine that every worker in that country has a job. With their free trade unions smashed, these workers not only have jobs; they also have the privilege of working longer hours at lower real wages than ever before. A large proportion of them are engaged in making munitions; many others have been drafted for forced labor and for military service. As a result of these conditions, food production has fallen off sharply within the Third Reich; meanwhile the British navy has clamped down hard on shipments from overseas. Except for soldiers and party workers, under-nourishment is universal; the diseases that follow in its wake are rapidly gaining ground and output per worker has reached new lows. Latterly, the semi-famine conditions endured by the German laboring class have been made bearable only by the theft of food from conquered territories; a large-scale slaughter of cattle and poultry is going on in

Denmark, Norway, and the Low Countries. The German army and party members must be fed well; German workers may fare somewhat better than the serfs imported from Poland and Czechoslovakia, but otherwise stark famine impends throughout the "New Europe" that Hitler is so hastily throwing together.

Of course, as we all know—having been told it so many times by *Facts In Review*—the Nazis are terribly efficient. "Terribly" is the right word in this connection, no one can doubt it; but one must doubt whether efficiency of their sort has any real foundation or can be kept up for any considerable period of time without constantly repeated conquests. What they are now practising, as the Germans themselves used to say in an earlier and saner day, is simply *Raubbau*—that is, an economy that grasps at the largest immediate returns, meanwhile destroying future sources of production.¹⁰ Germany's show of overwhelming military might rests, therefore, upon a rotten foundation. If her forces in the field should receive a single serious set-back, it is probable that the whole crazy jerry-built structure at home would begin to disintegrate. The ensuing débâcle is likely to be far more rapid and complete than at the end of the First World War. All of which emphasizes the duty resting upon us to aid to the utmost in the final thrust that will send Hitlerism crashing to ruin.

VI

Whatever may be said as to its genesis, background, or probable duration, the existence of superior military power, here and now, is a large and massive fact. To refer to it scornfully as mere physical strength, pure brute force, is futile. For it may be set down as one of the oldest truisms of politics that superior physical force, ruthlessly wielded, overcomes, for the time being at least, all opposition, whether by physical or other forces, or by both of these combined. The careers of the great conquerors of history—of Alexander, of Julius Caesar, of Attila, of Genghis Khan, of Tamerlane, of Napoleon Bonaparte—illustrate this truism. Somewhat quizzically, Rousseau stated it as follows: "To yield to force is an act of necessity, not of will—at the most, an act of prudence. . . . 'Obey the powers that be.' If this means yield to force, it is a good pre-

¹⁰ As Peter F. Drucker trenchantly put it, the aim of Nazi economic policy was "to convert the enormous German inferiority in man power and resources into at least temporary superiority." See his article, "War Against the Middle Classes" in the *Saturday Evening Post*, Aug. 10, 1940.

cept, but superfluous: I can answer for its never being violated."¹¹

Superfluous the precept may be, as Rousseau declared. In carrying it further, one runs the risk of being accused of "elucidating the obvious." Even that risk is justified, however, when, after abundant elucidation, large numbers of otherwise intelligent persons refuse to take the steps made inescapable by that which is demonstrably obvious. Turning to a consideration of the situation which confronts us, it makes no difference for the time being—although it may in the long run—that the chief wielder of superior physical force is fanatical, criminal, even contemptible, in most of his personal qualities. In all these respects he resembles other conquerors, who, like all large-scale butchers, have been of distinctly sub-human type. Further, it makes no difference for the time being if the form of government or the type of social system for which the wielder of superior power fights is abhorrent morally, repugnant to deep human instincts, and diametrically opposed to the long-run interests of the race. Like the highwayman, he has the gun and the drop on his victim. The latter may count himself lucky if he is allowed to hand over his purse and to escape with anything less than the loss of his life.

It is not meant to be implied that Herr Hitler is a highwayman, nothing more. Even if that were his proper and exclusive rating, however, with superior physical force at his disposal, he would have been able to overcome the seven small and one great neighbor nations now at his mercy. The fact that other than purely military elements contributed to his victories, such as German science and technology, centralized administration, the one-party system, propaganda, terror, and the famous Nazi ideology, makes him an even greater menace to civilization.

Conversely, no matter what the virtues and advantages of a free and peaceful nation—wealth, high standards of living, general diffusion of intelligence, respect for human rights—it must go down before superior physical force, ruthlessly wielded. To several of the nations so far overthrown by Nazi invaders, for example, especially to Austria, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Norway, Belgium, Holland, and France, most of us would unhesitatingly have as-

¹¹ *Social Contract*, ch. III. Rousseau continues as follows: "As soon as it is possible to disobey [such power] with impunity, disobedience is legitimate; and the strongest being always in the right, the only thing that matters is to act so as to become the strongest."

signed a higher cultural rating than to the Third Reich. With the exception of France, they were small; moreover, all of these small countries except Czechoslovakia were desperately afraid and hence unwilling to enter into defensive alliances until it was too late. Britain still stands firm, but it is not her democracy, her liberty, her respect for law and justice, that protect her; it is the British navy and air force. If we have so far remained unscathed, let us not attribute that good fortune to our free government, to our wealth, our intelligence and our civic virtues. Germany, Italy, and Japan are far away, although, paraphrasing Max Lerner, not so far as you think. Also the *Führer*, the *Duce*, and Prince Konoye are excessively busy for the time being in their own neighborhoods.

No; there is only one way open to a nation which may still have to confront a hostile *force majeure*, namely, to create a still greater force wherewith to overwhelm the aggressor. If that is not our situation today, it may well become our situation tomorrow. Only a decisive British victory and the complete overthrow of Hitler can save us from such a necessity. A stalemate in Europe will not suffice; at best, it could give us only a further breathing spell. If Britain falls, we stand alone against a possible, nay almost a certain, combination of aggressive dictator powers, flushed with victory, replete with the spoils of conquest.

In the latter event, Germany, Italy, and Japan may require some time to bind up their wounds, to organize the slave governments and the slave populations of the countries which have fallen into their hands, before they will be able to make the necessary preparation for a descent upon America. If so, we should know how to utilize the interval accorded us. The major effort of our government and people must be concentrated upon mass production of armament for warfare on land and sea and in the air. If we succeed in that effort, the dictator countries will moderate their threats and reconsider the economic demands upon us which they are now supposed to be meditating; they may even abstain from any direct action against the Monroe Doctrine. So far, wisely or not, we have kept out of the war in Europe; but only by the creation of an armed power sufficient to make attack upon us downright foolhardy can we keep war out of the Americas. In the meantime, let us give Britain—the first line of defense for our democracy—every possible aid. Above all things, let us give whatever is needed to defeat Hitler *promptly*. To be too late with our aid would be an irrepar-

able, perhaps a fatal, blunder. Political scientists must be realists. As such, we know that if Britain is crushed, the only kind of peace we can hope for will be an armed peace—and that probably of short duration.

It may be that, in spite of all our efforts to increase our military strength, Germany and Italy, perhaps with the aid of Japan, may think the gamble of an attack upon the Western Hemisphere worth trying. Certainly the loot of the Americas which they could divide among themselves in case of victory would be a magnificent incentive. If there is to be such an attack upon us, it is manifest that a policy of super-armament is the only alternative to abject surrender.

Combined attack by dictator powers upon America may result in our defeat or in our victory. In the former event, democracy will be dead upon this planet for a period of unpredictable length. Even so, let us hope that we might inflict wounds upon despotic aggressors from which they would not soon recover. This is not set down in malice; rather it would appear to be the only hope of future resurrection for our political principles. If democracy fighting for its life proves to be spineless and cowardly, why should any future generation wish to revive it? On the other hand, if it goes down fighting gloriously to the last ditch, it will not lose the power to fire the hearts of some future generation. Once more, as at the end of the eighteenth century, a race of rebels may be born of the sons of men.

VII

Given sufficient armament and as good a fight as our cause warrants, the result may be a victory. In that event—the happiest we can envisage—democracy will be safe in its last citadel, the United States. Still we could not afford to disarm so long as despotism remained dominant in other continents. It would still be a question of “we or they,” as Hamilton F. Armstrong expressed it, with the possibility that the struggle might be renewed at any time. A future so shadowed in its brightest aspect does not permit us to maintain the happy-go-lucky, tolerant attitude of the past; rather, we should adopt Voltaire’s famous battle cry, *écrasez l’infame*, for our device. In this respect the dictatorships have been far more consistent than the democracies. Never for a moment have Herr Hitler and Signor Mussolini concealed their determination to wipe out democracy, root and branch. Lesser Nazis and Fascists have poured forth a

constant stream of insult in the billingsgate which reveals their scurrilous mentality. They shriek *ad infinitum, ad nauseam*, that democracy is "bankrupt," "decadent," "plutocratic," "Jewish," a "fake," a "fraud," the "foul and filthy avenue to Communism," a "used-up system," a "has-been, selfish plutocratism," an "old worn-out slut."¹² We need not retort in kind, but we must coldly resolve to work unceasingly for the destruction of the whole vile totalitarian establishment. No doubt that will come to pass in the fullness of time, but it will be achieved much sooner if democrats everywhere organize and fight against all contemporary absolutisms. Meanwhile they may comfort themselves with the historic remark of a famous British statesman who, after listening to an opponent present his plan, said succinctly: "Sir, hell itself cannot be administered upon principles such as yours."

From the *Führer's* point of view, however, he is thoroughly justified in his attitude toward free government: so long as a single great democratic power survives, he cannot rest secure in his conquests. It is high time that we apply a similar logic to our own situation. Let us recognize the fact that so long as any great power remains despotic, we shall never have real peace but only an armed peace. Our policy must therefore be frank and determined opposition to all dictatorships everywhere: in war, we must give them two blows to their one until they have had enough; in peace, we must employ against them every policy short of war; particularly in economic dealings with them, let us be guided by the old Scotch adage, implicit if not explicit in Adam Smith, "nothing for nothing and damn little for sixpence."

VIII

"But, but, my dear sir," rises some anguished Mr. Caspar Milquetoast to object, "do you not know that a democracy which arms itself is doomed to lose its democracy?" The argument, if it can be called such, is constantly used in other connections by honorable gentlemen who know little of history and less about the specific causes of the rise of dictatorship. Thus we were told recently that if the anti-third term tradition broke down, totalitarianism would be our lot immediately and forever. Similar dire predictions are frequently made consequent upon the success of any candidate or policy the orator may happen to dislike. Thus on August 30, 1940, Senator Burton K. Wheeler of Montana, speaking in oppo-

¹² *New Leader*, July 20, 1940.

sition to conscription, rather melodramatically declared: "If you pass this bill, you slit the throat of the last democracy still living; you accord to Hitler his greatest and cheapest victory to date. On the headstone of American democracy he will inscribe—'Here lies the foremost victim of the war of nerves.'"¹³

In its most general aspect, the assertion under consideration may be stated as follows: "If you do this, democracy is doomed." It is then simply a species of that famous, and dubious, genus: "History teaches us thus and so." Any such prophecy regarding the early demise of democracy may be approached from two angles. If, first, it be presented simply as a generalization, allegedly based upon history, the facts of all recorded time would have to be searched, equal consideration given to those instances supporting it and to those conflicting with it. As a matter of logic, discovery of one or more instances of the latter sort would knock any such generalization into a cocked hat.

Second, the assertion may be made simply as a prediction, partly resting upon historical citation, but more largely based upon new conditions, at present prevalent, which are deemed certain to bring about its fulfillment. Now the statement that "war or preparation for war at the present time means the downfall of democracy" is obviously of this character. Since its historical support is weak, those who make it are obligated to point out convincingly the new conditions (perhaps changes in political organization, in the economic system, or in the art of warfare), which may make it come true nevertheless. This they never do; *ipse dixit* are more to their taste. As a matter of fact, they cannot do it; at best, they can only establish some degree of probability. Together with the rest of us, these would-be prophets must wait for the verdict of events to learn how much or how little of their prophecy was true.

Yet, in spite of these obvious reasons for caution, glib politicians

¹³ A statement given out by Mr. Wendell L. Wilkie on August 29 last is of the same character, but it deftly avoids the verbal pyrotechnics of Senator Wheeler. The passage in point is as follows: "The 'conscription of wealth' is a phrase without meaning. In event of emergency, the industries and assets of this country are at the disposal of the people. Let us not create that emergency before it actually exists by setting up a potential dictatorship." Using the same assertion in his campaign speech at Akron, Ohio, September 5 last, Mr. Norman Thomas at least deserves credit for setting a more or less definite time limit for the period of democracy's obscuration, viz.: "Let us get involved in war, and democracy's last chance to develop in orderly fashion and learn to solve its own problems will be gone, not to return in our generation or our children's."

constantly rush into print predicting the downfall of democracy on all sorts of grounds. Of course such assertions are not argument; rather they serve to conceal the absence of argument, which is made up for by an appeal to popular anxiety. The latter will be recognized as a rather commonplace propagandist device—one, by the way, in which Herr Hitler has proved himself the world's greatest expert.¹⁴

Clearly, therefore, assertions that "democracy is doomed if . . ." will not stand analysis; indeed they are much too "iffy" to stand up under criticism. Nevertheless, their constant repetition contributes to defeatism, and in time of crisis may prove disastrous. Political scientists, and historians as well, should prepare themselves to challenge these lightly-made prophecies of destruction. In particular, demagogical orators who predict the downfall of democracy if it goes to war, or even if it introduces conscription, should be brought to book publicly as to their actual knowledge of the causes of totalitarianism. A few exposures of this sort should discourage senators and other honorable gentlemen who raise a bogey in order to conceal their ignorance.

Let us for a moment consider the assertion that democracy and war are incompatible. As a generalization drawn from history, there is precious little support for it; indeed, numerous instances to the contrary may be cited. Since the Conquest of 1066, Britain has engaged in innumerable wars; nevertheless it became "a land of settled government, . . . Where Freedom slowly broadens down from precedent to precedent." From the foundation of their federation in 1291 to the end of the Napoleonic struggle, the Swiss fought almost continuously, both in foreign and in civil wars, yet they developed the purest democracy the world has ever known.¹⁵ In our own history, the Revolutionary War ushered out monarchy and opened the way for a federal republic. Nor did the Civil War permanently weaken the democratic principle in the United States; on the contrary, it set free nearly four million slaves. Following our participation in the First World War, the chief impulse of the American people, expressed by the Hardingesque slogan, "Back to Normalcy," was applied not only in domestic affairs, where it

¹⁴ See *Propaganda Analysis*, Vol. III, No. 10 (Aug. 1, 1940).

¹⁵ The Swiss federal constitution of 1848 provides that "every Swiss is bound to perform military service." Several referendum votes have sustained and strengthened this provision. Thus the present high degree of preparedness of the little Alpine Republic rests upon the most democratic of bases.

worked with some success for the time being, but also, tragically enough, in our foreign relations, where it kept us out of the League of Nations, thus laying the foundation for all the woes that now afflict the world.

In the light of history, then, the assertion that any democracy engaging in war must forfeit its democratic institutions is far from convincing. In particular, it leaves out of account the effect of victory or defeat. One would be safer in asserting that a government of any type which leads its people to a military débâcle is due for drastic overhauling. This, however, is as true of authoritarian as of democratic governments. Defeat of France in 1870 resulted in the overthrow of Napoleon the Little and the establishment of the Third Republic. Defeat of Hohenzollern Germany in the First World War led to the establishment of the Weimar Republic; defeat of Austria and Russia, to the overthrow of the Hapsburg and Romanoff dynasties. If Germany and Italy find themselves on the losing side at the end of the present war, it is altogether likely that Hitler and Mussolini will become dictators in exile—that is, assuming that they are lucky enough to escape with their lives. Totalitarian governments as well as democracies, therefore, run risks when they engage in war. Indeed, the risks of the former are greater, for with one severe military setback all latent internal strains and stresses make themselves apparent. Democracies, slow to wrath and slow to arm themselves, nevertheless go to war on the basis of a stern mass determination, and should therefore develop greater staying power. It may be conceded that a self-governing people which decides to take this fateful step must temporarily centralize power, make heavy sacrifices, submit to sterner discipline. To assert that these measures mean the complete destruction of democratic institutions, that they mean the advent of fascism,¹⁶ is absurd. Indeed, if supported enthusiastically and steadfastly, as in Great Britain at present, by the popular will, by sacrifice and discipline—that is, by self-sacrifice and self-discipline—they deserve to be ranked among the finest manifestations of the democratic spirit.

Overlooking its lack of historic verification, let us nevertheless assume for the moment that the assertion under consideration is true. To make the assumption specific, to bring it as closely home

¹⁶ It will be recalled that during the First World War the corresponding term was "Prussianization."

as possible, we may express it as follows: The United States goes to war as a democracy; in consequence, it suffers the immediate and complete loss of its democratic liberties. Still the words "immediate and complete" may be queried. Great Britain, for example, has now been at grips desperately with the greatest military menace in its history for more than fifteen months. Far-reaching controls over persons and property have been enacted by the regular processes of legislation. Some hundreds of leading fascist agitators have been withdrawn from the public advocacy of anti-British and pro-foreign doctrines, it is true, but Parliament still sits; after full debate therein, ministerial change is possible and one has already been made; pacifists are still allowed to make public protests, and, believe it or not, the London *Daily Worker* is still being printed. Whatever the future may hold forth, it is patently absurd to say that democratic institutions have been abandoned by the British. Certainly the country has not gone fascist to an extent even remotely approximating Nazi Germany, where press and radio are controlled to the last word by oleaginous Dr. Goebbels, where the subservient Reichstag seldom meets, and then only to function as a sounding board for one of Herr Hitler's speeches.

IX

But let us make still another concession to the assertion under consideration. Grant that the United States, a democracy, goes to war; grant, further, that in consequence it loses its democratic character immediately and completely, becoming a full-fledged fascist state. Such a development, as the case of Britain indicates, is highly unlikely. Even if it were to take place, however, *one might still vastly prefer to live under a totalitarianism of our own and dominated by an American than to fall a prey, as France has done, to the German Führer and his type of fascism*, with its merciless soldiery, its brown and black shirts, its Gestapo, its concentration camps, its torturers and sadists. If war comes, we should strive for a clear-cut victory won by a democratic American government. Personally, however, I should consider a victory won by a highly centralized, even by an American fascist, government if you please, as infinitely more desirable than a defeat at the hands of a foreign fascist despotism. (If this be treason, make the most of it.) Bowing ourselves to the yoke for a given purpose—the winning of the war—we might the more easily throw it off when that end had been

achieved. It is true that revolt is more difficult now than at the end of the eighteenth, or even at the end of the nineteenth, century. To "descend into the street," as the French used to phrase it, and to build barricades would be suicidal in an age of tanks, flame-throwers, and dive-bombers. Still there are joints in the armor of fascism. With time, new joints may appear. Unbridled power corrupts those who seek to wield it; luxury enfeebles those who would batten upon the fruits produced by millions of servile workers. In the end, we may trust the resourceful American people to find a way to overthrow an American dictator and to return as far as possible to the principles of the Founding Fathers of 1787.

Neither history nor the theory of probability, then, yields any appreciable support to the allegation that democracy and military preparedness are incompatible. It is not only false, it is also viciously defeatist. Wittingly or unwittingly, those who parrot it on any and all occasions give the impression that the survival value of democracies in such a wicked, wicked world as that of Anno Domini 1940 is slight indeed; we are told that like shrinking violets these democracies must perish with the first blast of the wintry wind of militarism. Assuming that free nations acted upon this pseudo-principle, giving assurance in advance to predatory dictatorships that under no circumstances would they risk their liberties by arming and fighting to preserve them, there can be slight doubt as to the result. They would be occupied militarily as soon as the *Führer* and his associates found it convenient, thereafter to be exploited under alien totalitarian control indefinitely. Prior to 1939, something could have been said in favor of pacifism and appeasement; after that date, all but the dullest coupled appeasement with preparedness. Now both pacifism and appeasement are thoroughly bankrupt policies. Even the old adage that "it takes two to make a quarrel" is hopelessly outmoded. Herr Hitler *solus* has demonstrated transcendent genius in picking innumerable quarrels on any grounds or no grounds at all; also in starting wars utterly without provocation against absolutely peaceful neighbor nations: witness the fate in the course of the present year of Denmark, Norway, Belgium, and Holland. Clearly, then, the acceptance of the assertion stated above would disarm democracy to avoid the possible fate of domestic fascism, only to subject it to a certain and far worse fate, the imposition of fascism by an invading alien power.

X

It is no part of the purpose of this address to present a complete program for future action. That market is overstocked: during 1940 we were surfeited with platforms drafted by the two major and by several minor parties, none of which became a best seller. There are, however, a few proposals, often neglected in public discussion, to which I should like to invite your attention. First of all, we must accept the statement made by Professor Fritz Morstein Marx that "our policy cannot survive under the disastrous load of chronic unemployment and sharply marked economic inequalities."¹⁷ Undoubtedly, chronic unemployment is the sorest point of contrast between ourselves and the dictatorships. Although the methods of the latter in dealing with labor are those of the slave-driver, nevertheless they have succeeded in putting everybody, except those blacklisted for political reasons, back to work. We must achieve the same result, and do it through the use of better means. It is to be regretted that neither of our major parties found space in its platform this year for a plank proposing an amendment to the Constitution whereby every adult citizen would be guaranteed employment at living wages. Paraphrasing Lincoln, what we intend is "to declare the right, so that the enforcement of it may follow as fast as circumstances permit."¹⁸ With this obligation imbedded in our fundamental law, methods of enforcement could be worked out as between federal, state, and local governments on the one hand and private employers on the other. A national commission composed of the most eminent political scientists, economists, educators, business men, and labor leaders should be appointed to supervise the process. Admitting the enormous cost involved, also the tremendous difficulties of detailed legislation and administration, still the thing must be done. Otherwise, how can we draft men to fight for their country many of whom have never had a job, many of whom must fear that they will not be able to find work after they have been mustered out of service? What a ghastly incongruity that those who are asked to risk their lives to save the government should not be guaranteed by that government so much as a chance to make a living in case they escape death on the field of battle! Recalling its past achievements,

¹⁷ Fritz Morstein Marx, "Totalitarian Politics," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, Vol. LXXXII, No. 1 (1940).

¹⁸ Speech at Springfield, Illinois, June 26, 1857.

democracy is more than justified in calling upon its sons to fight for it. We believe, however, that by far the greater achievements of democracy belong to the future, first and foremost among them the solution of the problem of unemployment. Let us then call upon the future, as well as upon the past, achievements of democracy in arming our soldiers spiritually for their final struggle against despotism.¹⁹

XI

Second, one must fight the devil with fire. Although the adage is scarcely in accord with the strictest principles of morality, warrant may be found for it in the pages of Sir (and Saint) Thomas More's *Utopia*.²⁰ As the world of 1940 learned to its sorrow, totalitarian states have not hesitated to subsidize murder, treason, sabotage, arson, and bribery in the countries they intend to attack. It is too much to expect that they will spare us similar inflictions in case our relations with them become more strained. If so, there should be no squeamishness on our part about replying in kind. In all the dictatorships, and now probably also in the countries they have reduced to slavery, widespread and determined underground organizations exist. Little as these organizations have been able to accomplish so far, they are obviously ready to take advantage desperately of any opportunity to strike at the governments under which their members are hunted as wild beasts. Once provided with adequate funds, they should be able to do far more destructive work than the disloyal elements in our midst. Think what Otto Strasser might have accomplished with a paltry hundred thousand

¹⁹ As a small and rather ineffective move in the direction proposed, it is interesting to note that the Burke-Wadsworth Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 attempts to provide guarantees that private business enterprises shall hold jobs open for employees who are called to the colors. Veteran preference in our civil service laws is another microscopic effort of the same sort.

²⁰ More writes in Book II of the *Utopia*: "As soon as they [the Utopians] declare war, they take care to have a great many schedules, that are sealed with their common seal, affixed in the most conspicuous places of their enemies' country. . . . In these they promise great rewards to such as shall kill the prince, and lesser in proportion to such as shall kill any other persons, who are those on whom, next to the prince himself, they cast the chief balance of the war." More also suggests the offering of rewards to enemy princes and their subordinates to act against their own countrymen. If these methods prove unsuccessful, the Utopians "sow seeds of contention among their enemies, and animate the Prince's brother, or some of the nobility, to aspire to the crown." The writer confesses that the above "utopian" advice nauseated him when he first read it. Totalitarian methods of warfare have convinced him, however, that it must be followed until civilization has been reestablished.

dollars or so! Even with the barest minimum of financial support, he kept the Gestapo in a state of perpetual jitters for a decade. Discreet use of part of our secret service funds—and that means no unnecessary publicity about details—might serve to bring about revolt inside the Third Reich considerably earlier than it would come otherwise. At any rate, the results would afford Herr Hitler an opportunity to reflect upon another adage—that with regard to the biter being bitten.

XII

The foregoing must not be interpreted as advocating atrocities—let the dictators have a monopoly of that sort of thing. Even in dealing with Fifth Columnists interned "for the duration," humane treatment should be insisted upon. Perhaps, however, one exception might be made in their case. If it be not cruel and unusual punishment under Article VIII of the Constitution, they should be compelled to listen to three hours of lectures daily—only the usual stint for undergraduates—delivered by eminent American college professors on the general subject: "Advantages of Democracy over Dictatorship." Minor matters of this sort aside, chivalry is out of the question if we must go to war against any of the totalitarian powers. The British have learned that lesson. Winston Churchill's decision to take over the French navy by force was indeed a bitter one to make, but it was clearly justified under the circumstances. The anguished squeals which followed immediately from Berlin and Rome were proof of it. Beyond all doubt, Herr Hitler, who has never let earlier pledges stand in the way of anything he wanted to do later, would have seized the French fleet for use in the invasion of Britain. How agonizing it must have been for him and for Signor Mussolini to learn that the British also knew how to "get rough"!

This address could not pass as authentic if it failed to import a large number of significant precedents from Switzerland. Of course the general assumption behind these importations is that whatever is Swiss must be genuinely democratic, also wise and practical. In the earlier years of the last decade, separate cantons of the little Republic of the Alps began to take action against the Communist party, suppressing its publications and deporting aliens connected with it. Federal legislation of a similar character began in 1932 with a *Bundesratsbeschluss* forbidding appointment to or continuance in the public service of members of the Communist party or of organizations affiliated with it. Meanwhile, Nazi organizations

similar to our own *Bunds* had endeavored to find rootage in Swiss soil, not very successfully to be sure. To counter their activities, the wearing of party uniforms and badges was forbidden in 1933, thus antedating the passage of the British Public Order Act by more than three years. Activities initiated anywhere in Switzerland to the advantage of any foreign state or party, and to the disadvantage of the country, were prohibited in 1935. Beginning a year later, propaganda, foreign or domestic, of communistic, anarchistic, anti-military, or anti-religious character was ordered suppressed. In 1938, to these forbidden types was added propaganda designed to disturb the internal or external security of the Federation, especially the independence or neutrality of the country, its democratic institutions or the interests of national defense. Later in the same year, an enactment—perhaps the most significant of the whole series—prohibited public and systematic efforts to cast contempt upon the democratic bases of the Federation or of the cantons, or to stir up hate against groups because of their race, religion, or nationality. At one blow, this *Bundesratsbeschluss* deprived German agents or sympathizers of the privilege of print, at least of printing that part of their creed which stirred up the most trouble locally. Finally, on August 6 of the present year, the Bundesrat comprehensively and categorically prohibited all activity throughout the Federation by the Communist party and its “transmission belts” (*Hilfs-und Nebenorganisationen*), also by anarchistic groups, also by groups affiliated with the Fourth International (Trotzkyites), and finally by any groups that might endeavor, presumably under new names, to take the place and carry on the work of the groups specified above. It is noteworthy that the foregoing enactments carried stiff penalties in the form of fines or imprisonment or both, to which, whenever aliens were involved, expulsion from the country was added.²¹

It is not meant to be implied that laws of a similar character should be passed immediately in the United States. We are not in the very center of the European frying pan as are the Swiss, and

²¹ *Bundesratsbeschlüsse* of December 2, 1932; May 12, 1933; June 21, 1935; November 3, 1936; December 2, 1937; May 27, 1938; December 5, 1938. Also *Bundesgesetz* of March 26, 1934. As these pages go to press, news comes from Bern that on November 19 of this year the *Bundesrat* dissolved the so-called “Schweizer Nationalbewegung.” To all intents and purposes, this “movement” was a true copy of the German National Socialist party which had been attempting to operate on Swiss soil.

perhaps we can afford to be more tolerant. On the other hand, conditions may so change, even here, that it will be necessary to take the wind out of the sails of foreign agents, of shirted agitators, of the "Reverend" Father Coughlin and his like. In time of war or threatened war, especially when subsidized from abroad, they are little less dangerous than armed invaders. To deal with them promptly and effectively is in accordance with the first law of nature—the law of self-preservation. Would that be unconstitutional? Contrary to the sacred principles of freedom of speech, of the press? But these are democratic principles. Is democracy, then, bound to permit enemies within its gates to strike unmolested at its very life? And when democracy dies, what happens to these sacred principles? If the constitutional argument be raised against any future enactments of the Swiss type, let the courts decide. If they decide adversely, the process of amendment may be invoked. Meanwhile, why not ask ourselves what conceivable benefit accrues, even in time of peace, from permitting rabble-rousers, banded together for that purpose and subsidized by foreign powers, to attack our races, nationalities, religious sects, or the basic principles of our political institutions?

Before leaving the subject of Swiss examples for American imitation, a word should be said in favor of the Swiss system of universal compulsory military training. Requiring a minimum of time at the *Rekrutenschule*, it provides a force of 480,000 soldiers ready for active service and an additional 100,000 of trained reserves. With our population, a similar system would provide more than 14,000,000 soldiers ready for all emergencies. Adequately equipped, so large a body of trained men would make armed attack upon the United States hopeless. As a minor detail, if we could divert a quarter of the attention now given baseball to the far more practical and enjoyable Swiss sport of rifle shooting and rifle competitions, probably no dictator would ever dream of leaving his calling card on Uncle Sam's doorstep.

XIII

It may be objected that the future sketched in this paper—a future of military preparation and perhaps of war—is decidedly dismal. But a far worse future may easily be imagined. Also it might easily be brought down upon our heads. "Appeasement" is the word one reads upon the door to that future; above it the in-

scription: "All hope abandon, ye who enter here." Those who knock thereon, and even those who resisted dictatorship with insufficient force—ten nations in all to the present date—know what that inscription means. It means slavery, dismemberment, expropriation, subjection to alien control, relegation to the position of an inferior race under the heel of a brutal master race, destruction of all human dignity and independence. Worst of all, it means standing aside and remaining mute when fiendish persecution is inflicted upon fellow citizens who happen to be Jews, liberals, or democrats. All this can be had for the asking: we have merely to lay down our arms and shout: "Heil Hitler!"

In the end, it is certain that Americans will not submit tamely to such a fate. They will not enter the door marked "Appeasement": they will go out through the opposite door marked "Defiance." I do not pretend to like the sort of future that confronts us. It may bring with it the heaviest burdens, the most cruel sacrifices. In all probability, things will get worse before they get better. It may fall to the lot of an American President to say, as did Prime Minister Winston Churchill, that he has "nothing to offer but blood, toil, tears, and sweat." Not liking a future, however, is no reason for not facing up to it. There is a deep satisfaction in resoluteness, through all perils, regardless of the outcome. Let us give thanks also that we are done with roseate illusions; that we are ready to deal with grim realities. Peace and justice may not be for our time, but we have the privilege of risking everything that they "shall not perish from the earth."