

(15) Schacht and the "Kolonial Bund" are pressing for colonies. The opposition to tropical colonies expressed in "Kein Kampf" seems to turn the pointer eastward as a natural corollary to anti-Soviet policy.

..... Actual advancement toward peace in Europe has been nil recently due largely to Germany (diplomacy plus saber rattling), and on the loss side the following points appear.

(1) There are indications that England feels that Germany "must be written off as a bad job" and England is re-arming for any emergency.

(2) Germany has alienated Poland to a certain extent through the Nazi's activities in Danzig.

(3) Belgian rearmament could also be turned to the advantage of France.

(4) The Franco-Soviet pact depending on its real military value can be regarded as a loss for Germany.

(5) Germany's internal activities have alienated Catholicism and to some extent christianity generally, and because of the attitude adopted toward racial matters, justice and real democracy, bad economic relations have arisen with the United States.

(6) Germany will seek to realize her aims without war if possible. If not?

Published in
Foreign Relations of the U.S.

1937, Vol. I, General

pp. 638-640

PSF: Dudd

Berlin, February 27, 1937.

Dear Mr. President:

Before you receive this, you will have seen a telegram or two which we shall have sent. This letter is designed to explain things a little further in case you have time to read anything.

Hitler is in a difficult position. His people are afraid of war, but not so much as the English and French. He is trying curious means to unite everybody. Universities and schools are all reorganized with no opponents allowed anywhere, hundreds of professors dismissed or pensioned when too eminent. The Protestants and Catholics must all allow their children from their sixth year to be taken in hand by Party propagandists. Some preachers resist and are imprisoned; others, who are very eminent, continue opposition, but their supporters are declining in numbers. Several eminent Party leaders go about the country proclaiming the Fuehrer as a modern Jesus, reorganizing all churches on "true German" principles. Mussolini is of course the modern Julius Caesar, annexing Spain.

Just how real is the alliance between "Jesus" and "Caesar" one cannot say, the purposes of both conflicting. Certainly there are some doubts. Although many eminent Germans hope and pray for a royalist restoration, about all Germans think annexation or absolute control of the Balkan states is their right. Hitler curiously promises Holland, Belgium and

The President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

- 2 -

Switzerland complete independence, yet authorizes maps in universities, and for sale everywhere, which show these countries as parts of Germany. At the same time the propaganda in these little countries, as also in Norway, Sweden, Poland, Czechoslovakia and Rumania, secret and public, contradicts the idea of real independence of any country where there are any considerable numbers of people of German descent. Millions of dollars are spent each year in this direction, and Boehle, chief of Foreign Propaganda organization, is now the most important official in the Foreign Office after von Neurath. There are secret agents of Boehle in all the German diplomatic offices. What this means one can readily see.

Dr. Schacht said to me a few days ago at a table where high Nazi officials sat: "Mussolini is annexing Spain and later annexing Egypt - he is our Julius Caesar." I raised some questions as to the dangers. He insisted that he was right. I raised the point a few days later when von Neurath was in Vienna, and the opinion there was not quite in agreement. However, the Foreign Office has several times asserted that Germany would not protest against Italian annexation of Egypt. On this occasion the Foreign Office again asserted Germany's right to control the "Danube" zone, and hoped von Neurath could unite Austria, Hungary, Germany and Italy - a slight fear that Mussolini might not keep his promises to Germany, he being a masterful Machiavelli. When I talked about better commercial relations with the United States, the Staatssekretär said he favored proper trade and treaty arrangements. I asked why

- 3 -

we had received no reply to the State Department's invitation to send delegates to the proposed April conference in Washington. The reply was that the Economics and Labor ministries objected - i.e., Nazi officials.

When one, therefore, wonders about the possibility of a real peace conference in Washington or elsewhere, the answer is: Will Germany or Italy confer seriously with any other peoples when their major aims are to dominate Europe and do it by frightening the populations of democratic countries? Several times since I have been here the peoples of England and France, especially those of smaller nations, have been frightened so that they yielded, events in Ethiopia and Spain being best examples. At the same time, great business companies of all democratic countries have supported the German-Italian demands by increasing sales of arms and war supplies, ours quite as much as others. Even small countries, like Rumania, have risked their own fates by selling war materials.

So, how can a peace conference succeed? Only through a real economic-finance cooperation between England, France and the United States. Can this be done? You know how much opposition English and French businessmen made to the Buenos Aires proposals - almost as much as Italy and Germany made through secret propaganda before and while you were in Latin America. In case Spain is actually annexed by Mussolini and then Germany proceeds to make moves into the eastern zone (same as the 1900-1914 policy of army officials here), England and France might be frightened enough to join the United States in real peace agreements. But one can never know what the DuPonts and the steel people cooperating in Europe with

- 4 -

I. G. Farben and other corporations would do under cover, as they did more than once at Geneva peace conferences.

You are in the most important position in the world, with amazing economic duties at home. Yet real success at home can not be attained if a world war breaks or if the mainland of Europe becomes a solid dictatorship. You know the possibilities. I have simply tried to appraise things on this side of the Atlantic. I shall once more talk with high officials here, as indicated above, about Germany participating in a peace conference, and wire you the answers I get. All the really informed internationalists hope and pray for your success.

Sincerely yours,

William E. Dodd

P.S. - Have been told more than once that all this is reported to the Government here before or soon after it reaches you.

WED

1 F: Dodd

R.S.F. Dated

These clippings from the Manchester Guardian - regarded here as most reliable.

John growing influence in the world is most welcome to English masses, most troublesome to the two dictators

New German Ambassador to the U.S. talked freely and critically to me before June 30, 1934; since that time hardly a word except in praise, but not in praise of Goebbels. He is brother-in-law of Rippenhuf in London

PEACE BASED ON DEMOCRACY

Mr. Roosevelt's Appeal

From our own Correspondent

NEW YORK, APRIL 14.

President Roosevelt today made another strong plea for international peace based upon democracy, mutual confidence between nations, and definite co-operation.

He spoke to the Board of Governors of the Pan-American Union, a body in which all the Republics in this hemisphere are represented. He urged his listeners to make sure that the pledges given at the recent Pan-American Conference at Buenos Aires were transformed into practical action. He said that democracy cannot thrive in an atmosphere of international insecurity. Such insecurity, he said, breeds militarism and regimentation and the denial of freedom of speech, peaceful assemblage, and religion. He reminded his listeners that he had addressed the same body four years ago, and asserted that much progress had been made in this hemisphere in the interval.

After the President's address, which was broadcast, the microphones were cut off, the journalists excluded, and the President made some additional remarks privately. It is understood that he defended the Latin-American policy of his Administration.

CHILDREN DEPRIVED OF NATIONALITY

Nazi Decree

BERLIN, APRIL 14.

The name of Vieth von Golsenau, better known as Ludwig Renn, is included in a list of 91 Germans published today in the official gazette who have been deprived of their nationality. Ludwig Renn's book "War" was one of the best sellers in post-war Germany.

The list also includes a number of children who are listed as relatives of people hostile to the State. The youngest of these is Peter Hauschild, who is under two years of age, and the ages of other boys and girls range from five to fourteen.—Reuter.

JEWIS IN GERMANY
Guardian May 16, 37
 Severe New Restrictions Imposed

From a Special Correspondent

The unhappy position of Jews in Germany has been severely aggravated in the last few days. On the strength of a decree of the State police all Jewish meetings, including those connected with sport, have been prohibited with June 15. Jews cannot therefore play tennis or football or enjoy river or other sports in public.

For publicity reasons the Third Reich declares officially that the cultural and social life of the German Jews is secured by the Nuremberg laws, but this decree of the secret police removes almost their last means of association for cultural purposes.

At the same time the State police is increasing its activity in another direction. In a great many parts of Germany members of the German aristocracy have been arrested recently and charged with secret monarchistic activities.

German Impressions

for private

[Aug. 11, 1937]

Preface

The following pages are not an essay. I have made no attempt at unity or literary form. They are also by no means a unified estimate of present conditions in Germany. Anything of the kind would be entirely beyond my powers. What I have tried to do is to set down some of the more striking things that were said to me while I was in Germany, such comments on these remarks as seem to me probably sound, and a very few general conclusions of my own.

I believe that the principal defects of what I have to report and to say arise from the fact that I had no opportunity to talk with people who represent more or less the opposite type to the intellectual: I mean hard-headed, unimaginative but shrewd and competent men of affairs who have few beliefs about what is good or bad politically but are chiefly concerned for the effective running of things in the present and near future. I suspect that the opinions of such men would often be very different from those of my informants, and not less significant.

German Impressions

In 1914 at the outbreak of the war I was pretty well acquainted with Germany. I had first visited the country in 1895, had spent four semesters in a German university in 1902, '03 and '04, and later had returned for fairly long visits four times in the summer. But since the war I had been in Germany only once for a single week, under circumstances that made it difficult for me to form clear impressions. Accordingly, when I went to Germany this summer my qualifications as an observer were good only in certain respects, for I had no more than a vague impression of the great changes that had taken place in the last two decades. It is true that I had at least the advantage of being well aware of my ignorance of these changes. One experience in particular served as a warning of this ignorance: I had noticed from time to time that some of my old German acquaintances whom I had seen in this country had quite honestly forgotten many of their prewar opinions and points of view.

The circumstances of my visit were especially favorable in that I was to meet several important Germans in a quasi-official capacity and that I was to see a good many others with whom I had professional relations or, directly or indirectly, personal relations. In all, I had conversations, most of them long conversations, with some 25 people, many of them professors and also many in other walks of life. One was a former minister of state. Another was a former member of the Reichstag, who holds a very responsible position in one of the heavy industries, another a leader of the Protestant church in Prussia. There were two students, there were the wives of several

Note: Where I purport to quote remarks of other persons or of myself it is obvious that I am at best paraphrasing. I use this form for convenience. The statements must not be regarded as precise reproductions of the original remarks.

professors, there was a civil servant, and there was a man described to me by a responsible person as the most intelligent and experienced foreign newspaper correspondent in Berlin, and there were several others whom I shall not designate.

I had made up my mind to try to inform myself as well as possible about certain aspects of the conditions in the country, and to this end while in Germany to make an effort to listen to what I was told, to remember it and not at the time to form judgments of my own, except concerning the sincerity and objectivity of my new acquaintances. I also originally intended to ask few questions and to avoid leading questions. In many instances, however, this precaution seemed to be quite unnecessary and not infrequently a free and untrammelled discussion arose, which, so far as I could judge, entailed none of the familiar disadvantages of a debate. In fact, most people seemed eager to talk, and clearly found relief in talking freely.

There was one person who, after receiving me with great politeness and consideration, delivered a lecture of about three-quarters of an hour and carefully and skillfully avoided any suggestions that I made tending to lead him away from a prepared statement that he had clearly and precisely in mind. I attach no importance to what he said and shall disregard it because it is quite impossible for me to guess how trustworthy his remarks may have been. Two other persons were extremely reticent and gave me little or no information that I could regard as significant. There were three or four others who, speaking in the presence of a third person or for a short time, said very little. They also hardly count. There remain some fifteen or more individuals, old and young, male and female, of widely different experiences and occupations, though all, of course, of the educated classes, who freely and, so far as I could judge, frankly poured out their opinions

and expressed their feelings about a great variety of topics. I shall try first of all to put down certain statements made by these persons that seem to me sufficiently interesting to be recorded, but I shall not try to attribute them to individuals.

I was told over and over again that the situation when Hitler came into power was nearly intolerable and was rapidly getting worse (only one person explicitly denied this), that nearly everybody agreed at the time that something had to be done, and that the establishment of the Nazi regime seemed to be the only thing that could be done. One informant said that big industry, which had taken its part in putting Hitler in, was sorry within two weeks for what it had done. But much as moderates disliked the extravagances of the Nazis, at any rate for the moment, nearly everybody had agreed that the step was inevitable. Most of my informants declared that in their opinion many useful things were accomplished at the beginning of the Nazi regime and there is a considerable agreement that Hitler did in a very conspicuous degree restore the feeling of national dignity, pride and confidence, thereby giving a meaning to life for great masses of the population who had come to feel that life was really not worth living. There are some people who deny all this, but it seemed to me that they were probably so strongly hostile to the government or so lacking in ability to control their own feelings that their opinion may be disregarded.

However, I was also told in a particularly impressive interview by a man who made a deep impression on me for his courage, honesty and sincerity that the formation of a new and deep cleavage in the German people began at once, and that in his opinion that cleavage, which has grown steadily, more than counterbalances all the benefits of the two or three first years

of the Nazi government. He fears and expects that this cleavage will be the most important factor in German life for at least two generations to come.

In contrast to the favorable, if grudging and seriously qualified estimate of the results of the first years of the new government, there was substantial agreement in disapproval of the present situation. Accordingly, it seems safe to say that in a certain class or set of people in Germany a very large majority are now thoroughly hostile to the government. This raises the question of the attitude of the various classes of people through the country, and I was told much about this by many different people, mostly, I think, well informed. Here are some of the remarks. The clergy, both Catholic and Protestant, except a small minority who act as spies on their colleagues and who are quite generally regarded as beyond the pale of common decency, are opposed to the government. The great majority of devout Catholics and Protestants agree with and pretty generally follow their priests or pastors. One man whose wish it would be to believe the number as large as possible, but who seemed to me exceptionally honest, told me that this accounts for 20 per cent of the total population of Germany, say 10 per cent Catholic, 10 per cent Protestant, who are opposed to the government because of their religion.

The peasants, I was told, should be divided into two classes, peasant proprietors and agricultural laborers. It is said that the peasant proprietors are now in large majority hostile to the government. The reason given is that the minute regulations imposed upon them, the new laws about inheritance, the conditions under which mortgages may be obtained, and the

apparently arbitrary and unsound petty interferences with their everyday activities combine to irritate them, - often to the limit of their endurance. I feel pretty sure that this is true of many, but can venture no opinion about the proportions. The agricultural laborers are said to be more favorable to the government.

As for the industrial working class, I was given very little information that seemed to me trustworthy. One man seemed to think that a good many former socialists, if not communists, with a docility that is common in Germany, had accepted the present regime and come to like it. Several others were firmly of the opinion that the working men and their wives are merely hiding their feelings, which remain unchanged.

It was pretty generally said that the petty bourgeoisie, out of which the Nazi party arose and in which there were originally high hopes of better economic conditions, has become disillusioned, dissatisfied and hostile. I should guess that this is certainly true of numbers that are absolutely large, but possibly not very large relatively. Again, I have the feeling that my informants were not particularly well qualified to form an opinion.

The students are said to have undergone a great change. Originally they were overwhelmingly in favor of Hitler. I was told by a student in one provincial university that today 90 per cent of the men students in his university are hostile to the government. He added that a majority of women students were in favor of Hitler. The explanation of this latter curious fact, given by him, corroborated by his mother and by a woman of thirty who was also present, as well as by a professor, all of whom took part in the conversation, is said to be this. Hitler is unmarried. He is, therefore,

not the property of any one woman. He is a vegetarian, he does not drink, he does not smoke, and for countless thousands of German women, especially unmarried women, he has become a kind of God. They have his portrait before their eyes at work and in their rooms.

The men students of the universities are said to be hostile to the government for the following reasons: They dislike interference with their private lives, and those of the higher social classes strongly resent the suppression of the old Corps and Burschenschaften. They find the one club that the Nazis have set up in place of these others both perfectly flat and indirectly obnoxious. They resent the attempts that are made to regiment them and to discover their private opinions, and for this reason stay away from certain smaller universities where the system for accomplishing this sort of thing works smoothly. Also, they have begun rather widely to see that their instruction is not only far inferior to what it used to be, but much less than adequate to their needs.

I attach little importance to what I was told about the attitude of the top of society, whether big business or old aristocracy, except that the trend is unfavorable to Hitler.

Coming back now to the professors, who represent the class that I know best, of whom I saw the largest number and who, knowing more about me, were probably most disposed to speak freely, it will perhaps be well to go into further details. There is, I should think, all but universal conviction that the German universities have been practically destroyed as well-balanced, all round institutions of learning and of research. There is little hope that they can be presently restored to anything like their former state, and the general attitude is one of deep depression. The following episode throws light

on the attitude. It seems to me, though a slight affair, as significant as anything in my experience while in Germany. I was dining with an old friend, a professor in the University of Berlin. There were present his wife, a friend of hers who is the daughter of one of the most distinguished Jewish scientists of thirty years ago (the only 'non-Aryan'), a pupil of my friend now an assistant to him, and a pleasant, intelligent medical professor from a provincial university whom I had never seen before. After some general conversation about conditions in the United States which was not without personal significance because one daughter of the Jewess is already in America and another expects to go to America soon, the medical professor said to me something like this, "About 1910 when as an assistant I first began to see American medical men, we found it necessary to make great allowances for them because although they were good fellows their education and training had obviously been defective and they were clearly behind the best Europeans of the same age. Today we look to America as leading the world in medical science. How has such progress been possible in a quarter of a century? How far has it been due to pouring out money?" It was quite apparent that his question was really the expression of a hope that something like this might some day be possible in Germany.

To this question I replied about as follows: "We have indeed made great progress in America, but nothing like what your question implies. You are largely in error for two reasons: (1) You and practically all Germans greatly underestimated the achievements of American science 25 years ago. (2) Today you considerably overestimate our achievements and our present merits. In short, you arrive at far too great an estimate of our progress by subtracting a quantity that is much too small from a quantity that is much

too large." Thereupon there was a good deal of discussion, and at the end everybody agreed that I was probably right. For my part I have no doubt of it. My opinion that the Germans in most respects underestimated Americans before the war is no new one and is probably today generally recognized. As for their overestimate at the present time, at least in the case of the kind of people whom I saw, it seemed to me almost as obvious as the extravagance of the unfavorable criticism of America that one encounters in the daily press. Needless to say, I can form no estimate of how widely this new respectful admiration of America is distributed, but I should think it probably the characteristic of a very small element in the population of Germany and for the present a factor of absolutely no political importance. To one accustomed to the attitude of younger men twenty-five years ago, with whom I naturally associated at that time, the contrast is today, however, almost comic. Twenty-five years ago I often had a feeling that it was necessary to treat many of my contemporaries among the Germans on the intellectual level, because of their naive self-satisfaction, much as one treats the newly rich on the social level. Today I feel the need to guard myself against over-respectful admiration of America on the part of the Germans.

The atmosphere of fear, though it is perhaps exaggerated by liberals in Germany and here, is pretty conspicuous in the universities, and there is good ground for it. I was told the following story under circumstances which made the report seem entirely trustworthy. About a year ago two professors of the University of Leipzig found themselves at the end of the afternoon in the Professors' Room at the University, and one of them noticed as they were leaving that a colleague had forgotten his brief case lying on the table. They decided that they ought to look inside to find out the owner in order to return

it to him, and on opening it discovered careful notes of the private conversations of several of their colleagues, obviously destined for the authorities. The result was that the spy was cut by his colleagues and sometime later when he inquired of one of them why he was being cut, he was told the reason. Thereupon, he said "You don't suppose that I am the only person doing this, do you?"

The administration of the universities causes unhappiness not only for reasons of this kind that are largely emotional, but also on strictly technical ground. One of my informants whom I consider particularly trustworthy said to me, "Perhaps the greatest difficulty in Germany today is that men who have the education and capacity of chiefs are ruled and ordered about by men of the mentality and education of Unteroffizieren." He added that there are two exceptions, the army itself, which is beyond the control of ignorant, incompetent meddlers, and a small group around Schacht. (To this I am inclined to add, from what others have told me, a small group around von Neurath. Incidentally it is amusing, if tragic, to think of the feelings of a person like von Neurath, a Wurtemberg gentleman brought up in a hard-working, cosmopolitan, aristocratic family, and, I suppose, a competent, diplomatic technician, as he now is, firmly embedded in the Nazi regime.)

At all events the universities are run by stupid, ignorant, prejudiced, largely dishonest people. Of that I think there can be little doubt, and the unintelligent mistakes are quite as serious as the deliberate acts in their effect upon competent scholars and scientists as well as upon the instruction.

I found a few indications of sharply limited hopes for the future of the universities. First, one medical scientist said to me, "They like to say they don't need us, but they know that they do." To this I replied

"Yes, of course, they know that they need physicists, chemists and medical scientists, but what about historians?" He replied by shrugging his shoulders hopelessly. I was also told by two or three people who unquestionably know something about it at first hand that the Kaiser Wilhelm Gessellschaft is probably safer from interference now than it was a year ago, and that there is a prospect that it will have some small radiating influence. In this connection it will be interesting to set down what seems to me a remarkable and significant coincidence. Some weeks earlier I had been talking in Paris with an old friend who is one of the most intelligent Frenchmen I know, a professor at the College de France. He said to me, "In the present state of the country with all the financial and political trouble, the College de France which, in accordance with its foundation, is relatively free from government interference will play a more important part in the intellectual life of the country than it has for many years. In short, it will perhaps again fulfill the purpose of its founder." It was only about three weeks later that a man who has had an extremely responsible position in the intellectual life of Germany during the last 30 years said to me, "The Kaiser Wilhelm Gessellschaft, being relatively independent of the government, is destined to play a more important part in the intellectual life of Germany than it has in the past, and our greatest hopes center about it." The bearing of these two practically identical statements on the importance of privately endowed universities in America seems pretty evident.

The influence of the Kaiser Wilhelm Gessellschaft on the development of the physical and medical sciences in the universities is likely to be considerable and in the right direction.

From another source I learned that the organization formerly called the Notgemeinschaft, and which now bears another name more in keeping with Nazi pride, has been given more money to be used in aid of research this year than previously. These I think are small but not negligible signs of betterment.

The reports about the recruiting of young men as scholars and men of science were uniformly bad or at all events expressed deep depression. I was told by many that in general the able, intelligent, energetic young men are going either into the army or into industry and that there are very few who are taking up university careers, even in the favored physical and biological sciences, and I think this is entirely trustworthy information. The result of this and of the events of the past 25 years may be briefly sketched as follows: There was no great destruction of life during the war among university men who are now more than 55 years old, for many of them were already in positions which tended to protect them from risk. On the other hand, this group has been decimated through the treatment of the Jews and of certain others who proved either irreconcilable or unable to take care of themselves. The group between the ages of 40 and 55 is small because probably a majority of those who would have become professors were either killed in the war or in some way or other deflected from what would have been their course. Younger men have been through the evil times and have chosen a university career less often than would have been the case in a happier period. And now the supply of good young men is still dwindling.

The upshot of all this may be expressed in the form of a very rough estimate, as follows: Among the professors and dozenten of the German universities there are less than half as many able men as there were before

the war, and their work is not half as effective as it was at that time. The rest are, in general, a bad lot, stupid, incompetent and often dishonest.

I feel constrained to add that it is my impression that the German universities had been slowly declining for a quarter of a century before the outbreak of the war, and that the present situation represents the result of a long, slowly descending wave on which is superimposed the result of a quarter century of catastrophe.

One final remark about the universities: I was told over and over again that there is hardly a first-rate scientific investigator in Germany who would not gladly accept a call to America or to a moderately comfortable post in almost any other foreign country. Needless to say, I take this statement more confidently as an expression of a strong feeling of hostility to the government and of hopelessness for the future than as a prediction of what people would do.

A few remarks about Hitler may be set down. I was told that both von Blomberg and von Neurath have been much impressed by Hitler's success in educating himself about all sorts of technical or quasi-technical subjects, and that they find their dealings with him personally reasonably satisfactory. My informant added that he had come to believe that Hitler is considerably more intelligent than anyone had at first supposed. At this point I put in a question that I had formulated long before going to Germany, to this effect: "Hitler's principal task has been to rebuild in Germany a feeling of confidence, solidarity, security, national pride, etc. To me it seems that the very best raw material available in great quantity for this purpose is the great mass of the more unintelligent but devout Protestants and Catholics. Accordingly, I think that his treatment of the churches is no less than 'wahnsinnig'. What have you to say to this observation?" The reply was cordial agreement and

the statement that Hitler is certainly not intelligent enough to understand this kind of consideration, and that he is also emotionally so devoted to a few favorite ideas or prejudices that he is quite incapable of objective consideration when they are involved. These are (1) the dogma of race, (2) the hatred and fear of Bolshevism, and (3) the belief that his Nazi religion must be adopted by Germans generally. I was also told that Schacht has twice presented his resignation to Hitler and that on the second occasion Hitler said to him, "If you retire today, you will be dead tomorrow."

Another report was that two of the most distinguished men of science in Germany went to Hitler to try to persuade him to treat the Jews better and that they were dismissed with gross insults. A further story is that he has made a political testament nominating Goering as his successor in the event of his death.

It is said that Goering, who loves the flesh pots, ostentation, and magnificence, is far more friendly to the rich than Hitler and would be glad to preserve the old economic order with himself as one of the favored few. Of course, I heard a great many other things about Hitler, Goering, Goebbels and others that are common knowledge, but it is hardly worth while to go on talking about such questions because there must be hundreds of people who are better informed than I am.

* * * * *

So far I have been setting down what was said of the present state of affairs. In many respects, however, trends are more significant than conditions at a moment, and I especially tried to find out what my informants thought about trends. On the whole, the opinions expressed about economic

trends seem to me valueless, but the estimates of trends of opinion, though rather bewildering, are, I think, significant. Everybody agrees that the feeling in Germany was in general very much happier a year or two ago than it was when Hitler came into power, and that most people were far better off. There was also general agreement, with hardly an exception, that people in general are less happy today than they were a year ago, and that the number of people hostile to the government has been increasing rapidly in many if not nearly all classes for more than a year.

I suppose it is pretty safe to guess that this would have happened in almost any strong and vigorous government coming into power under the circumstances that existed in Germany when Hitler began to rule, for under such circumstances no government could possibly fulfill its promises, let alone the hopes of a distracted and unhappy population. But there was, I should say, a general agreement among my informants that something far more significant than such a normal reaction has occurred. This has already been suggested in the case of the students by what I have said, and I think it is obviously true of both devout Protestants and devout Catholics. It is doubtful if the professors as a class have become very much more hostile than they were a year or two ago, because their position was probably already definitively established at an earlier date. I think there is little doubt that the wealthier peasants and the peasant proprietors generally have also become much more hostile in the past year, and my informants were very emphatic that that is also true of the small shopkeeping class and similar people. Once more I think it is fair to say that nobody knows much about the working man. On the other hand, some people say that the 'Kraft durch Freude' activities are having a considerable effect upon large numbers of people who are about

at the level where middle class and proletariat meet.

If one were to average the opinions of all my informants, opinions which on the whole are not widely divergent, I think the upshot would be that three or four years ago a considerable majority of Germans were at least somewhat favorable to the Nazi regime, and that generally the German people could have been divided into three large classes: the strong partisans of the government, the strong opponents, and the rest. Today my informants believe that there are only two large classes, the strong adherents of Hitler and the strong opponents, the adherents making hardly a third of the population, the strong opponents more than half. Of course, I have no independent means of knowing whether my informants are anywhere near right in their quantitative estimates. When one thinks of the different opinions honestly held about the outcome of a presidential election in the United States, it is clear that very little importance attaches to guesses of this kind. But I should like to say at this point that I found myself more and more convinced as I talked with more and more people that there has been for something over a year a strong trend away from Hitler.

Naturally there was a good deal of talk about what is coming. The general opinion is that the Nazis will remain in power for a long time and the only hope is an evolution within the party. But further, I was repeatedly told that decent men find it quite impossible to enter the party, not merely because of their dislike of its policies, but also because of the dishonesty, stupidity, violence and ignorance that are everywhere present. In this connection certain other remarks about Hitler are much to the point. I was told that one of Hitler's most unfortunate virtues is loyalty to his

old associates. Now, of course, the type that is qualified to make a revolution is very far from the type that is qualified to rebuild. So it has come about that he is surrounded chiefly and the party in general is made up of people who are not only inferior in intelligence and ability but who have the wrong kind of temperament and the wrong kind of ability for the work now in hand. In this way, it was said, a vicious circle has been set up. Evolution within the party toward a better and wiser policy of government is the only hope for improving conditions, and the very nature of the party makes impossible the recruitment of the kind of people who could bring about such a healthy evolution.

By this time it must be clear that my informants were generally pretty well all of one kind and that my information is one-sided. I feel this restriction on the significance of what I am putting down very keenly and have no doubt that the people with whom I talked are in no sense a fair sample of the German population. But, as I said in the beginning, they were selected not because of their political views but because of the fact that I had access to them either on business or through professional connections or through old personal associations. Therefore, I think their substantial unanimity of some importance.

There has been talk recently of the beginnings of malnutrition in Germany. One man whom I know well and trust, who is the head of a big clinic in one of the poor quarters of Berlin, told me clearly and emphatically that there are as yet no signs of malnutrition in his hospital. Personally I regard this one piece of evidence as decisive. However, I can well believe from other things that were said that Germany is very close to the line in this respect.

During my stay in Berlin I heard "Heil Hitler" as a form of greeting very rarely indeed, either on the streets or in shops, and I saw no sign of admiration of brown shirts. On the other hand, when the guard marched up and down Unter den Linden it was followed by large and enthusiastic crowds. I should think there can be no doubt that the army is immensely popular today, and, so far as my observation is of any value, the attitude of the public to the Nazis in uniform supports what my informants told me. I had the impression, although it is not clearly supported by anything that I can now remember that was said to me, that a considerable factor in all this is the old, traditional admiration of Germans generally for thoroughness and efficiency. To all appearances the army is as good as ever and however it may be with the civil servants, the ordinary run of members of the Nazi party are, I should think, pretty conspicuously lacking in these qualities. Indeed, I now remember that I was told over and over again that the Nazis are uneducated people, and in addition to the remark that people of the officer kind are ruled by people of the unteroffiziere kind, it was repeatedly said that education is in the hands of people of the volkschullehrer kind. This is equivalent to saying that ignorant, meddling, conceited busybodies are very widely in power.

I was told over and over again that nobody in Germany wants war and only once heard anything to the contrary, when in a company of five or six people a student remarked that the story was going about that so and so, an important man in the Nazi party, had said that the four year plan would have no sense if it were not a preparation for war (war a l'échéance as the French say). Nobody else agreed that this remark was to be taken seriously, but I am confident that there is a good deal of wishful thinking in the unanimous opinion of my informants, and of course they know that they are individually and collectively unable to do anything about it. In this respect I fear that my informants do protest too much, not dishonestly, indeed, but wishfully.

Perhaps it will be interesting to put down the two extreme prophecies that I heard about the future. The first represents the point of view of some of the more determined and courageous pastors of the Protestant church and is substantially as follows: "The struggle between the government and the Protestant church will continue, and bids fair to be more serious in the immediate future than it has been in the past. (This prophecy has been fulfilled already.) The government will use every means, honest and dishonest." At this point one of my informants illustrated the methods of the government by turning to a daily newspaper lying on his table and showing me the government statement issued the day before that seven or eight pastors had just been arrested. He then added that the number arrested on that previous day was not seven or eight but forty-five. "The government disposes of all the force and has nearly every other advantage. However, we have one advantage. Our aim is a single one and it will never change. The government has many changing aims. Therefore, we shall finally win, but it will probably be my grandchildren who will take part in the victory. Meanwhile there will be much persecution and suffering, but in the history of the Christian church that has often happened and we Christians have learned that the fate of the individual is nothing compared with a principle."

The second prophecy to which I have referred was given me by a German now no longer in Germany, a few days after I had left the country. In his opinion the army could overthrow the government at any moment without difficulty, or with relatively little difficulty, if a few preparations were skillfully made. Secondly, the higher officers of the army despise the Nazis in general and dislike the present regime. Thirdly, the dominant sentiment in the army that prevents immediate action is the old tradition not to mix

in politics and above all not to put the army in the position of being responsible for a coup d'etat, let alone a revolution. Accordingly, what will happen is this. The army will wait until the time shall come when in some way or other trouble arises that calls for intervention. Such trouble is not far off, perhaps a year off, perhaps 10, but not longer. Then, the army, being in duty bound to intervene, will put back into power throughout the country the old fashioned, efficient, highly educated, well trained kind of civil servants, and there will be a return to honesty and decency in national life.

It is a striking fact that nobody in Germany expressed such an opinion as this. I may perhaps comment on it to this extent. Some of the elements out of which the theory is constructed are obviously true and correspond to relatively permanent factors in Germany, but the combination, especially in the more elaborate form in which it was stated to me, is far too elaborate to satisfy me, at least.

* * * * *

Having now set down, so far as I can remember them, the more significant things said to me while I was in Germany, I shall try to draw a few conclusions.

I am satisfied that there is a deep cleavage in Germany, and that on the whole there are relatively few people (relatively, that is to say, to the numbers in England or the United States) who are neither ardently favorable to the government nor ardently hostile. I think there can be little doubt that for a clear majority the question of where they stand politically is as important as any other question. In other words, the cleavage is real and it is significant day in and day out for most people, and constantly

in their minds. Moreover, in a measure, anyone who is on their side politically is a friend, anyone on the other side an enemy. The cleavage goes right down into families and divides them. (If I am not mistaken, one could find similar remarks about similar circumstances in Thucydides.) So far I am in agreement with my informants.

I also feel confident that the trend has been for the past year in the direction that they describe. But when the question is made quantitative I feel myself, on the one hand, quite incompetent to make a precise estimate and, on the other hand, sceptical of the statements that were made to me. I am inclined to guess, however, that there are at least half as many people definitively hostile to the government as my informants thought. In other words, I think it very safe indeed to say that more than one-quarter of the German population are strongly and definitively hostile to the present regime (in plain English they hate it) and that the number of these people is increasing. Secondly, I am bound to say that it seems to me unlikely that more than about one-third of the population are strongly favorable, for otherwise I think I should have seen more signs of support of the government. Accordingly, I suspect that the number of people who remain relatively non-partisan is greater than I was told. My reasons for this guess had better be indicated. Nearly everyone whom I saw has had the old fashioned German higher education, and among them there is a prevalent tendency to an overintellectual attitude. Moreover, Germans are at least as emotional as other people and they have been subjected to violent provocations to an emotional attitude for many years. I have the feeling that at least most of my informants are really incapable of imagining

an attitude of indifference as a normal attitude under existing circumstances, and yet it seems to me probable that there must be thousands of little people in Germany who are very much more concerned with their own everyday affairs than with considerations of national politics. Moreover, intellectuals tend to forget how many people live merely from day to day with a feeling of reasonable satisfaction when a day passes with reasonable comfort. Of course, when things get bad enough that is no longer the case, but as I have said there is no evidence of malnutrition in Berlin, and the sufferings of the Germans today are what may be described as moral and spiritual rather than physical. I should think that today the amount of physical pain in Germany as in other countries that arises from disease is a hundredfold greater than the physical suffering that may be directly or indirectly of political origin. The truth is that only one remark that I heard while I was in Germany implies a tendency to look at the phenomena with cold objectivity. This remark was made by perhaps the most distinguished of all the persons with whom I talked. It was elicited by my statement that I hoped to understand and did not wish to criticize or to form moral judgments. The reply was something like this. Perhaps after all what has been happening in Germany in the last few years is a process which, apart from its details, was inevitable and determined independently of the plans or ideas or wishes of any single group of individuals. Perhaps, in short, it is the working out of a political, social and economic process, already in many respects determined by forces that were present before Hitler came into power. Now that I have put these words down I realize that they are my own and that something less was said to me. In short, this is my interpretation of the opinion behind what was said, but I think it tolerably correct as an inter-

pretation, and it was, as I have said, the only sign of a really objective point of view that I noticed.

This remark implies another. My informants are, upon the whole, judging moralistically. Now I think there can be no doubt that many of the things done by the present government in Germany, while certainly open to condemnation on any moral grounds that I should be willing to accept, have produced and continue to produce results which are in part useful and not infrequently necessary to the well-being of the country. In cases of this kind the disapproval of intellectuals, however strong, may mean very little. In any case it should be taken with the utmost caution. If there were evidence that anybody in the present government except Schacht is capable of a really mechanistic and objective attitude toward the problems that he has to solve, I should attach very great importance indeed to this remark, and should be tempted to reject much more of what I was told than I do reject. But, as I have said, the evidence is that beyond a certain narrow range Hitler is sometimes even less capable of objectivity than his enemies the intellectuals, and I think that, on the whole, one may take it that there is very little Machiavellian planning in the present government. That is not to say, however, that there is a dearth of selfish, unscrupulous trickery.

I conclude with an opinion that is something more than a guess: In method as distinguished from purpose the great weakness of Nazi policy within Germany is the failure to utilize and to exploit systematically many of the strong sentiments that widely exist in the population rather than to attack them, and try to change them; for many cannot be changed but are activated and strengthened by persecution.

August 11, 1937

