

Society for the Prevention of World War III, Inc.

100188

Deutschum
and
America

By John Brown

PROF. OF THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY
WASHINGTON, D. C.



Reprinted from the
JOURNAL OF LEGAL AND POLITICAL SOCIOLOGY

Published by
PHILOSOPHICAL LIBRARY, NEW YORK

Distributed by the
*Society for the Prevention
of World War III, Inc.*

515 MADISON AVE., NEW YORK CITY

WAR REFERENCE BOARD RECORDS

000189

INTRODUCTION

The article "Deutchtum and America" by Prof. Brown of the Catholic University, Washington, D. C. is an excellent study proving the growing German influence in the cultural and educational spheres of the United States.

As the Society for the Prevention of World War III, Inc., considers Prof. Brown's article as a very valuable contribution to inform the American public about the German propaganda in the United States, we have obtained permission from the author and the editors of the "Journal of Legal and Political Sociology" to reprint Prof. Brown's article.

The penetration of America's cultural and political life with German propaganda is one of the most effective means of Pan-Germanism in its struggle for world domination.

Without the political and economic backing given to Germany in the United States, she would have never been able to prepare so thoroughly for the present onslaught. The resurrection of German power is due to a large extent to the systematic activity of well organized pro-German groups which have exerted growing influence on the political, economic and cultural life of the United States during the last decades.

We shall be very grateful to our readers if they would give us further information on any pro-German propāganda activity wherever they find it. This information will be kept strictly confidential if desired.

SOCIETY FOR THE PREVENTION OF WORLD WAR III, INC.

000190

DEUSCHTUM AND AMERICA

by JOHN L. BROWN

TO TRY to analyse in detail a "national character" is usually a vain and futile business. It is an evasive quality which tends to evaporate in discussion, but remains, nevertheless, very real. Nations, like personalities, do have dominant traits which appear early and persist, through diverse exterior forms, to the very end.

Germans, for example, were early obsessed with the idea of the Volk, of an organic Deuschtum, quite different from the normal conception of the politico-juridical state. It has been one of the prevailing motifs of their political thought and constitutes one of the outstanding symptoms of the mental derangement which has long afflicted them.¹

I Persistence of "Deuschtum"

Even in the early 16th century we have a flood of tracts claiming that the Germans had been divinely selected as the fourth of the world monarchies predicted by Daniel, the greatest of European peoples. This "Ur-deuschtum" has a whole line of theoreticians and defenders, including Peutingcr, Wimpfeling, Luther, Melanchthon, Sleidan, and a great number of forgotten minor figures.²

¹ Verrina, *The German Mentality*, London, 1941; C. Brinitzer and B. Grossbard, *Germans vs. Huns*, London, 1941; Peter Viereck, *Metapolitics*, New York, 1941; Harold Butler, *The Lost Peace*, New York, 1942, are representative of the superabundant commentary on this subject.

² Cf. F. X. Wegele, *Geschichte der deutschen Historiographie seit dem Auftreten des Humanismus*, Monaco, 1885. Melanchthon, in his tremendously influential *Chronicon Carionis* says, for example: "God has endowed the German people with a signal honor in willing that they should control the continuation of the Roman Empire and be the chosen guardians of Europe." Likewise he contends (with later German historians following him) that the Empire of Charlemagne was a German Empire and not French. Sleidan, one of the most nationalistic of the German Reformation historians, wrote in 1588 a universal history within the framework of the "Four Monarchies", *De quatuor summis imperiis libri tres*, where he underlines the historical destiny of the German nation as the protectors

000191

John L. Brown

The development of the ideas which we commonly label as Nazi can be traced in the works of the outstanding German philosophers and historians throughout the nineteenth century—we have been provided with an abundance of citations in books about Nazism to show that there is a line which passes from the Teutonic Knights, if you wish, through Luther, to Herder, Schlegel, Görres, Schelling. Hegel states baldly that the individual exists for the state and not the state for the individual: "The Volk as state is the spirit in substantial rationality and direct reality, hence the absolute power on earth."³

Some elements of Fichte were also exploited, rather through conscious misinterpretations, as selections as *Fichte für heute*⁴ testify. His works provide many passages which have a quite different sense. Those leading to Pan-Germanism, to totalitarian economy and to nationalistic Volkstum were the only ones which became influential in contemporary Germany. Adam H. Müller in his *Ueber König Friedrich II* (1810) declares that "the great federation of European peoples which will come some day as sure as we live, will also bear German hues, for everything great, fundamental, and eternal in all European institutions is certainly German." These themes engaged nearly every German writer and thinker of prominence throughout the nineteenth century—Friedrich List, Wagner, Nietzsche, Treitschke, Ranke. H. S. Chamberlain, writing to Kaiser Wilhelm II⁵ rhapsodized: "And because the German soul is indissolubly linked with the German tongue, the higher development of mankind is bound up with Germany, a mighty Germany spreading far across the earth the sacred heritage of her language and imposing herself on others. . . . God builds today upon the Germans alone." G. M. Soloveichik, in *New Europe*⁶ has sketched in succinctly the development of Deutschtum in the early twentieth century—Friedrich Naumann, author of *mitteleuropa*, which projected a "multimembered brotherhood" of states under German influence; Tannenbergh with his "Greater Germany;" Moeller van den Bruck; Spengler.

of Europe and as a superior race, the worthy successor to the universal Roman Empire. This work was used in Germany as a text book even until the beginning of the 19th century, according to G. Mertz, *Schulwesen der deutschen Reformation* (Berlin, 1902), p. 333. In 1700 it was translated into French and employed as a school book for the instruction of Frederick the Great's father.

³ *Grundlinien der Philosophie des Rechts* (Stuttgart, 1938), p. 441.

⁴ ed. Ludwig Roselius, Berlin, 1938.

⁵ See Wickham Steed, "Pan-Germanism" *International Affairs* (XVII, Sept.-Oct. 1938), pp. 667-668.

⁶ G. M. Soloveichik, "Pan-Germanism," *New Europe* (III, July-August, 1943, pp. 19-21.

Deutschtum and America

The exaltation of Deutschtum is not a Nazi innovation but an abiding tendency of German thought. The theoreticians of the Third Reich are simply echoing the ideas that they had studied in school, of the classic writers of their race. If Hüber in his *Verfassungsrecht des gross-deutschen Reiches*⁷ asserts that "The German people forms a closed community which recognizes no national borders" he can find support in Fichte. Gottfried Neese, Herbert Scuria, Friedrich Beck and the countless other apologists of Blood and Soil have brought nothing new or unique; they have simply vulgarised what they already found in their national tradition.

II Anti-Nazi, Pro-German

Hence it is not surprising that a German who is staunchly anti-Hitlerian may not necessarily be "anti-Deutschtum" at all. In fact, it is only the rare exception who can put resolutely behind him, with a real effort of the will, the centuries-old Prussian preoccupations for the realisation of the dream of the "Greater Germany." As André Chéradame states:⁸ "La disparition de Hitler ne supprimerait pas le péril pangermaniste. Ce danger réside non dans un homme mais dans la mentalité du peuple allemand." In a letter to the *New York Times* of July 4, 1943, H. T. Kohlhaas, who describes himself as a "German-American" expresses the opinion that whether liberal, communist, socialist, etc., every German is a Pan-Germanist; that even refugees, while usually sincerely anti-Nazi, are saturated with objectionable and dangerous Germanic philosophy and hold exaggerated views about German might, German cultural and scientific contributions, and German organisational genius.

It is a fact that many of the most prominent German exiles (with a few notable exceptions) whether Aryan or Jew, reveal in their speeches and their writings a tendency towards Pan-Germanism, sometimes consciously, sometimes unconsciously, sometimes marked, sometimes faint, but inevitably perceptible. Otto Strasser is an extreme example of the convinced and militant Pan-Germanist. Denied entrance to the United States, he now lives in Canada and occasionally contributes articles to American reviews. In "What About Germany After the War"⁹ he pleads for a German federation (with the understanding that this would

⁷ Berlin, 1939.

⁸ *Défense de l'Amérique* (New York, 1941), p. 215.

⁹ *Catholic World* (156, Oct. 1942-March 1943), pp. 268-275.

000192

John L. Brown

become the dominant force in Central Europe.) He warns against any attempt to dismember Germany. He is also eloquently certain (from another recent article in the *Catholic World*) that re-education by German anti-Nazis will be able to transform the hardboiled and fanatic Hitlerjugend. It is clear that Strasser is preparing himself in the hope that he will be able to play an important political rôle in postwar Germany. However, as Ernest P. Pisko writes in an article "Free Movements and not so Free,"¹⁰ "It would be entirely erroneous to consider Strasser an anti-Nazi because of his more recent actions. He is merely anti-Hitler, and this from personal motives. . . . There can be no question that a movement in which a man of Strasser's type holds power is anything but a free movement."

Prince Hubertus zu Lowenstein, former German youth leader and anti-Nazi, has been very active in this country, lecturing in many universities and frequently contributing to newspapers and magazines. In "Union Now With Germany"¹¹ he protests against any dismemberment of the present German state; "Germany should consist of those regions which are genuinely German, Austria included." He defends the cause of the "good German" in insisting that Germany and Nazism cannot be equated. "Perhaps it is because there are no Italian exiles who would be so vile as to identify their country with Fascism and who would advocate the destruction of Italy, while there are unfortunately Germans who have adopted this vile attitude towards their native land." His letter to the *New York Times* of August 22 is even more significant as an indication of how even the sincere Christian anti-Nazi cannot escape the strain of the Pan-Germanism. He insists first of all on the democracy of the German masses. These "good Germans" should not be punished. "While a civilian cannot question military necessity, the student of history may say that the periods immediately after the overthrow of a despotic administration are those which usually lend themselves most readily to the rebirth of national democracy. If in the Axis countries that opportune moment should be allowed to pass unused or the impression created that benevolent foreign Gauleiters will take over where the native left off, a great chance for democracy will be missed. Under the shadow of foreign bayonets, no democracy strong enough to stand on its own feet can develop." All this adds up to the fact that there should be little if any Allied military occupation of Germany, that the task of rehabilitating and governing should be placed in the hands of

¹⁰ *The Christian Century* (February 18, 1942), p. 213.

¹¹ *American Mercury* (53, July-December, 1941), pp. 546-551.

Deutschtum and America

a "Free German Committee," composed of exiled nationals. The letter is at once a bid for power and a plea for an unpunished Germany.¹²

An article such as that of Wolfgang zu Putlitz, "Your German American Neighbor"¹³ is more obviously brazen. Connected with the Nazi legation at the Hague until 1939, the author assures us that he has not taken out first papers and does not intend to. His rôle is to protect the German-American against the prejudice of his neighbors and to dispel any fears which we might have about a German Fifth Column, which he can characterize, even after the fall of France as "the great bugaboo of our age."

Until the rise of the Nazis, Count Coudenhove-Kalergi was widely recognised as the chief of a movement in favor of "Pan-Europe." On the surface, the program was an extremely attractive one. However, it should be remarked that since Russia, as an "Asiatic power" and England as an "extra-continental power" were both ruled out, Pan-Europa could have been dominated only by Germany. In fact one observer has said that Count Coudenhove-Kalergi tried to achieve without war for Weimar Germany what Hitler's Germany attempted by force of arms. Since 1941 he has resumed his activities in the United States, with less of an anti-Russian tendency, for reasons which are very apparent. But there are no basic differences between "Pan-Europe" and the new "European Union."

Even a superficial examination of the articles written in the course of the past three or four years by anti-Nazi exiles will confirm the trends which have been indicated above. The old themes of Pan-Germanism, with certain variations of a political sort, recur again and again in the writings of Rauschnig, of Friedrich Stampfer, Paul Hagen, Wilhelm Sollmann, and many others.

III *The "Two Germanies"*

All this is closely bound up with several extremely important issues which will affect the whole future of Europe and America.

Can we recognise the validity of existence of the "Two Germanies" the good democrats and the Nazis?

What will be done with Germany when hostilities end?

¹² On the unfortunate inadvisability of using German exiles for such rehabilitation, see V. M. Dean "What Future for Germany," *Foreign Policy Reports* (February 1, 1943), p. 285.

¹³ *Harper's* (184, Dec. 1941-Feb. 1942), p. 322-28.

John L. Brown

These two questions are asked and re-asked in public discussion and in the press. Naturally, the anti-Hitlerians in exile are very anxious to convince the Allies that it is the Nazi criminals who are solely responsible for the war and not the German people. Such a distinction is both dubious and dangerous. Undoubtedly, there is in Germany a relatively passive group who find Hitler and his works revolting, but this does not justify us in treating the German nation as a thing apart from the policy of its leaders. It is true that the leader influences the actions of the masses; but it is no less true that the leader comes from the masses and expresses their spirit and their aims. Every people tends to get the government and the leaders which they deserve. Professor F. W. Foerster has devoted his life to combatting Prussianism and militarism and he sees Nazism as an authentic manifestation of "Deutschtum." In the *Wall Street Journal* of March 29, 1943, he writes:

"In any case it is a most misleading idea to differentiate the German people from the Pan-Germanistic madness of their Prussian and Teutonic leaders. We have to do with a kind of national drunkenness, with a real mass infection, produced by a century of Prussian propaganda, poisoning the entire people by systematic lies. Therefore, only a deeply penetrating 'de-lousing' and re-education can lay the basis of the New Germany—cured of her national megalomania—a people which have abundantly proven that they are not able to resist the madness of their leaders must be put under a long guardianship—this is the only 'just peace' which can be offered to the German nation."

There has always been a tendency in this country to distinguish between the "good German" and the Hun, between the "good German" and the Nazi. This distinction arises from several factors. In the first World War we did not immediately witness the devastation of Belgium and the north of France. In this one we did not undergo the merciless bombing to which England was subjected, or the savage occupation which the Russians have endured, or the wholesale murder and devastation done with insane fury in other occupied countries. For the Englishman and the Russian, for the Pole and the Czech, the Norwegian and the Greek, it is difficult if not impossible to take such a distinction seriously. Here is a Polish opinion:¹⁴

"It should be borne in mind that: (1) Hitler was and is supported by large masses of the German people. The Nazi movement in spite of its reactionary character was and is a popular one, the Volksbewegung as the Germans call it. (2) The Nazi and German military machine

¹⁴ Feliks Gross, writing in the *New Europe* (July-August, 1943), p. 3.

Deutschtum and America

employs hundreds of thousands of people who have shown brutality and cruelty unprecedented in modern times, in dealing with their opponents particularly the peoples of the occupied countries. According to the United Nations Information Committee in London, 3,400,000 people were murdered in occupied countries before the end of 1942. For this many Germans share the criminal responsibility. (3) The first two points indicate that the destruction of the Nazi machine will not automatically produce the democratisation of the German masses."

IV—Deutschtum in the United States

Large numbers of Americans of German ancestry have retained, to a greater or lesser degree, an abiding feeling of their race. They have been actively abetted in this by the activities of the VDA, the German language press in this country, and the numerous (some 20,000 it has been estimated) German clubs and singing societies. The great wave of German emigration which came to this country after the political fermentation of 1848 was composed of German democrats who, by and large, were accepting exile for the sake of their liberal opinions. Their achievements, the considerable rôle which some of them played in the development of this Republic has created a favorable atmosphere for the perpetuation of the idea of the "Good German" versus the "Bad Nazi."

V. The German Tradition in the Universities

Furthermore the culture of Germany has always exercised a considerable influence in the United States, especially during the nineteenth century. To examine one sphere which is particularly relevant for this study, the American system of advanced education has been preponderantly German in its origins and traditions. Until the foundation of Johns Hopkins there was no "graduate work" properly speaking. Many of the original Hopkins faculty had done their advanced studies in Germany. During the rest of the nineteenth century and through the early years of the twentieth, a German doctorate was almost a "morceau obligé" in a successful American academic career. The "elders" of the American universities were, for many years, the products of seminars of Berlin, or Bonn, or Marburg. They were imbued with the idea of the superiority of German Wissenschaft, perhaps since they had invested their own intellectual capital in it. They tended to regard French university life as something frivolous and "literary," while English univer-

John L. Brown

sities were considered the pipe-smoking haunts of an idle upper-class. Even professors of Romance languages often would by-path Paris for Berlin and would return to the United States speaking French with an authentic German accent. Hence, academically, a kind of intellectual Pan-Germanism began to take root. Many of the virtues and vices of American research can be traced to Germanic origins—order, method, an exhaustive handling of detail, exact documentation, respect for the footnote, the cult of the quantitative.

VI *The German Language Press*

This admiration of Teutonic culture aided in differentiating the German immigrant from the Latin or the Slav, who were usually looked down on, aided in making him much more persistently German. For in a country like the United States, where the second immigrant generation has usually tended to lose the national traits of the parents and to abandon the mores and the language of the "old country," the German group has been remarkably tenacious. In some sections of the Middle West there are communities where until recently German was almost as common as English. The German foreign language press has fostered this feeling. Up until the time of the declaration of war, these papers were openly anti-British and isolationist. During the war, they are one of the most difficult to control. Constant surveillance has been necessary to prevent the inclusion of subversive materials. In some of these publications, official Office of War Information releases, when they were used at all, were printed in Latin type, while the rest of the paper was printed in Gothic, in order to make sure that the readers were well aware of the difference. An article published in the *Neue Volkzeitung* (an anti-Nazi weekly) called "A Nazi World of Fairy Tales in the U.S.A." gives a clear picture of the situation which existed until recently. In these papers (all of which claim to be sturdily American) there is no attempt at all to introduce the readers into American life. Instead, they present nostalgic, Pan-Germanistic visions of the "homeland." Take this fantastic passage from a novel "Fremde Welten" which was serialized by the *Detroit Abendpost* only last year. This passage appeared in the installment of November 22, 1942. The novel has its setting in Australia:

"... So you would be willing to return to Germany if you had the means?"

"O there is nothing that I long for more desperately. But unfortunately it is the wish for which there is no fulfillment."

[12]

Deutschtum and America

"But there is, there is," exclaimed Helga with a strangely transformed and radiating face. "I have the money to pay the expenses for both of us. . . . What do we care for the people in this hateful country?"

Then Helga took his sound right hand into both her own hands and like a shout of exultation it came to her lips: "We'll take the next boat—out into the sun—to our home country—to freedom—to happiness!"

For generations German Americans have built up in their minds a fantastic vision of the mother country, at once beautiful and wronged, the seat of the highest culture and the greatest scientific and organisational skill. Elmer Davis, when he was still a young journalist, stated in an article in the *Forum* in 1915 that the fatherland to which German-Americans felt themselves so strongly attached was a kind of Never-neverland. He was quite right when he added that the liberal Germany of the conception of many German-Americans was entirely different from the Germany of Wilhelm II—and entirely different from the Germany of today.

These and other factors make large portions of the population of the United States curiously susceptible to the "Pan-European" or more bluntly Pan-Germanistic solution of the problem of "what to do with Germany." Our approach to the whole question has been much less realistic than that of the British, who have a much closer experience with the Nazi state.¹⁵

Neither France, England, or Russia has any taste for a solution which would re-instate the "Good German" as the master of Mitteleuropa.

VII *German Area Study and its Importance*

We are already preparing, in the form of the Foreign Area Studies which the Army Specialised Training program has set up in some 200

¹⁵ It is not only the Vansittartites who combat the notion of the "Two Germanies" as a basis for post-war negotiation. A resolution passed by the British Labor Party by a majority of 1,083,000 (reported in the *New York Times* of June 18, 1943) stated that the Germans who are opposed to the policy of their government are a very small minority, and that no permanent peace would be possible after the war unless Germany was completely disarmed and her "spirit of aggressive nationalism completely eradicated." Brendan Bracken, in the *New York Times* of August 28, is intransigent. In replying to those "silly people" who are talking about educating the Germans in the post-war period as to the folly of

[13]

1000195

John L. Brown

of our colleges and universities, the reply to this central question of the treatment of Germany after the war.¹⁶

We are now training some 100,000 soldiers in the language, history, customs, psychology, political and economic structure of various foreign countries. They will be the ones who will carry out the details of the American occupation and rehabilitation of post-war Europe. In their hands rests the practical outcome of our attempts at a resolution of the German question. In campuses from New Brunswick to Berkeley, classrooms are crowded with young men who are following these courses in area study. For its concrete influence on the course of history, this is perhaps one of the most significant movements in large-scale education which has ever been undertaken. The attitudes which these students acquire, the directions in which their thought is directed will fix important trends not only in German history but in the history of all of Europe. It is imperative that they acquire sound and democratic ideas about the problem of Europe, that they should not be led astray, in their good will and in their ignorance of the complexity of the Old World, by teachers who are not thoroughly versed, both in the American tradition and in European background.

VIII *The Problem of Teaching Personnel*

To find teachers of this sort is admittedly very difficult, because the specialist will not suffice, because an integrated "area study" of this type has seldom been tried in the American universities. Few Americans, who have a broad and deep knowledge of European problems, in addition to a sound American formation, are still available, were never available, in fact, in any large number. The needs of global war have long since drained many of them into the intelligence services of the Army and Navy, the State Department, and into the wartime federal bureaus such as the OWI, the OSS, the OEW, etc. Most of those who remain are specialists in some branch of the philology or the early history of the area concerned, who know all about Vincent of Beauvais but nothing of

war, he would nominate Air Chief Marshall, Sir Arthur T. Harris, as the best "educator" on that subject.

¹⁶ For a brief description of this Foreign Area Study program, see *The Herald-Tribune* for Sunday, August 29, 1943. In addition to this program which is designed for enlisted men and "is not an officers' training school although many of the graduates may become officers later," there are various centers for more advanced "foreign area study" for officers, such as those at Yale and Harvard, and the School for Military Government at Charlottesville, Virginia.

[14]

Deutschum and America

Otto Abetz, who know the history of the rise of Provençal poetry, but nothing of the rise of the Nazi party. They certainly could not be expected to render the most efficient service in this area study. Unless care is exercised "area study" can easily break down into conventional classroom teaching of the language of the country studied, with some accessory lectures on history, geography, and social features. Such a formation, geared to pre-war days when there was time for superfluous or irrelevant information which would have no immediate political or social consequences, is completely out of place today, when the principles taught in these Foreign Area courses must be put into practice by those who take them. The future reputation of the United States in Europe will in part depend on decisions that these students will take. For they will be in continued and intimate contact with the foreign populations, "both in waging the war and in maintaining the peace."

We must not have too many illusions about the quality or the extent of the previous preparation which these students have had for foreign area study, in spite of the fact that they were selected from Army trainees who had scored 115 or over in the Army General Classification test and had some knowledge of a foreign language. Many do not speak the language of the area in which they will be called upon to work with any real ease or fluency. Some are almost a-political or at best given to provincialism as far as the tangled skeins of European political movements are concerned. They are often willing to believe anything plausible which they are told. They know they must conquer Germany, but they have little idea as yet what ought to be done with it. Many are willing to take the easiest solution offered—the minimum of American interference, the restitution of Germany to the "good Germans" who will elect deputies and everyone will live happily for ever and ever—or at least until these "good Germans" have been mysteriously metamorphosed into Nazis and the whole structure will come tumbling down once again.

IX *The German Professors in Exile*

It is clear that the old line foreign-language teacher can be utilized in such foreign area studies only to a limited degree because of the limitation in his own training and experience.

There remains, however, a whole group of teachers, who are extremely eager, for any number of motives, to step in and assume an important role in the Foreign Area Study courses. They comprise a very mixed assortment of the qualified and the unqualified, the clever and the obtuse, the sincere and the frankly opportunistic. Since 1933, they have

[15]

100196

John L. Brown

formed an ever-growing problem in the American university, a problem which has not yet been studied frankly and honestly, although it is of real importance in any attempt to analyse the recent sociology of learning in the United States. This is the group of the German professors in exile. There is no place here to assay the many contributions to American academic life, which such exceptional minds as Einstein, Cassirer, Panofsky and others have brought to this continent. Nor can we detail the problems and the tensions which have been created in giving a marked preference to this group over other European scholars. This can be sociologically explained, but not justified, by the aforementioned two factors—the part German scholarship played in the formation of American universities and the considerable number of German Americans who persist in their "Deutschtum." Something should be said, however, about the implications of their influence in the teaching of foreign area studies and their indoctrination of the students who will carry out the work of American occupation and reconstruction in Europe.

What are some of these implications? There is the likelihood that they will instruct their pupils, whether consciously or not, to think in terms of a Pan-Germanic Europe, veiled as "Pan-Europe" or under some other tag. They will teach the danger of the disarmament of Germany, of the necessity of preserving intact the economic and social structure which the Nazis have built up in Central Europe.¹⁷

They will insist on the need of preserving German strength in order to prevent the "Communization" and the "Russification" of Europe. They will teach the essential differences between the "good German" of Goethe, Beethoven, Thomas Mann and the Nazi. They will even claim that the majority of the German nation was always anti-Nazi and anti-Hitler, but that they were forced to support the Party. But granted such a spineless population, which followed a leader in whom they did not believe, there is no guarantee at all but that in twenty-five years a new Hitler will arise to force the people into submission once again.¹⁸ To subscribe to this doctrine of the "innocent German people" after the political crimes committed by them and their leaders, is to

¹⁷ See the article, "To Solve the German Problem—A Free State?" of Upton Sinclair, in the *New York Times*, August 14, 1943.

¹⁸ W. F. Foerster, "Germany Ruled by the Nazi Spirit," *New York Herald-Tribune*, July 3, 1943: "In Germany the dynamic minority commands the nation's destiny. Therefore, it is no use to stress the peaceful type even if the peaceful are in the majority. They were never a serious factor when it came to shaping the nation's fate . . . What is the aim and purpose of telling the victims of the ruthless German type that there live innocent sheep beside the German wolves?"

[16]

Deutschtum and America

subscribe to a kind of moral anarchy, which completely abandons any belief in free will and moral responsibility which is the basis of any organised society.

And what has been the record of the "academic man" in Germany during the past ten years? The Universities, possessed of a prestige which is unknown in the United States, could have been bastions of resistance against Hitlerism. Unhappily, the professorial class revealed itself incredibly supine and irresponsible in the face of Nazi pressure. The Catholic and Protestant clergy were infinitely more courageous in insisting on the dignity of man and the rights of the individual conscience against the all-inclusive demands of the State. Some professors went over completely to the Party, taught even classical philology from a pure National Socialist point of view, converted the social sciences into a fanciful mythology of "Rasse." Others kept silent and hoped for the best. They remained quiet, perhaps did not wholly approve, but offered little or no active resistance. After all, their pensions were at stake. The academic pension in Germany had the same fatal and anesthetizing effect on the university group as the Civil Service and army pensions had on French official classes, who sometimes supported Pétain simply because the Vichy government offered to continue these stipends.

Undoubtedly, there were professors in the German universities who resisted whole heartedly the throttling of intellectual and spiritual life. On the whole, however, their behavior could be labelled as a "trahison des clercs." They felt it was possible to appease the Nazis. They felt that by sacrificing intellectual integrity and honesty they could save their pensions. In the end many found that in sacrificing honor to keep jobs and pensions, they lost jobs and pensions too. That lesson should have been made abundantly clear by the events of this war: to give up principles in the hope of maintaining things ends by the loss of both.

Such is the record of a troublingly large group in the German professorial classes.¹⁹

They pose essentially the same problem as that of the German people as a group. If the Nazis actually comprised such a small minority of the population, why has the Underground given so little sign of activity,

¹⁹ A serious study of the reaction of the Universities to National Socialism would be very worthwhile. The use of university professors as instruments in German propaganda abroad was particularly significant in the promotion of "Franco-German" relations, in which Sieburg, Abetz and others were particularly active.

[17]

why there has been such slight indication of any popular resistance?²⁰

Why did the professors consent to nazify their courses, to abandon the highly vaunted objective of German science in order to prostitute it for the most sordid political purposes? Perhaps it was the "timidity" of the academic mind. Perhaps it was a tacit agreement with some of the basic principles of National Socialism which Hitler was presenting in a "popular" form. Perhaps it was a lack of conviction and a lack of belief in liberalism and democracy which made professorial resistance to Nazi pressure so feeble.²²

At any rate, the German professoriat, in spite of striking exceptions, is not a group which inspires the most complete confidence.²⁴ They

²⁰ Friedrich Stampfer, "The German Problem," *New Europe* (July-August, 1943) p. 14 gives the rather startling explanation that "There was no visible resistance for two reasons. Every attempt to resist would immediately have been punished by death. Moreover the opposition inside Germany preferred at that very moment a lost war to a won revolution. Those men and women did not want to foster a new stab in the back legend; they wanted to throw upon the Nazis the undivided responsibility of war and defeat."

²² In many instances there should be no talk of resistance at all. Cf. Heinz Pol, *The Hidden Enemy: The German Threat to Post-War Peace* (New York, 1943), p. 109: "In the spring of 1933, after the world expressed its first misgivings over the Hitler régime, about 1200 university professors, descendants of the manifesto-makers of 1914, issued an 'Appeal to the Intellectuals of the World.' This Pan-German 'elite gleichgeschaltet' by Hitler, thought it useful to declare that 'German science appeals to the intellectuals of the world to show as much understanding toward the stirring German nation united by Adolf Hitler for freedom, honor, justice, and peace as they would toward their own nation.'" See also on this connection "Der Fall Bergsträsser—Pro und Contra" in *Aufbau* July 4, 1942, pp. 14-15. Maximilian Scheer's "contra" is matched by the "pro" of C. J. Friedrich of Harvard University. The excellent pamphlet of Julian Huxley, *Argument of Blood* (London, 1941) states in describing the attitude of the teaching class (p. 23): "The Jew Emil Lask was the most important thinker that Heidelberg had produced for half a century. He was moreover the only member of his faculty who fell in the first World War. In the very building where he taught was affixed the notice, 'Wenn der Jude Deutsch schreibt, lügt er.'" None of his colleagues protested. Such was the pall of moral cowardice that the Nazi terror draped over German learning." And later (p. 29): "Professors allowed their assistants to be beaten, driven into concentration camps, exiled with hardly a gesture of disapproval. They remained silent at the dismissal of colleagues in whose appointments they had had a share and by whose side they had worked for years. The merest handful chose to retire into the decent obscurity of private life."

²⁴ Julian Huxley, *op. cit.* p. 30 estimates that by the autumn of 1937 about one-fifth of the German professoriate (about 2500 persons) had been dismissed. It is very significant that the four-fifths who remained made no protest against this intolerable situation. It must also be noted that some were dismissed because of non-Aryan ancestry who had been prominent champions of National Socialism in the Universities.

objected to the violence with which the Nazis deprived them of their jobs and of their pensions. But large numbers, it is clear, were secretly or subconsciously convinced of the basic tenets of the Nazi creed—the superiority of the German people, the bankruptcy of liberalism, the exaltation of violence and the "feeling of the blood," a revolt against the rational and the intellectual, a thirst for national expansion. We find no group coming forward to carry on the tradition of the "Göttingen Sieben."

It is this class which is now anxious to influence or direct the education of the American soldiers who will be assigned to work in Germany and to aid in the carrying out of Allied plans for occupation and rehabilitation. Miss Dorothy Thompson, in replying in the *American Mercury* (June, 1943) to the article of Kingsbury Smith "Our Government's Plan for Post-War Germany" (in the *Mercury* of April, 1943) protests against some of the details of these plans which seem to her unduly harsh; she states that we are preparing "gauleiters" to take over in a conquered Germany. It would be ironical if the term should take on an unsuspected exactness and our foreign area courses for Germany should tend to produce a group that should have accepted, by and large, the principles on which a Pan-Germanistic Europe would be based.

These courses are charged with dynamite, have the potentialities to do tremendous good or tremendous harm. They can be essential in the formation of administrators who will work towards the introduction of democratic ideals into the poisoned system of Germany; or they can produce a group which is in unconscious agreement with the Pan-Germanistic trends which persist in so many anti-Nazi exiles. Every possible precaution must be taken that the material presented in these courses represents a faithful image of the official policies of the United Nations and not the individual interpretation of an anti-Hitler pro-German. Basic sources and required readings should be provided by the government itself, in order to make sure that German area study does not become another possible instrument of "Deutschtum," a means which would contribute to the losing, rather than the winning, of the peace. Regular official inspection by native Americans who know both Germany and the traditions of their own country, should not be neglected; these inspectors should not only attend classes at regular intervals but should chat informally with the trainees, to determine the channels in which their thought is being directed, as well as to check on the fluency they are acquiring in the language. Otherwise Germans who remain strongly German in spite of being anti-Nazi, will attempt, with the best conscience in the world, to do everything in their power

John L. Brown

to convince their pupils of the necessity of preserving German unity and strength in post-war Europe. As E. T. stated in a letter to the *New York Herald-Tribune* (April 11, 1943):

"These attacks against unconditional surrender as well as other facts are proofs of a mobilisation of sympathy for the German people. In my belief, all those German anti-Nazis who are expressing such ideas are but Pan-Germanists. They have but one goal: to save German unity. They are strong opponents of any kind of dismemberment of Germany after the war. I heard even the other day one of these people telling an American forum: 'Prussia was the strongest bulwark of democracy.'"

X Themes to Avoid

Granted the present situation, precautions should be taken that themes such as the following (which are being elaborated with increasing frequency in newspapers and reviews) do not bulk too large in the presentation of German area study: "The two Germanies;" formation of a "Free German Committee" for re-education and rehabilitation; the organisation of a Pan-European Federation in which Germany would play a leading part; the preservation of the German economic organization of Europe; the punishment of Nazi criminals by the Germans themselves; resistance to the idea of "unconditional surrender"; the insistence on unique German contributions in science, arts, letters.

The campaign to perpetuate the myth of "the two Germanies" has been one of the principal efforts of the anti-Nazi pro-Germans both in this country and in England. It provides the ideological foundation on which their detailed proposals for the solution of the German problem rest. On these grounds, in "News from Germany" (September, 1942), the periodical of the German Social Democrats in London, the continuous bombing of the Reich is deplored since "the workers are well aware that this is a war against Hitler and not against the German people, and the Nazis rejoice whenever English bombs dropped on working-class districts promise to shatter this belief."

Hence it is argued that the Allies should make haste to form a "Free German Movement" that can take complete charge of the task of re-education, rehabilitation, and whatever chastisement may be necessary. Prince Hubertus zu Loewenstein is eloquent in his support of such a movement. In his letter to the *Times* (August 22, 1943) already quoted he writes: "German national committees formed abroad could do a work that no foreign military or civilian administration could ever achieve." He implies that the very notion of training American soldiers to act as an army of occupation and rehabilitation is a tragic error.²⁵

[20]

Deutschtum and America

Following also from the "good German" motif, is the plea that all the European nations must share the responsibility for the war. "Germany Tomorrow", a recent publication of the American Friends of German Freedom, reaffirms the position that Germany was not responsible for the last war; it admits that in the present conflict the problem is "different" but asks whether there is not a joint responsibility for the underlying reasons that led to the emergence of Hitler and the victory of Fascism. Friedrich Stampfer, in *New Europe* (July-August, 1943, p. 14) relieves the German people of responsibility for Nazism: "Neither the leaders nor the people of western democracies wanted to fight for the freedom of Europe." Gerhart Seger writing in the same periodical (p. 17) follows the same line: "But at this very point, already, I fail to see all the guilt on the side of Germany. The Inter-Allied Military Control Commission in charge of carrying out the military clauses of the Treaty of Versailles did not support the Weimar Republic, which wanted to make Germany a civilian democracy."²⁶

As a means of reintegrating the "Good Germany" into a European order, there has been much emphasis on the need for a Pan-European Federation. "If this is a war of liberation," pleads Paul Hagen, "there ought to be a democratic solution not only for the liberated victims but for Germany too." He disapproves of any solution which would seek security "in a drastic reduction of German strength by at least temporary dismemberment and by the preparation of a long-term occupation government." He proposes a democratic federation, something on the line of Count Coudenhove-Kalergi's plan. The proponents of such plans, however, do not give enough consideration to the possibility that such a continental federation would soon come under the domination of a militaristic, Junker Germany. Linked with this idea of federation are the arguments in favor of preserving the Nazi economic organization of Cen-

²⁵ See also the various letters of Mr. Fritz Ermath (*New York Times*, August 29, 1943 and the *New York Herald-Tribune*, August 1943) together with the able answer of F. W. Foerster, (*New York Times*, August 28, 1943).

²⁶ Seger's arguments about the Weimar Republic should be confronted with the statement of the former chancellor Wirth who wrote in the *Luzerner Tageblatt*, December 5, 1937: "As to German rearmament, Hitler simply continued the work which was begun by the Weimar Republic. The great difficulty was that our efforts had to be concealed from the Entente. I always had to appear polite and harmless. . . . The treaty of Rapallo permitted us military experiments on Russian territory. When Hitler came to power, he had to occupy himself only with the quantity of the army. The quality was due to our work, since the real military reorganization had been brought about by the Weimar Republic."

[21]

John L. Brown

tral Europe. Nothing would be more ideal as an instrument for the maintenance of Pan-German domination.

Admitting that the Nazi criminals should be punished, there is a growing campaign in some exile groups that such punishment be carried out, not by the Allies, but by the German people themselves. The *Neue Volkszeitung* (Oct. 10, 1942) editorialises: "In view of the steadily growing brutalities of the Nazis, President Roosevelt has considered it necessary to declare publicly that the United Nations after the war will appoint international commissions in order to judge all the Nazi criminals in regular courts. We believe that it should be much wiser if this judgment were passed by German courts, naturally after all Nazis and half-Nazis have been expelled from the ranks of the German judges." This is simply an invitation for the Germans to repeat the "punishment" which they inflicted on their "war criminals" in 1918. The Allies presented a list of some 900 criminals who should be tried before an international tribunal. Germany refused to consent to this, but agreed to punish the guilty before a Supreme Court in Leipzig. Out of a list of 45 names, 12 were actually tried, and only six convicted. All of these were given insignificant sentences.²⁷

XI Conclusion

In general, the drive for a negotiated or "soft" peace should be counteracted. The Casablanca program provided for unconditional surrender. If Germany managed to win a negotiated peace, the infuriated peoples of Europe who have for years been crushed by Nazi oppression would take their own vengeance—and none could blame them. There is being launched (in this country as well as abroad) a large-scale effort (to use the expression of F. W. Foerster) for the "mobilisation of sympathy" for the Germans. It is significant to note the growth of such organisations as the American Friends of German Freedom, which published "In Re: Germany" and the National Council for the Prevention of War, whose bulletin "Peace Action" is edited by Frederick J. Libby. Representative Clare Hoffman of Michigan in a recent "Town Meeting of the Air" (reported by *PM*, August 15, 1943) advocated "collaboration" with the enemy. "War pursued to the bitter end is a human tragedy and the sooner we can stop it the better." A prominent anti-Nazi exile has labelled the demand for unconditional surrender as "essentially undemocratic and aggressively un-Christian." The technique of "mobilising sympathy" was well worked out after the last war, and the same methods,

²⁷ Sheldon Glueck, Trial and Punishment of the Axis War Criminals, *Free World*, November, 1942.

[22]

Deutschum and America

refined and perfected, are being put into operation now, in order to salvage as much as possible of German resources for the "next war" which Goebbels is already promising the German nation. Even Dorothy Thompson exhorts us "to salvage Germany." Unless we are very careful Germany will succeed only too brilliantly in salvaging herself. A representative of one of the European subject nations, Dr. Alexander Loudon of Holland, in a broadcast on August 19, has envisaged the situation very clearly. "The Nazis will do the same thing they did in 1918. Now as in August, 1918, they are staging defeat . . . and preparing for the next war. . . . I sincerely hope that the Germans will not be allowed to surrender until they are completely crushed, until their Army, Navy, and Luftwaffe are individually whipped and their wartime commanders made to sign a document of defeat and unconditional surrender." The campaign for a "soft peace" is furthered by the fear that is being fostered by the Pan-Germanists that a thoroughly disarmed Germany will open the way for the "Communization" of Europe. There is the possibility that the generals and the big business men in Germany *can* deal with Russia, if the conditions of Britain and the United States are too harsh. It is to the advantage of the Nazis to create as much suspicion as possible among the Allies about the post-war settlement of Germany. Until there is agreement on this point, the enemy still has a valuable card up his sleeve.

Such trends must not go unnoticed. Every effort should be made to control them by means of a careful choice of instructors, by the use of reliable texts and readers, by frequent inspection by competent authorities. And there is always the additional danger that the foreign area courses may be used not only to present partisan political ideas but even to forward personal political fortunes. At any rate, the whole program is much too important not to be carefully controlled and co-ordinated. In the case of certain large centers, where there are competent and experienced faculties, well-stocked libraries, and previous experience in the organization of studies of this sort, there is in general no reason for any inquietude. In smaller colleges and universities, however, where a faculty of "regional experts" has been hastily assembled, where library facilities are often inadequate, where there have been no anterior experiments in presenting language and area studies, there is always the danger that a pro-German anti-Nazi could exercise a decisive influence on the tone and content of the training program. In such cases, we should be rehabilitating Germany, not for a lasting European peace, but for the waging of another war.

Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C. (On Leave)

[23]

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

000200

In reply please
refer to: 618

MAY 6 1944

Dear Mr. Turner:

Thank you for your letter of April 28,
1944, and its enclosures.

The booklet, "Know Your Enemy" which you
sent under separate cover, has been received.

Very truly yours,

J. W. Fehle
Executive Director

Mr. George Turner,
Executive Secretary,
Society for the Prevention
of World War III, Inc.,
515 Madison Avenue,
Suite 825,
New York 22, New York.

EdBT RBHutchison:agr 5-5-44 JH

000201

SOCIETY FOR THE PREVENTION OF WORLD WAR III, Inc.

A Non Profit Organization

**515 MADISON AVENUE (AT 53RD STREET)
SUITE 825
NEW YORK 22, N. Y.
PLAZA 3-4985**

Filing Authority
To: Files
Ans. 5/6/44
No. Ans. Req.
Initial
Date

April 28th, 1944

JH

ORGANIZING COMMITTEE

**REX STOUT
CHAIRMAN**

**LYLE EVANS MAHAN
VICE CHAIRMAN**

RUDOLPH FLUEGGE

FREDERICK W. FOERSTER

C. MONTIETH GILPIN

JULIUS L. GOLDSTEIN

ISIDORE LIPSCHUTZ

EMIL LUDWIG

ERIC MANN

PETER B. OLNEY

HARRY L. SELDEN

PAUL WINKLER

Mr. John W. Pehle,
War Refugee Board,
State Department,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Pehle:-

Knowing your interest in the important events of the day, we are taking the liberty of sending to you, by separate mail, a copy of our new booklet entitled "Know Your Enemy" by T. H. Tetens.

This book has already been sent to nearly every representative of the Government in Washington, D.C., and we hope that you will read it with interest - especially Chapters 8, 9 and 10. We shall also send you samples of the literature which we are distributing and if, after perusal, you find that it might be of importance to some of your colleagues, we shall be glad to send them the same material upon request.

You will find enclosed, a copy of our first leaflet which sets forth the aims and the task of this group of well-informed men who have pledged themselves to combat the insidious pro-German propaganda in these ominous days.

Sincerely yours,

George Turner
GEORGE TURNER
EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

GT'rw
encl

It is high time to call a Spade a Spade!

We know what is ahead of us.

Millions of American and Allied soldiers are waiting for D-Day.

But in our midst strange things are happening.

A group of German political exiles is working overtime in order to form a so-called council of democratic Germans in this country. Many outstanding Americans have been asked to sponsor this new movement. Tonight, Saturday, April 22nd, a meeting will take place in Manhattan, at which the formal announcement of this new organization will be made.

All the members of this new committee call themselves anti-Nazi. No doubt they are anti-Nazi. But today, after four and a half years of war, we must ask bluntly:

Is repudiation of Hitler and Nazism enough? Perhaps it is for some Germans.

But is it enough for the United Nations?

Is it enough for the victims of German aggression?

Is it enough for the future safety of the United States?

Above all, while millions of Europeans under German oppression are deliberately starved and murdered; while American soldiers are dying and American mothers are receiving telegrams: "The War Department regrets . . ." it is not the time to form so-called "democratic" German movements in this country.

We have been fooled once by a so-called German "democracy." Must we be fooled again?

This is no time for Americans to work on the manufacture of a device for Germany's escape.

It is time to teach Germany and the German people the only lesson they apply to others, the only lesson they understand: Force. A "respectable" Germany may, with guidance, some day develop only if our actions are inspired by our past experience.

But let us beware of booby traps!

Society for the Prevention of World War III, Inc.

515 Madison Ave., N. Y. (22), N. Y.

PLaza 3-4985

REX STOUT
President

LYLE EVANS MAHAN
Vice-President

000203

**SOCIETY
for the
PREVENTION
of
WORLD WAR III, INC.**

A Non Profit Organization

●
ORGANIZING COMMITTEE

REX STOUT
-Chairman

LYLE EVANS MAHAN
Vice Chairman

RUDOLPH FLUEGGE
FREDERICK W. FOERSTER
C. MONTIETH GILPIN
JULIUS L. GOLDSTEIN
ISIDORE LIPSCHUTZ

EMIL LUDWIG
ERIC MANN
PETER B. OLNEY
HARRY L. SELDEN
PAUL WINKLER

515 Madison Ave. at 53rd St., N. Y. PLaza 3-4985-4986



**O
U
R
T
A
S
K**

000204

The Facts

THE WIDESPREAD habit of setting the Nazis apart from the German people results from an inadequate knowledge of German history.

This inadequate knowledge has made Americans easily vulnerable to the lies and distortions of German propaganda and its supporters, both conscious and unconscious, within our country.

Unless the American people are brought to understand the German master-race obsession, and the resulting German determination to conquer the world by force, we cannot possibly take the necessary steps to prevent a third world war.

The forces in Germany that raised Hitler to power and have maintained him, are the identical forces that stood behind Bismarck, and Kaiser Wilhelm.

Any treatment of the enemy, after military victory, which does not destroy those forces, will leave Germany as strong and dangerous as ever.

Our Task

"THE SOCIETY FOR THE PREVENTION OF WORLD WAR III," proposes:

1. To assemble a thorough documentation concerning the nature of the German world menace, by using the services of the world's best qualified experts in the field.
2. To spread its findings as widely as possible in scientific circles, political groups and organizations, and to make the documentation accessible for the use of Government officials, historians, educators, writers, journalists, radio commentators and the general public.
3. To oppose the conclusion of any peace which would eliminate Nazism, but would leave unharmed the driving forces behind the German march towards world conquest.
4. To study the best methods for insuring a permanent peace through the suppression of all possible sources of danger.
5. To investigate pro-German propaganda and influences in the United States, study their effects, report on them, and combat them.

To win World War II is a job not only for most of us, but for all of us.

To prevent World War III is a job not only for a few of us, but for many of us.

Will you be one of the many?

WE NEED YOUR HELP!

000205

"TWICE WITHIN TWENTY-FIVE YEARS, Germany has disturbed the peace of the world.

Twice within twenty-five years, Germany has stopped at nothing to accomplish her final aim to enslave the world by force.

An incomplete knowledge of the Teutonic danger has led many people to believe that wiping out Hitler and Nazism will be sufficient to secure lasting peace.

We made the same mistake with the Kaiser in 1918, and we lost the peace!

The Weimar Republic was the convenient cloak behind which secret rearmament was started the day after the Armistice.

Unless the nature of the danger is thoroughly understood, the same maneuver would succeed again.

The forces behind Hitler—which are the same forces that stood behind Wilhelm II, and previously behind Bismarck—are ready to set up another false front and to carry on their fight for world conquest.

The resurrection of Germany after the first World War is due, to a large extent, to the systematic activities of powerful pro-German groups in America which have exerted a growing influence on the political, economic, and cultural life in the United States ever since the end of the last century.

Without the political, economic and ideological backing given to her in America, Germany would never have been able to prepare so thoroughly for World War II.

Germany will be still nearer its goal for world domination ten or twenty years from now, in spite of her military defeat, unless we learn from the errors of the past."

--Excerpts of Prof. F. W. Foerster's address at the Society for the Prevention of World War III, November 23, 1943.

000206

To: SOCIETY FOR THE PREVENTION OF WORLD WAR III, INC.
A Non-Profit Organization
515 Madison Avenue
New York 22, N. Y.

Dear Sirs:

Realizing the importance of your work and being in agreement with the aims of the Society:

- Please send me your material so that I may be kept fully informed.
- Please enroll me as a member.
- I enclose \$..... as a contribution to your work.

Name

Address

City..... State.....

000207

SOCIETY FOR THE PREVENTION OF WORLD WAR III, Inc.

A Non Profit Organization

515 MADISON AVENUE (AT 53RD STREET)
SUITE 825
NEW YORK 22, N. Y.
PLAZA 3-4985

347
W. R. D.
Authority
For Files
Ans.
Co. Ans. Reg. Free ✓
Initials
Date 3/12/44

March 13, 1944

ORGANIZING COMMITTEE

REX STOUT
CHAIRMAN

LYLE EVANS MAHAN
VICE CHAIRMAN

RUDOLPH FLUEGGE
FREDERICK W. FOERSTER
C. MONTIETH GILPIN
JULIUS L. GOLDSTEIN
ISIDORE LIPSCHUTZ

EMIL LUDWIG
ERIC MANN
PETER B. OLNEY
HARRY L. SELDEN
PAUL WINKLER

Mr. John W. Pehle
Treasury Department
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir:

The present Society has just been formed and is now organized for an intensive campaign to offset the insidious pro-German propoganda which is advocating a soft peace for Germany, for we feel that unless we expend our greatest efforts in combatting such propoganda it will most certainly result in paving the way for a militant Germany and a further world war.

To people of your importance will fall the responsibility in taking the necessary measures to prevent our younger generation from being plunged into another holocaust. For this reason we are taking the liberty of enclosing our first pamphlet which sets forth the tasks that we have undertaken and our aims. An illuminating booklet entitled "Know Your Enemy" has just been received from the printer and one of the first copies is being sent to you by separate mail. Knowing your interest in the vital problems of the present day, we are sure you will find this booklet more and more revealing as our military victory approaches. You will find it also an excellent book of reference and it goes without saying that we should be most happy to send a copy of this valuable book to any of your friends or colleagues whose names you might indicate to us.

not enclosed

We would draw your attention especially to Chapters 8, 9 and 10 and would be glad to hear your criticisms and comments.

Sincerely yours,


GEORGE TURNER
EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

GT:rw
enclosure

Two Enclosures when
rec'd in files 3/12/44
1944

100208