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CHAPTER I

I The Problem

Statement of the problem. It was the purpose of this study to discover the attitude of the American people (including various classes from the common laborer to the President) toward war as expressed in a limited body of current literature. The materials concerning war published in the Saturday Evening Post and the Atlantic Monthly magazines during the years 1938 and 1939 have been chosen for this purpose.

In the conclusion, attention is drawn to articles of any special literary value and to the articles that seem to be mainly propaganda.

II Limitations

This thesis is limited by the fact that it does not show the changing attitude of the American people toward war as the war clouds, which recently clouded the far horizon, moved closer and darkened our own doorsteps.

The material used in this thesis does not show a decided change in the attitude of the people, because the
attitudes expressed in the *Saturday Evening Post* and the *Atlantic Monthly* are the opinions of people who have studied the problem of war and established positive convictions concerning it. It was extremely interesting to observe, not the changing attitude, but the increased desire of people to express their positive opinions as war came closer to their lives.

The problem of this thesis is limited to the attitudes expressed in the magazines mentioned in the preceding paragraph. This excludes many of the attitudes of the multitude of people who always become the puppets of war propaganda.

### III Procedure

In proceeding with this problem it was necessary to examine each article. At first it would seem that one could scan the table of contents and select only the articles on war; but this would be an unsatisfactory method, because many articles could not be judged by their titles.

As each article was read, the desired information was written on 4 x 6 inch cards and filed in card folders. The cards were filed under general classifications and later rearranged so that the information could be used in definite chapters of this thesis.
IV Sources

Main:

The Saturday Evening Post 1938-1939.

Atlantic Monthly 1938-1939.

References that aided in drawing conclusions:


Baruch, Barnard M., Taking the Profits out of War. (Publisher and date not given.) 150 pp.

Experiences and speeches that have aided in drawing Conclusions:

Moral Rearmament Meeting; Hollywood Bowl, July 19, 1939. (25 nations were represented. 25,000 persons attended.)

CHAPTER II

ASPECTS OF WAR

National defense and foreign policy. If some people have rich gardens and their neighbors have chickens, it becomes necessary to build a fence around the garden or else sacrifice it to the chickens.

America is in this condition concerning national defense. "Because we hate war, we don't want to arm. But there is little question that the 'Peace' of Munich makes it necessary for us to arm. Even the professional pacifists admit that." 1

At the present time we are embarking on a program of national defense that far exceeds any program in the history of the United States. There is a wide difference of opinion in regard to how far we should go.

It is the belief of the editor of the Saturday Evening Post that the generals and admirals, who are experts in the War and Navy departments, should be the ones to decide what we need and how much we need for national defense.

Politicians usually put defense into politics. The

---

program then becomes not one for national defense but for political national defense.

President Roosevelt said:

Political national defense is not the way of national defense in a democracy; it is the way of national defense in a dictatorship. And, as the record of the dictatorships shows, it is not a very good kind of national defense... Let's build ourselves a good fence, but not a spite fence, the kind the dictators build.2

The first and most important move to be made in our air-defense program is to overhaul our procurement policies so that our airplane factories can produce planes far enough in advance to permit efficiency and economy in production. When factories are working at the maximum output, the efficiency economy, and often the quality of the product, are decreased. This is the case in England and France today.

At the present time America is below the minimum level consistent with national safety.

Whether we like it or not, our hand has been forced. Germany has led the way toward aerial rearmament on a large scale, and we must, of necessity, follow. But where Germany has achieved results under compulsion and dictatorship, we must find other methods, for dictatorship is not in the American scheme of things.3

We can strengthen our Army and Navy to such an extent that we need not fear an invasion of the Western Hemisphere

---

2 Stout, loc. cit.

3 Paul S. Johnston, "Hitler Wasn't Bluffing," The Saturday Evening Post, 211:86, February 18, 1939.
regardless of who wins the European Wars. This would guarantee peace to half of the world. We can be an example to other countries by establishing a high standard of living for all of our people. "We can wipe out of our midst the disintegrating forces of corruption and coercion of men."4 We can prove to the world that the hope of humanity is not in killing or regimenting men but in saving them and in developing their lives.

America, too, has a duty wholly to her own people. From them is coming a stern demand that we must not again sacrifice our youth for a useless hope. I know whereof I speak. My daily mail is heavy with their concern. Our young men are ready to die on our own soil for our own country, but they are defiant against their sacrifice for others' quarrels. Their mothers and fathers, who have skimped and denied themselves that their sons might be even better equipped to serve their country than they have been able to, are filled with anxiety lest the hope of their life service be lost. Our sympathies for the democracies will be drawn upon heavily in the days to come. Our duty to our sons is to hold reason in power over emotion. It is to hold the long vision of America's future. It is to keep out of these wars.5

During the arguments that ensued for lifting the embargo on the sale of arms, munitions, and implements of war to the belligerents, Senator Norris said:

It is fortunate, therefore, that in following our legal rights (meaning the legal right to lift the embar-

4 Herbert Hoover, "What America Can Do," The Saturday Evening Post, 212:78, October 28, 1939.

5 Loc. cit.
go)...we are able to enact a law which will more likely keep us out of the war and at the same time puts us on the side of humanity and civilization.6

The following quotation reveals the attitude of the people who were in favor of lifting the arms embargo.

How fortunate to be able to take the side of humanity and civilization, how fortunate to be able to help save the principle of free institutions, how fortunate to assist at the defeat of the aggressor before he can make it our turn—and to do it with perfect safety and some profit!7

If this argument is true, it is our war too; and instead of selling equipment to the Allies we should deliver it without cost and at our own risk.

Fear is an ignoble factor that is influential in forming the attitude the United States takes toward the present war. If we remain neutral, we fear that the wrong side will win, in which case Germany might capture the British navy and use it against the United States. On the other hand, we fear to be unneutral lest we be drawn into the conflict. This fear is the result of two things. The first is that the American people have been pursuing a fantastic ideal of security.

The word "security", which was new among us, has worked a deep injury to the American spirit. It has meant everything—economic security, social security, 

6 Wesley Winans Stout, editor, "Design For Freedom", The Saturday Evening Post, 212:24, November 11, 1939.
7 Loc. cit.
physical and moral security, immunity from war by passing a law in which we abandoned all the neutral rights we had once been willing to fight for—and all the time it meant nothing, for there is no such thing in this world as either immunity or security.

Secondly, the American people have been led to believe they could keep their fancied security and still exert their moral and material power in world politics. They were told there was much they could do, more effective than words and short of war, to uphold the principles of freedom; that they could indulge their moral passions against the aggressor, threaten to employ decisive economic weapons against him, threaten to quarantine him, in fact; and all with perfect safety. For had they not passed a law to keep themselves out of war?8

When we wake to the reality of our position, there seems to be only one logical method of establishing security and safety and that is by increasing our strength.

What we need for purposes of practical security is first of all a new word. The word is "Impregnability," or a state of supreme defense. We need more than a bigger navy. We need two, one for the Atlantic and one for the Pacific, each incomparable. We need an impenetrable anti-aircraft wall. We need to be able to meet not any aggressor but any combination of aggressors.

Then we may be sure that the principle of free institutions as a basis of modern civilization shall have, beyond the solace of our words, a time yet to live in this world.

Then we may create a world of our own, or finish the one we started, dedicated to peace and freedom, indestructible.

No other nation in the world has the power to do this. To no other had it been possible for destiny to assign that prodigious task. We have all the means; and though the cost would be very great, our phantasy of security without price has already cost us more.9

Colonel Frank Knox points out that many pacifists and

8 Stout, loc. cit.
9 Loc. cit.
opponents of large scale military preparation have changed their attitude since recently observing some of the powers of Europe and Asia resort to crude brutality and gangster methods. These people have joined with those who favor military preparation and intervention by the United States when, and if, a new war is precipitated. "To an extent never before equaled in unanimity, American public opinion supports a strong policy of national defense."\textsuperscript{10}

If totalitarianism is established anywhere in the western world it will inevitably bring with it all the evils that have made Europe into an armed camp, and which promise soon to start a suicidal war.

Because of European conditions, we cling desperately to the principles of the Monroe Doctrine; but we face another question that is vital to our security: "Must we, for our own safety, prepare for another military expedition overseas as an active ally, or associate, of the nations who oppose the totalitarian powers?"\textsuperscript{11}

In 1917 the United States entered the war with the idea of making the world safe for democracy and of fighting a war to end war. Neither of these goals was attained


\textsuperscript{11} Ibid., p. 76.
because of the nature of the peace settlement. President Wilson presented his fourteen-point peace program, which was accepted by Germany. According to Colonel Knox, at that time Germany was capable of waging a long expensive defensive war, but rather than do this she agreed to the Armistice, laid down her arms, and made herself defenseless.

The Treaty of Versailles was an act of bad faith which ignored the fourteen-point program as outlined by President Wilson.

It was a victor's peace imposed upon a vanquished foe. That it contained the seeds of future wars the history of the past twenty years, and the present crisis abundantly prove. It is to the eternal credit of the United States Senate that it saved us from the ignominy of ratification of such an instrument of international double crossing.12

The United States had another disappointment, which was the non-payment of war debts. Colonel Knox suggests our European allies minimized our importance in the war until the war debts were gradually repudiated. This resulted in the Johnson Act, which forbids future extension of credit by the United States to any nation that defaulted on its World War debts.

These experiences in treaty making and war debts have been influential in molding the attitude of the people toward war.

12 Knox, loc. cit.
The net effect of all this has been to drive in on the American consciousness, with renewed vigor and convincing emphasis, the wisdom of George Washington's warnings to his fellow countrymen, upon the evening of his withdrawal from public affairs, against involvement in European quarrels. So general has this feeling among Americans become that I dare say no proposal could be submitted to the American people to which a more nearly unanimous negative answer would be made than to the question: 'Do you want to send another army to Europe and fight in another of Europe's wars?'

For many years, Great Britain has enjoyed safety from invaders because of her geographical location. The only thing she needed to do was to have a navy strong enough to control the seas. Airplanes and long range guns have greatly reduced her safety.

America can profit by England's example. Vast oceans intervene between us and possible enemies on the east or west. If we maintain a navy of superior strength, we can keep ourselves safe from attack and protect the Western World against totalitarianism.

The readiness with which the American public has accepted proposals for rapid expansion of our sea power, and the unanimous fashion in which these proposals have been treated by Congress, attest to the universality of this point of view.

Since there has come about substantial agreement among Americans, first, that we must provide an adequate national defense; second, that this defense must be built in terms of the defense of the entire Western Hemisphere; third, that we do not propose to seek security by sending an expeditionary army overseas; fourth,

13 Ibid., p. 77.
14 Ibid., p. 78.
that we propose to take full advantage of our insular position by creating a dominant navy.\textsuperscript{14}

The most important thing that we need to protect is the Panama Canal.

In the Canal Zone itself there is imperative necessity for the immediate enlargement of existing air fields, the augmenting of our air forces, the enlargement of anti-aircraft artillery defense to at least twice its present size, and the erection of adequate barracks to house the garrison. Most of these essentials are provided for in the army appropriation bill which has recently passed Congress.\textsuperscript{15}

The United States needs more than military protection in the Canal region. It needs the cooperation of the twenty-one nations which make up Central and South America. If our diplomats assist our soldiers and sailors, hemispheral security can be obtained. The United States has many common interests with South America, the greatest of which is the refusal by both to accept totalitarianism.

The majority of the people in America believe that we shall have to assist the European democracies again in making the world safe for democracy.

President Roosevelt expressed this idea in Chicago October, 1937.

The President proposed that we should have to help quarantine the aggressor nations of the world. First he borrowed the words to make a terrifying picture of what that day would be like when the aggressors went utterly mad. 'If those things come to pass in other

\textsuperscript{14} Ibid., p. 78.

\textsuperscript{15} Ibid., p. 79.
parts of the world', he said, 'let no one imagine that America will escape, that it may expect mercy, that this Western Hemisphere will not be attacked. If those days are not to come to pass...the peace-loving nations must make a concerted effort...there is no escape through mere isolation or neutrality...the epidemic of world lawlessness is spreading. When an epidemic of physical disease starts to spread, the community approves and joins in a quarantine.' 16

In another part of his message the President said:

Words may be futile, but war is not the only means of commanding a decent respect for the opinions of mankind. There are many methods short of war, but stronger and more effective than mere words, of bringing home to aggressor governments the aggregate sentiments of our own people. 17

The following quotation expresses an attitude of hostile criticism toward such a policy.

Suppose it were, as a senator said in debate on the national-defense program, that 'Every time we sell a plane to France, standing between us and the dictators, so to speak, we need one less ourselves.' In that light, the thought of measures short of war turns out to be such a thought as that, of all the nations representing the democratic ideal in the world, the one most powerful shall save itself by selling arms to the others. The word for that attitude is one that war at its worst has never yet deserved. 18

Our foreign policy seems to be very indefinite, and few citizens understand just what our foreign policy is.

There is no division of the American mind on the subject of adequate—very adequate—military defense. But unless we have a definite foreign policy—not Mr. Roosevelt's nor any President's, but a national policy—

16 Wesley Winans Stout, editor, "Who Cultivate War," The Saturday Evening Post, 211:24, April 8, 1939.
17 Loc. cit.
18 Loc. cit.
it is impossible to be intelligent about a defense program.

To this we add that while we talk about our military defense without knowing what our foreign policy is, we are neglecting our natural defenses. The first of these, more important in many ways than armament, is to keep our industrial machine at high key and in full production. This we have failed to do. Our machine is running down. And our second most important natural defense is to mind our own business.¹⁹

It is folly to believe in the doctrine of peaceful security through military weakness. Excessive preparedness for war is also a menace to peace; nevertheless a country that possesses great military and naval strength can usually choose peace if it prefers. "For us adequate armaments—especially naval—offer a positive way to peace with security for the country and its external interests."²⁰

President Roosevelt emphasizes the fact that it is necessary for the military and naval strength of the United States to be equal to that of other nations. He said, "For us it is the most certain way to ward off insecurity and war in a world seething with a spirit of great unrest and aggression."²¹

Diplomacy without military-naval force is absolutely futile. This was proved in the World War when President

¹⁹ Ibid., p. 109.


²¹ Loc. cit.
Wilson strove valiantly to safeguard our interests through diplomacy alone. He discovered too late that diplomacy must be backed by naval power if we were to avoid being drawn into the conflict.

The futility of diplomacy when divorced from adequate force, the danger of being drawn into war from weakness, and the peaceful security that is inherent in military naval strength, are principles that have many illustrations in American history.22

Many advocates believe that our navy should be restricted to a purely defensive role, near our coasts. Admiral Leahy told the Congressional committee:

In defending our territory in war we cannot assume an attitude of passive defense and simply beat off an attack at one place and later another. In such a case we would see our coasts blockaded, our outlying possessions seized, our commerce, both coastwise and foreign, driven off the seas, and we would undergo the costly experience of finding the war lasting until the enemy 'had attained every objective and everything he wanted.'

A diplomatic demand for the evacuation of China, backed by greatly preponderant fleets, would therefore leave Japan no choice but to comply. To fight the foreign fleets would mean only the certain destruction of Japan's fleet as well as her cherished army. Inherently the present situation in the Orient presents a classic opportunity for the influence of superior naval forces as an ally of diplomacy and peace. But obviously the European superiority of naval forces must be very pronounced. Otherwise war would be certain, and a satisfactory settlement exceedingly uncertain. Without a settlement by some such Pacific means as suggested, the danger of widespread war arising out of the ferment in China will surely be chronic for many years.23

22 Ibid., p. 497.
23 Ibid., p. 501.
Neutrality and isolation. According to the Gallup polls, reported in the June, 1939, issue of the Saturday Evening Post, about three-fourths of the American people want to stay out of war, but the same number of people believe that we shall inevitably be drawn into another war. The results are that we want to stay out of war but we think it is impossible.

The people know that giving economic help in the World War was largely responsible for American participation, yet eighty-two per cent want to give aid to Britain and France in a war with Germany and Italy.

Hatred toward other nations is an influential factor in causing war. From 1935 to 1937, the percentage of people who feel unfriendly toward Germany increased from seventeen to thirty-one per cent. This shows a decided increase in hatred. It was not revealed how this feeling changed during 1938 and 1939.

The people want peace; but the great majority of them believe and do the things that lead to war, namely, helping the nations which they favor, and hating certain other nations. With minds and actions of the people, war seems inevitable.

Mr. Henry L. Stimson is an internationalist leader. His views are directly opposite to those of Mr. Baruch. He would let the President pick the customers. If he chose to do so, he could sell to Britain and France and refuse to sell
to Italy, Germany, and Japan because the latter are aggressor nations. If America chooses her customers, she can control the outcome of the war. In the event of a long war American supplies would largely determine the outcome.24

Mr. Bernard Baruch is the leader of those who believe in isolation. He believes that in order to keep out of war an impartial attitude toward all participants is necessary. The only way to be impartial is to offer American products, consisting mainly of food and munitions, to any nation who will pay cash for them and send ships to our shores to get them.

Mr. Baruch's theory is that in 1914-1917 we delivered groceries, sent our delivery boy among fighting people who slapped his face and snatched or destroyed the parcels he was carrying, and naturally we had to back him up by slapping the slappers. But if another war should come we'll keep the boy at home, and the rowdies will have to walk into our store on our premises and behave themselves.25

The fact that history reveals habitual disorganization among nations somewhere justifies the isolation of a powerful nation when disturbances occur.

War is a throwback from civilization for victors and vanquished, whatever be the initial objects of these crusades. Even presupposing victory, we must weigh carefully the losses against the gains.26

---

25 Ibid., p. 833.
Isolation should be the policy unless a nation is acting as trustee for certain types of civilization within areas for which it is directly responsible. When this situation occurs the trustee nation's supreme duty is there,

Unless (1) the evils of the world threaten this supreme duty, or (2) these evils can be rectified by an effort which will not indirectly defeat the performance of this special duty.27

Isolation as used in this article by David L. Cohen pertains more to the economic and political isolation than it does to isolation in connection with war.

At the beginning of the World War, America was a debtor nation to the extent of about $3,000,000,000; but at the end of the war, it was a creditor nation to the amount of $14,000,000,000. This was one of the greatest economic transformations ever seen in modern times.

Many people, according to Mr. Cohen, believe that it is because of this economic change that America would not sign the League of Nations covenant. If America can grow rich while other countries wage war, why should we sign a document that would abolish war?

At the close of the World War we had fought and won but we did not understand making peace in a modern world.

For this is the Axiom and the paradox and the futility

27 Whitehead, loc. cit.
of modern warfare between great powers: When you have vanquished your enemy, self-interest dictates that you put him on his feet as quickly as possible. It may be that in so doing you help him to rise and fight you again; or, hopefully, that being again on his way to prosperity he will grow fat and peaceful. But, whatever the risks, the victor must help the vanquished.28

War and democracy: During the World War the machinery of repression was just beginning to operate when the war ended. Only a small part of our army saw actual service, and the civilians made small sacrifice compared to what would have been required had the war continued.

Milton S. Mayer said concerning the present European War:

I believe that this war, if we enter it, will destroy the democracy we have as a nation. When a nation goes to war—not just sends an expeditionary force, but really goes—everything physical and spiritual in that nation must necessarily be placed at the service of the state. And however eloquent and elegant the slogans, that is Fascism. For as democracy, in its simplest statement, is an order in which the state exists for men, so Fascism is an order in which men exist for the state. And in no condition to which men submit do they exist for the state so completely as in war.29

When a nation is at war all the niceties of civilized society are forgotten. If America goes to war, the liberty that we enjoy in a peacetime democracy must be sacrificed.


29 Milton S. Mayer, "I Think I'll Sit This One Out," The Saturday Evening Post, 212:97, October 7, 1939.
We shall inevitably adopt a form of Fascism. Most Americans hesitate to trade their democracy for a form of European government. If we do elect war and trade democracy for Fascism, we have no reason to believe that we can exchange again at the close of war.

War destroys the democracy in nations; but what seems to me infinitely worse; it destroys the democracy in men. I am trying to say here what the wise horse said to Gulliver two hundred years ago: 'When a creature, pretending to reason, can be capable of such enormities, I dread lest the corruption of that faculty might be worse than brutality itself'. More terrible than Hitler is the Hitler, the Fascist, the animal, in all of us. And that brings me to what Octavus Roy Cohen would call the 'most reason' why I oppose war. I oppose war because it debases the man in men and exalts the animal. And that is what I mean when I say that I think this will degrade humanity.30

One nation could not wage war against another nation if the people in the nations would refuse to hate each other. War always occurs when the people of a nation become willing to sacrifice their homes, their wealth, and their lives in order to destroy the people whom they have been taught to hate.

I don't want to go to war, because I don't want to be trained to hate men. The evidence is abundant--I offer you Nazi Germany, though the same conclusion may be reached from common sense--that the human spirit cannot survive war whole. And the spirit of men who are brutalized hard enough and long enough--I offer you Nazi Germany--is maimed beyond the hope of anything more than partial and temporary recovery. There are exceptions,

30 Ibid., pp. 97-98.
but I am not sure I am one of them. I take myself to be
an ordinary man, and I wonder what will happen to my
humanity when I am hired, as Swift puts it, to kill in
cold blood as many of my own species, who have never
offended me, as I possibly can.31

Wars are fought for the purpose of bringing peace;
but, so far, they have failed in their purpose. The World
War did not bring peace. Critics often say it was the Treaty
of Versailles that produced Hitler and not the war that was
responsible. The nature of the peace settlement no doubt
brought resentment from Germany which has been expressed by
Hitler, but the war produced the peace. The warriors made
the peace. Men can not be brutalized for years by the
horrors of war and the hatred of enemies and become humanized
in a few hours after the war ends.

'But we've learned from experience.' Have we? What
do we want to do to Germany now? And if we want to
crush Germany now, what will we want to do when we have
entered the war and won it at terrible cost, and the
crushing of Germany is ours for our signature? The next
Treaty of Versailles will make the last one look like
St. Francis' sermon to the birds.32

One of the greatest difficulties of planning an
equitable peace before entering a war is that war makes men
incapable of writing an equitable peace. "When men fight
well they fight like wolves, and the only equity among wolves,
when the fight is over, is 'winner takes all.'"33

31 Ibid., p. 98.
32 Loc. cit.
33 Loc. cit.
Equity rests on reason instead of force. Man possesses the animal power of force and also the human power of reason. There is a constant struggle between reason and force in man.

The success of a democracy depends on the ability of men to govern themselves. It is the force in men that must be governed and not the reason. The man who can govern himself is the man who is master of his animal passions.

Men under Fascism have their animal passions governed not by themselves and the reason they possess, but by the animal passions of others. I cannot see how we can have, or save, democratic states without democratic men, without men in whom reason governs. War, like Fascism, teaches men two things: How to be governed by the force of others; and how, the force of others permitting, to be governed by the force within themselves. If the worst thing that can happen to men is to come under the rule of the tooth and the claw, I cannot see why men should come under that rule voluntarily by going to war.

'But you can't argue with a mad-man.' No, you can't. You have to use force, and your victory depends on your superior force. But war makes "madmen" of us all, and no balance of power that was ever devised remained in balance very long. For the victor grows fat and the vanquished grow lean, and the time comes when the vanquished have to fight and see their chance. Carl Sandburg's line might well be engraved above the doors of every foreign ministry in the world: 'There are not nails enough to nail down victory.'

In the last World War, the people of America shouted "self-preservation." We fought and won; but today, we wonder what we accomplished. Many people believe that if we keep out of this war and Hitler wins, he will invade America next.

34 Mayer, loc. cit.
The Kaiser had that same idea when America entered the war and suppressed his idea by conquering Germany. Today the Kaiser's philosophy is nearer to America than it was in 1917.

Mr. Mayer believes that if Hitler wins this war and turns on America next (which is doubtful) it will not be because he won the World War but because he lost it. As long as each defeat brings Hitler closer to America it seems foolish to participate in another war. "I insist that if war worsens the conditions of the winners, the answer must lie somewhere else."35

Hitler, they tell me, is a mad dog. 'When you see a mad dog coming, do you shoot him or go to jail,' I can only inquire whether, when you see a lot of mad dogs coming, you shoot the one that is farthest or the one that is closest. There are sweatshop operators within a mile of my home. There are respected citizens who have degraded my city, lied to it, stolen from it and corrupted it. These people threaten democracy, and they don't threaten it from the other side of the ocean.

If I can be shown some way to stop Hitler, I'll go along. 'We have no quarrel with the German people,' said President Wilson in his War Message. But it was the German people whom we shot, and the forces with whom we really had a quarrel grew and festered, and festered and grew, until they flowered in Hitlerism. And now we are asked to shoot the German people again. Mr. Jay Gould is supposed to have said he could hire half the workers to shoot down the other half. When we enter this war we do Mr. Gould's work for him free.36

It seems to be necessary to use force to suppress


36 Mayer, loc. cit.
crime, but everyone knows that a man hunt and the application
of severe punishment to criminals is not elevating to those
who participate. A policeman's lot is not a very elevating
one even though he enjoys a defensive role in the name of
the law. Soldiers are trained to hunt and torture, maim
and kill. A nation can control its policemen because they
are a small part of the population; but it seems doubtful
that it can control a man-hunting population.

The analogy of crime and war is worth pursuing. We
use force to repress crime in organized society, not
for the purpose of preserving society as it is--ridden
with crime regardless of repression--but to preserve
society for a further end, the end of progress. Our
goal in repressing crime is a society in which crime
will not arise. If, instead of devoting all our efforts
to repressing crime, we devoted some large portion to
eradicating the causes of crime we might someday get a
crimeless society. Every reformer has always argued
thus, and these same reformers must, by their own logic,
argue that war will never be ended by war, but only by
the eradication of its causes.37

Most Americans agree that the United States is in a
dilemma. We are to choose between war and neutrality. Since
we are in this position most of the people choose neutrality
as the lesser of the two evils, which admits that either
choice is to choose an evil. It would seem that by choosing
the lesser of two evils the world grows worse more slowly
than if the greater evil, war, were chosen.

37 Mayer, loc. cit.
This is the essence of Greek tragedy, in which the central figure has so long postponed decision that he is left, in the end, with two choices, either of which is fatal.

I cannot concede that the world is condemned and that the only question is whether we shall enjoy a few years' or a century's stay of execution. I cannot concede that our civilization is through, that we have to risk collapse now or certainly get it later. And it is not because I am mystical. It is because I know who makes these wars that pull down civilizations. It is not stones, or fences, or clouds. It is men. And unless we acknowledge our responsibility, along with our rights, as men, I can not see how we can claim our rights. If we are only animals, as incapable of solving our central problem as other animals, why, then Hitler has justice with him when he treats men like animals. For the only justice among animals is the justice of the strong.38

Mr. Mayer does not agree with the idea that America's choice must be the lesser of two evils.

The choice is among two evils and an alternative good. The evils, less and greater, fluctuate. The good remains the same, everywhere and in every age, and no matter whether there is war or peace. The human good is the good of reason and free will, and I cannot be persuaded, contrarily, that force is the answer to force, that hate is the antidote for hate, and that war will save the world from war. 'For all they that take the sword,' said a very wise man two thousand years ago, 'shall perish with the sword,' and according to my exegesis 'all' means 'all.'

'But,' says one of the reformed slackers, 'that's the way the world is. I know it's bad, but that's the way it is, and we have to make the best of it.' The best of a bad world is not very good. The real victories of men have been won by cultivating, not the world that is but the world that should be. Must we admit, despite all our fine talk of human liberty, that we have to do as the Hitlers do? Someday, somewhere, some generation

38 Mayer, loc. cit.
will have to say: 'Oh, no. All the other holy wars were phony, and this one looks too much like them.'

The great nations of the world today are undergoing a period of readjustment. Some nations are called "aggressor" nations because they are resorting to war in an effort to expand. They are also ignoring international relationships. Some nations are going to an opposite extreme in their effort to preserve peace.

We have had similar periods to this in history and have readjusted ourselves after the conflict.

But modern inventions have not only made present-day wars more horrible, they also have impressed acts of violence more vividly upon men's eyes and ears and minds. Motion pictures and the radio bring today's battles to millions in countries still at peace, and the feelings of the people are stirred as never before. An emotional atmosphere is thus created which makes people receptive to notions of crusades, of waging holy wars. Human emotions become so involved that clear thinking--always difficult--becomes more difficult than ever...

Peaceful neighbors are roused thus to a dangerous fighting mood, so that they finally decide that even another world war may be necessary to set the world to rights again.

During this last war the objectives were expressed by the following slogans: "The war to end war" and the "war to make the world safe for democracy."

Subsequent events have not satisfied most people that these laudable objectives were achieved.

39 Ibid., pp. 99-100.

Nevertheless, it is astonishing to observe how many people today, well-meaning and apparently sensible, are prepared now to fight another world war for one or another such crusading purpose.41

The following quotation is part of an editorial printed in The New York Times for June fifteenth, 1938.

The average American may not define in words the loyalties he shares with certain other people. But in the democracies of Europe—in the little democracies in the danger zones; in the more fortunate democracies of Scandinavia; above all, in the great democracies of France and Britain—the average American finds a way of life which he knows instinctively to be the way of life which he himself has chosen.42

Because of the common interests enjoyed by the people of democracies, it is natural for all democracies to sympathize with and favor each other when aggressive dictators threaten to destroy democratic forms of government. Naturally, because of these common interests, the average American wants the democracies to overthrow the dictators.

He knows that these democracies are the outposts of our own kind of civilization, of the democratic system, of the progress we have achieved through the methods of self-government and of the progress we still hope to make tomorrow. He knows that if these outposts are overrun by dictatorships of either Right or Left we shall find ourselves deprived of friends. He knows that, despite geographical remoteness and a traditional desire to avoid entanglement in other peoples' quarrels, we are inevitably the natural allies of the democracies of Europe.

41 Ibid., p. 48.
42 Quoted by Bess, loc. cit.
No remoteness from the scene of a potential European conflict can isolate the United States from the consequences of a major war. No neutrality Act can prevent the American people from favoring their natural allies. In any ultimate test of strength between democracy and dictatorship, the good-will and the moral support—and in the long run more likely than not the physical power of the United States—will be found on the side of those nations defending a way of life which is our own way of life and the only way of life which Americans believe to be worth living.43

There seems to be no evidence that a war today can divide countries according to the much discussed divisions, "totalitarianism" or "Fascism" or "dictatorship." The countries will no doubt divide according to self-interest. Anyone who visualizes such a war as a holy war is deceiving himself or misleading his followers.

It is always dangerous to arouse the fears and prejudices of the American people concerning European affairs. In the beginning the intention of the policy might be good but in nearly all cases it leads to aroused feelings, and this is dangerous to American neutrality.

Hysteria rules by no half measures. When you touch off the powder of terror, you get not illumination, but a blinding explosion. When you have awakened the animosities of a people, you have created the foreign policy that will carry you into war whether you will it or no.44

Mr. Moley believes that the American people have been

43 Bess, loc. cit.
taught that they must help the democracies, because two or more forms of government can not coexist in the world. The world must become all democratic or all totalitarian. This is of course, a fallacy; but there are many people who believe it to be true. If we should act on this theory and enter a war believing that we were engaging in a "holy war" to save democracy, we should find ourselves engaged in wars as hopeless as the religious wars that were fought hundreds of years ago. Since that time, people have learned that they can live peacefully in a world in which many types of religion exist. We should also learn that the world can exist in a peaceful state even though many types of government exist.

It is the opinion of Mr. Moley that Hitler has created a feeling of horror and revulsion in the minds of the majority of the people of the United States. Regardless of how strongly we feel on this subject, we should not forget practical considerations. Some of these considerations are: Will war against a government that persecutes its people help those who are being persecuted? Will it intensify their persecution and bring immediate destruction everywhere of human lives and other precious human values which will be irreplaceable? Will war bring to the United States a centralized control of life, speech, press, and property so absolute that we lose the very values for which we fight abroad?
The people are aware of the fact that war will compel us to stand by the President, who will immediately acquire increased powers. Criticism will be restricted; communication and industries will be nationalized; profits conscripted; wages and hours fixed.

The United States wants to keep its democracy and assist other democratic nations in retaining their democracies. We want to be influential in European affairs but not to the extent that we have to enter a war.

You cannot frankly give to one side in a quarrel what you withhold from the other side without courting, first, reprisals and, ultimately, hostilities. There is no such thing as a little unneutrality. When a nation declares and implements its hostile sentiments toward one side in a conflict, the chances that it can persuade that side of its disinterestedness are pretty slim. It is on this hairline margin of safety that we are now operating.45

Mr. Moley says that we have raised frivolous objections over the process of rectifying the evils of the Treaty of Versailles and encouraged France and England to abandon appeasement because of reliance upon our active support. To the extent that we have done this, we have contributed toward war in the illusion that we were serving the ends of peace. We have merely increased the tragedy.

War strategy and equipment. During the pre war days

of 1914 the American people viewed the widespread preparation for war. They said that unless the madcap career of the arms race were halted the guns would begin to discharge by themselves.

The attitude toward war is the same today. In almost every nation, including America, the arms race has grown to enormous dimensions. "Today the whole world looks on, helplessly fascinated, while an irresistible force inexorably approaches an immovable wall."

Since the end of the World War, we have seen many improvements (if they can be called such) in war equipment. Modern warfare has been streamlined. Comparing modern war machines to the antiquated machines of the World War would be like comparing a 1940 V8 to a model T.

The inextricable struggles of masses of men in trenches, the inviolability of tanks, the peril from submarines, the effect of heavy artillery—these old factors have given way to the new (mediaeval!) fortified position, the anti-tank gun and trap, the modern automatic shoulder gun and machine gun, the listening apparatus, the convoy, the depth charge, and so forth. The offensive must remain the strategy of someone who begins a war,—especially if someone who begins a lightning war,—otherwise there's no lightning victory, but a remorselessly slow and sure defeat. Yet our twenty years' progress in instruments of death, by increasing the destructive power of any one soldier, have merely done what over-rapid installations of machinery have done in industry. They have enormously raised the output (of

death) per man; but they have rendered great armies of men less necessary. To put it another way, they have raised the ratio of necessary superiority in numbers for an offensive from about 2:1 to about 4:1 or even more.47

Peace movements and elimination of war. Mr. Mayer suggests that if we are not satisfied with the world, we can attempt to build a better one. It might require a long time because it has taken thousands of years to build the war-torn world that we have today. It may take hundreds or even thousands of years to build a better one. If a better world is to ever be built, someone has to start it.

I have simply decided, a little egotistically perhaps, that I want to start now, to give my children and their children something to build on. They cannot build on the wreck and ruin of this war and, what is more, they won't even want to.48

If mankind is ever to be saved, it must learn to value justice above material possessions. Marxism, Fascism, and Capitalism are all forms of materialism. "The love of material goods above all others is just as animal as the love of war.49

Justice is a virtue which arises from man's capacity to reason. It expresses liberty, equality, and fraternity.

47Hutton, loc. cit.
48 Mayer, op. cit., p. 100.
49 Loc. cit.
We cannot make sense out of justice by looking at the moon or taking dope or building battleships. We can make sense out of justice by using our reason to discover why justice, like wisdom, is better than rubies.

It is a sensible military tactic to recognize the enemy before you shoot. The common enemy is the animality in man, and not the men here and there who are behaving like animals at the moment. Neither science nor prayer nor force will save us. What will save us is the reason that enables men, in ancient Israel or modern America, to choose between guns and butter, and to choose well. When we have produced men of reason, we shall have a world of reason, and the Hitlers will disappear. As long as we produce men of force we shall have a world of force, and the Hitlers, whoever wins the wars, will carry the day.

Society may make many demands on me, as long as it keeps me out of the cave. It may take my property. It may take my life. But when it puts me back into the cave I must say, politely but firmly, to hell with society. My ancestors were cannibals without benefit of parliaments.

One man alone can do very little toward stopping war, but his influence might spread until he has many followers. Eugene Debs was one man who had the courage to oppose war even though he was thrown in jail for it. His influence has caused other men to see the animalism expressed by war.

And if there is only one Mayer, his case against this war remains the same. That one Mayer will have to take his kicking around like the man he claims to be, and he may not get a chance to open his mouth, much less build a better world. But he will have taken his stand, not because he thinks God or the big battalions are with him but because he can take no other. And he will have to say, with William the Silent, that it is not necessary to hope in order to persevere.

50 Mayer, loc. cit.
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Andrew Carnegie was opposed to war. In 1910, he set aside the income from ten million dollars worth of first mortgage bonds to be used for aiding in the abolition of international war. In 1938, this amounted to more than $800,000.

The results attained, during the twenty-eight years from 1910 to 1938, are debatable; however, there are some concrete results. The number of peace organizations has increased and the membership in these organizations has grown tremendously. The conclusion to be drawn from these facts is obvious. The American people do not want war.

At the present time the peace movement in the United States is better organized and more militant than ever before.

There are, for one thing, more peace organizations. There is an organization for every conceivable taste and every known shade of opinion from the Young Communist League, which considers itself a peace body, but probably is not, to the Foreign Policy Association, which does not consider itself a peace body, but undoubtedly is. The National Peace Conference—which aims to endow the movement with some coordination—lists forty participating organizations on its letterhead. To the left and the right of these forty there are probably twenty more which find the program of the N.P.C. too conservative or not conservative enough. That means a minimum of sixty organizations devoted, in whole or in part, to the business of peace—which is unquestionably the largest number of organizations devoted to a single reform in the whole history of moral uplift.

52 Stanley High, "Peace, Inc." The Saturday Evening Post, 210: 8-9, March 5, 1938.
But there is more to this numerical picture than the list of sixty distinguishable organizations. Some of these organizations serve as the peace agents for affiliated bodies. For example, there is the Department on International Justice and Goodwill of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, which has, besides a record-breaking name, official and delegated responsibility on the question of peace for twenty-three Protestant denominations. The National Council for the Prevention of War 'serves as a clearing-house for thirty-two national organizations which consider peace as one of their primary aims.' The National Conference on the Cause and Cure of War lists eleven "member organizations," some of which do not appear on the list of sixty. The total membership of the eleven affiliates is something more than 6,000,000. The League for Peace and Democracy--until recently the League against War and Fascism--had 400 official labor-union delegates at its recent congress in Pittsburgh, who were the elected representatives of 1,600,000 labor-union members. It is likewise affiliated with certain left-wing farm organizations and claims the right to speak on peace for a related membership of more than 4,000,000.53

There are many local and subsidiary organizations that are affiliated with the peace movements. During this current year, 1938, the National Peace Conference plans to establish councils in many towns and cities. The League of Nations, at this time, has twenty-three branches in eighteen states. The Foreign Policy Association has seventeen branches. The National Council for the Prevention of war has regional offices and more than one hundred local offices. The Women's International League for Peace and Freedom have expanded until they now have more than one

53 Ibid., pp. 9-89.
hundred branches. The United Student Peace Committee is attempting to establish an organization on each college campus. The Emergency Peace Campaign has also expanded. This organization has twenty regional offices and 'working contacts' in two thousand communities.54

The organized peace movements do not always function harmoniously. Each organization seems to have its own panacea for peace. Despite this fact their one goal in common is peace. They are all back of strong neutrality legislation in every international conflict. The result of American neutrality on warring nations is a secondary matter to the peace organizations. The peace organizations do not condemn a big navy as long as the navy remains inside the territorial waters of the United States.

I don't think there is any clear-cut answer. None that will serve present generations. Future hope, I think, lies in a league of the nations; not this league, necessarily, but the one that will grow out of the seed of this one—maybe not till another general war has made all the nations understand that they must unite or perish.55

54 Ibid., pp. 8-89.

CHAPTER III

ATTITUDES TOWARD INTERNAL PROBLEMS

Economic and Labor. It is difficult for an ordinary citizen to visualize what happens to the labor situation when a country enters a modern war. If the United States were to suddenly enter a war, the labor situation would be revolutionized.

Great Britain has furnished us an example of the rapid changes that occur. When she entered war in 1939, she immediately formed a petroleum pool, which was under government control. Gasoline was rationed; filling stations were closed; mechanics and garagemen were out of employment; advertising was eliminated. This meant unemployment and drastic economic changes.

We had a similar experience during the World War when the government took control of the railroads. If we enter war again, there are no important industries that the government would not control. This leads to endless problems concerning pensions, retirement, and insurance of employees. Adequate solutions to the problems will no doubt come only at the bitter expense of laborers.

Many people believe that modern warfare can be conducted successfully only through complete industrial and
military mobilization. Some people are very much opposed to governmental control.

In war the basic and underlying necessity is the maintenance of morale both at home and at the front. This is quite as important as the creation and training of armed forces, or the supplying of those forces with the necessary matériel to carry on a military campaign. Final victory is inconceivable in the face of a serious and enduring decline in morale. In their opposition to industrial mobilization, business and labor leaders would be standing shoulder to shoulder. For there can be no question but that in both groups there would be complete and unequivocal agreement that nothing could be more destructive of morale, and nothing more certain to prevent the attainment of that maximum of production which war requires, than would the mobilization of industrial workers and the placing of business and industry under a military regime. The only assurance that the maximum output of goods and services necessary for the successful prosecution of a war can be obtained lies in the willingness of labor to work wholeheartedly and unreservedly to attain this end. Regimentation, with its limitations on the liberties which the individual has normally enjoyed, is completely destructive of morale.1

One main purpose in industrial mobilization is to eliminate strikes and interruptions. Losses due to these strikes and interruptions would be small compared to the losses suffered from a nation wide force of sullen, discontented laborers.

The patriotism of the American workman cannot be questioned. Given a chance, he will more than carry his share of the burden of war. But to stifle and strangle that patriotism through regimentation and military controls which are foreign to the entire experience of the

industrial world would do far more to jeopardize eventual victory than would the maintenance of those normal relations which are traditionally a part of our industrial life.2

If war forces limitations upon the workers, the limitations will be grudgingly accepted unless the laborers are certain that the employers are not reaping a profit. Regulations must affect both employers and employees equally.

How limitations may be placed on profits without at the same time imposing impossible limitations on the government's war-procurement program is a problem of the utmost complexity on which it is not possible to touch here. But if from labor are to be taken conditions to which it has been accustomed, and for which it has struggled and fought for decades, if protective labor legislation already on the statute books is to be modified or suspended, and if limitations having the elements of conscription are to be placed on the ability of workers to move freely from place to place, labor—whether organized or unorganized—will accept such losses and limitations as a patriotic necessity only if it is convinced that its losses are not the employers' gains and that its sacrifices are not for the benefit of profits.3

In 1917 America entered the World War believing that she was fighting a war to end war, after which the world would be made safe for democracy. In order to fight and win this war, it was necessary for us to spend vast amounts of money for equipment and for supporting our army in France. It was imperative that we assist the Allies financially by lending large sums of money to them. After the close of the war we lent money to the newly organized governments Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Jugoslavia.

---

2 Eliel, loc. cit.
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Germany borrowed money so she could reorganize and begin preparation for another war. The cost of military participation in the World War plus the money that our government lent to the European countries during and after the war has cost the United States over fifty billion dollars.

From this costly experience, we have learned very little.

Again the fires of revenge are lighted. Again the tracings of scar tissue on the map of Europe are tumescent and red. The aggressor is loose and heavily armed—more heavily than ever before, thanks to not having paid his American debts. The nonaggressors also are heavily armed—more heavily than ever before, thanks to not having paid their American debts—and yet, as they think, not heavily enough. Again France and England are calling to America for help. To help them? No, no. To help them save for mankind the priceless legacy that is Europe.4

During the four-year period of the World War, the Federal Government paid its running expenses from taxes. It borrowed twenty-three billion dollars more and spent a total of thirty-six billion dollars for "shot and shell."

From this thirty-six billion dollar expenditure there were few assets at the close of the war. Most of the material was "worn out, rusted out, eaten up or shot away."5

___


5 Ibid., P. 320.
When we really want to lick somebody like the Kaiser, we make the financial system lie down and roll over. Nobody worries about balancing the budget, or grandchildren staggering under burdens too great to bear. But when we set out to lick a depression, our hearts are obviously not in the work. The queer thing is that it could probably be licked as easily as the Kaiser, and without killing anybody.6

War and preparation for war always bring a "shot and shell" prosperity that is based on spending for implements of death.

What will happen to a country which some day is bold enough to abolish unemployment by spending for instruments of life--for houses, schools, medical care, for conservation, parks, playgrounds, for the arts?7

The American Veterans' Association has compiled the following figures to show the amount of cash payments made by the Federal Government to the veterans of all American wars and their dependents. These figures do not include land grants or other benefits not paid in cash.

The Revolution $70,000,000, War of 1812 $46,216,600, Indian Wars $76,632,510, Mexican War $61,206,821, Civil War $7,973,404,309, Spanish War $1,286,877,997, World War $7,572,621,751.8

The economic phase of war is not challenged often enough.

There has always been a feeling that the natural resources of the world are unevenly distributed among

---

7 Loc. cit.
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nations. This has resulted in privileged and underprivileged nations in which there have always been class envy, class enmity, and often feelings of injustice. These conditions have caused some nations to effect a redistribution of resources and wealth by force.

The changing conditions of the world have continued to produce changes in the values of natural resources. A modern mechanized army and navy would be worthless unless the nation to which they belonged had an ample supply of fuel oil and rubber. During the Napoleonic Wars these resources would have been useless to an army. Because of the changing values of scientific resources, it is impossible for one to predict what resources will be of greatest value in future warfare.

There can be no valid legal title to the earth's resources, but there is a moral title. Possession of them should belong to the nations that will make the best use of them for all mankind. This leaves one unanswerable and disputed question: Who will make the best use of them?

There is a glaring fallacy in the economic interpretation of war. "It is said that an industrial nation goes to war to gain access of its own to raw materials, or physical possession of the sources; and this is widely accepted as a
rational motive. During peace times, there is a surplus of commodities that are exchanged, between all nations, at the current prices; but in time of war, the exchange is stopped. This reverses the above quotation. Instead of going to war to gain access to raw materials and control of sources, nations want access and control so that they can make war.

Man's long habit of fighting for the things he wants and needs makes it very difficult for him to realize that war as a rational instrument of economic policy is obsolete.

That was not always so. It was not so when the wealth of the world was in things that could be seized—treasure, plunder, slaves—not so as concerning land when agriculture was every nation's principal resource.

What we are saying is that in the natural world, the world before machines, technology and science, war might very well have been profitable. Victory always was. The economic motive was then valid.

The difference is that the wealth of the modern world consists, not in treasure, not in things you can seize and drag home, but in the continuity of process, in movement, in exchange and credit. War is very old. This state of the world is all new, hardly above one hundred and fifty years old, yet most of us are still thinking of war and its motives as they were for tens of thousands of years before.

War might occur for revenge, for racial aggrandizement, for lust of power, but not for an economic motive. Capitalistic business has learned that war is unprofitable, even a war boom in a neutral country.

---

9 Stout, loc. cit.

Thus it may be that the terrific and opposite forces we have called up out of the void to create an artificial world, without knowing how we should manage or balance them—powers representing the two great human passions, one to create and one to destroy—do have a way of balancing themselves, even so that what shall defeat war at last will be war itself.11

According to the editor of the *Saturday Evening Post* America has attempted to establish world peace. Her first effort was the League of Nations by which she hoped to organize and share with Europe the responsibility of peace. President Wilson produced the League of Nations but the American people refused to accept it.

Our second attempt at peace was by the method of disarmament. Europe was skeptical of a disarmament program because, if all nations disarmed, the one that had the most raw material and the most highly productive factory system could rearm at an advantageous rate. This would give America supremacy. When America threatened to produce the strongest navy and army in the world, which she could do, the nations immediately began to talk disarmament. America then agreed to limit her armament program in proportion to those of other nations. A treaty was made, after which America immediately began to destroy some of her surplus naval equipment. To her surprise she soon found that she was the only nation that had decreased her power. The

11 Stout, *loc. cit.*
other nations were finding weaknesses in the treaty that permitted them to produce unforbidden types of warcraft.

The third method of establishing peace was by economic measures. Since we were a very productive nation, it would be a good business policy for us to sell abundantly to Europe. We practically upset the economic balance, but we lost a lot of money and advanced the present war by at least ten years.

When the present war in Europe ends, if America keeps out, she can have economic and financial supremacy of the world. Since we created this power by our own hand instead of seizing it by force, we are at liberty to use it as we see fit. We could make this economic power serve the idea we fought for in the World War. We could use it in such a manner that it will nourish the things with which we want to live and at the same time gradually destroy the undesirable things.

War cannot end war, nor does it greatly abate the aggressor. The Unmoral economic motive begins immediately to arm him again, and it has all to be done over. America, England and France armed Germany. That was business. After Munich, England continued to sell essential war materials to Germany. That was business. The economic weapon employed in peace to strangle war would be mightier than all the navies. Could there be a higher use of the American power than to impose that thought as a new law of the world and mind that it was kept?12

During the war our democracy, by necessity, became a modified form of dictatorship. The government controlled production, regulated prices, and seized 85% of all war profits. It took charge of the railroads and even partially suppressed freedom of speech and press and the rights of labor unions to strike. The people of the United States were told what to eat and what to wear.

If we enter war again, liberty will be suppressed to an even greater degree. Legislation has already been passed so, that in case of war, the President would immediately hold approximately a dictator's power over the United States not only politically but also economically. The May bill and the War Department report on powers for the President are carefully worked out and are ready for immediate introduction to Congress. "There is little in the Nazi system except the mysticism that is not included in all this legislation."13

We entered the World War without a Fascist taint of planned economy or a Socialist taint of Government operation of enterprise. "We had no centralization of credit. We had no deficit. We had a debt of only one and one quarter billions."14

13 Herbert Hoover, "We Must Keep Out," The Saturday Evening Post, 212:76, October 28, 1939.
14 Loc. cit.
If we engage in another war, we shall have a weakened sense of private enterprise when we enter. We shall start with a four and a half billion dollar deficit in peace expenditures. Also, we shall have a forty billion dollar national debt.

When we emerge from another World War, our industry and agriculture will be far more distorted and demoralized. Our taxes will be still more increased. Then we will face the inevitable depression, with all its unemployment and misery, which must follow every great war. The pressures for continued Government regimentation of economic life in peacetime will have been multiplied. Yet we can not increase, control and direct the economic activities of a people without compulsion...

Surely the voice of experience calls to us that we are little likely to emerge again without great impairment, if not total loss, of our American system of liberty. What shall it profit a nation that loses its own soul?  

Propaganda. Propaganda in modern warfare has a three-fold purpose: It inflames hate for the enemy; it secures favor from neutrals; it attempts to discourage the enemy people. It has become a weapon no less potent than tanks, guns, and men.

Propaganda causes people to believe they are fighting for their homes and for independence. People justify immoral use of words and lies. They uphold war, which sanctifies the killing of men and the destruction of truth. Truth, justice, and tolerance are thrown to the winds when

15 Hoover, loc. cit.
a lie promises to gain an advantage.

The major fact is that, in this period before we entered the Great War, propaganda was organized without moral restraint and was poured upon us with all the genius of war strategy. And do not let us be smug accusers. We did it ourselves the moment we entered the Great War.16

During the World War we were called upon by the democracies to witness the wickedness of the despots. We were taught to believe that they would overcome the world with their savagery. We were made to believe that we would be the next victims. We thought liberty could live only if we joined in the struggle.

The major purpose of propaganda is to build up hate. Hate is the most potent of war emotions. It is the most malign of all human emotions. With a little urging of hate we can be made to forget even the fine inheritances of our own civilization. We can be made to forget Goethe, Schiller, Beethoven, Luther, or Rodin, Voltaire, Pasteur, or Tolstoy, or Dante, Michelangelo, Verdi and Cavour, and a thousand others. Do these hates make an inheritance for our children?17

The attitude that one can't learn the truth about war is expressed in the following quotation.

I've read them all and I'd say not one gives a true objective picture of war as it is—not even the best of them, war and peace. They're not content to show us war; they all try to sell an idea, in terms of propaganda.18

At the present time there is an attempt to frighten

16 Ibid., p. 9.
17 Ibid., p. 74.
humanity away from war by picturing the horrors of it. This is a worthy attempt, but man will not be frightened by anything for long.

The war books don't tell the truth. War isn't divisible. The truth must show all sides...The history books are the worst--at least the ones I read when I was young. Sheer patriotic propaganda.19

Many young people oppose war and say they will not fight but many of the older generation say:

But what you can't conceive before you're in it, is the wartime atmosphere, the hysteria, the rule of mob opinion. Will you be able to stick to your principles when the flags go by? And the women start yelling--they're the noisiest of all. For awhile, yes, you probably will. But remember this: never before in the world's history has the government had at its disposal such powerful agencies for spreading propaganda.20

The older people believe that when war propaganda is spread properly the young men will find an excuse to justify going.

Margaret Culkin Banning shows the falsity of war propaganda in the following statement:

During the last campaign, a great many people were conscious that they were not fighting the battle which they really wanted to fight. Of course, a war never lives up to its propaganda.21

Wartime presidential power. During the past few years, the President of the United States has gained power. Since

19 Moffat, loc. cit.
20 Ibid., p. 69.
the current war in Europe, he has proclaimed a limited national emergency without exactly defining it. The effect of the emergency is to give him extraordinary powers when war is imminent. He has already used many of these special privileges; therefore, we might be safe in the assumption that war is imminent.

The majority of Americans hate totalitarian powers and dread to see them prevail against the democracies of Europe. The most outstanding step that we have taken toward preparedness for war is to immediately transform our American democracy into a dictatorship, the thing which we supposedly go to war to destroy.

It means, says Mr. Hoover, if we go to war, we shall accept immediate dictatorship. That is not rhetoric. It is not a statement of probability. It is a thing that is already written in the form of abdicating laws, to be enacted immediately upon the declaration of war. If we should go to war tomorrow, the state of our physical preparedness would be a scandal, as it was when we went into the World War. But day after tomorrow we should probably not be able to talk about it, for by that time the Congress, if it were in session, or as soon thereafter as it could assemble, would almost certainly have enacted the pending pre-prepared laws that deliver into the hands of the President the absolute power to govern by edict.22

In Bill S.2160, a 231 page document, the President is given the power to fix all prices by edict; to seize and take possession of tangible and intangible property; to

license all business; to establish laws against hoarding, waste, and profiteering; to settle labor disputes; and to establish any agencies he deems necessary.

Mr. Hoover says, that if we have war, we shall have this dictatorship; and at the close of the war, it may be impossible to return to a democratic form of government.

On the Mobilization Day plan before the War Policies Commission, General MacArthur said:

It contemplates the Mobilization, by successive periods, of six field armies and supporting troops, or approximately four million men in arms. Obviously, the Mobilization Day Plan contemplates an expeditionary force—that is to say, a foreign war.23

23 Stout, loc. cit.
CHAPTER IV

ALLIANCES AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

European alliances and European wars. Herbert Hoover expresses the belief that America can keep out of European wars. No matter what the outcome of such wars is America need not fear her independence.

Our decisions for war and peace are largely determined by our emotions and our reasons. We are opposed to joining in European and Asiatic wars. This attitude is based on reason. We hate dictatorships and aggression; therefore, our sympathies are with Great Britain, France, and Poland. One of our greatest dangers is that our indignation will displace our reason.

Americans too often see a small part of the gigantic but invisible forces of disintegration that dominate the people of Europe.

Here are twenty-six races of four hundred million people, outside of Russia, living cheek by jowl in an area two-thirds the size of the United States. Through them surge the forces of nationalism, of imperialism, of age-old hates, memories of deep wrongs, fierce distrusts, and impellent fears. There are the conflicts of religions and persecutions. Long before the World War these forces were in added ferment because of new ideas from the Industrial Revolution. There is here a hell's brew of malign spirits.

And these spirits find tangible expression in the rivalry of economic development, the setting up of barriers of trade, the struggle for political independence, the
pressure of population, the grabs and quarrels over vast areas of the earth for colonization and for exploitation. These all add to the centrifugal forces.¹

We form our opinion about every force that moves Europe for good or evil; but since we live in a democracy of slow-moving public opinion, we are unable to take part in the shifting of power politics in Europe. "The voice of experience calls out sternly that we cannot solve the problems of, or keep the peace in Europe."²

The game of European power politics has little interest for Americans. This game has been going on for centuries; but during the brief existence of the United States, we have had as little as possible to do with it.

We were lured into this game once, during the World War, and have been wondering why ever since. Americans don't like this game, because it is a bloody game and a dirty game. Many Europeans don't like it either. The difference between them and us is that they have to play it whether they like it or not, and we don't.³

Americans are not interested in who is the master of Europe. There would have to be a greater issue at stake than this to get America into another European conflict. "Certainly we would never fight just to help one side smash

¹ Herbert Hoover, "We Must Keep Out," The Saturday Evening Post, 212:8-9, October 28, 1939.

² Ibid., p. 9.

the other in this everlasting dogfight."\textsuperscript{4}

European politicians know that America is gullible for moral issues and preventive war talk. America saw the nations of Europe disregard moral issues at the Peace at Munich. This leaves only one appeal and that is from the preventive standpoint. Surely the American people will not be misled, as they were in 1917, into believing that they must join the Allies and crush Germany to prevent her domination of Europe and a possible seizure of America.

Since the days of George Washington, the American people have been very dubious about the benefits to be derived from mixing into European power politics. We do not want to be obligated to participate in the innumerable controversies that often lead to war.

Many of our politicians and reformers are trying to make it appear that issues are at stake that really are not involved. Everyone agrees that Americans prefer democracies to dictatorships. We dislike the totalitarianism in Germany, Russia, or any other place where it could exist. We are horrified by inhumanity in any form.

The real issue at stake is: "Are the American people willing to stake their president and his political advisers

\textsuperscript{4} Bess, loc. cit.

\textsuperscript{5} Ibid., p. 25.
to a seat in the game of European power politics?"5

President Roosevelt has made it clear now that he
wants to sit in on this game, and that he will continue
to take a hand as long as the American people will pro-
vide him with chips.6

If the United States is going to mingle in European
affairs, it should not be in a half-hearted manner. If we
are going to influence the policies of various European
nations, we are going to have to fight to help these same
countries whenever it becomes necessary for them to uphold
a policy.

The policy of President Roosevelt has been to under-
mine the Anglo-French policy of appeasement. Since these
countries have abandoned it and war has occurred, some people
think we are obligated to help them.

The developments in our foreign policy since the
Munich settlement have been extremely far-reaching, no
matter what our political spokesmen in Washington may
say about it. And some of the tendencies are certainly
dangerous. Unless the American people really are ready
to plunge into European politics up to the limit, and
to face the prospect of fighting a world war, I hope
they will waste no time in telling their political lead-
ers that they intend to do no such thing.

If we let matters drift as they are, if we continue
to break down the European policy of appeasement without
any intention of fighting in a European war, then we
shall soon face our own Munich.7

On April 12, 1939, The New York Times printed an

5 Ibid., p. 25.
6 Bess, loc. cit.
7 Ibid., p. 122.
editorial which President Roosevelt adopted and approved.

Washington, April 11--President Roosevelt strongly implied at his press conference today that he believed the involvement of the United States in any general European war was inevitable and that this nation should stand shoulder to shoulder with Great Britain and France against Nazi-Fascist machinations aimed at world domination by force. The President made known his belief by expressing his approval of a newspaper editorial interpreting his use of the collective pronoun 'we' in his farewell remarks at Warm Springs, Georgia, Sunday, when he promised to be back again in the fall 'if we don't have a war'.

In a formal statement February 3, the President said: "We are against entangling alliances, obviously. The foreign policy has not changed and is not going to change."

President Roosevelt asked Hitler and Mussolini if they would refrain, for a term of years, from attacking or invading certain specified European countries. This venture into European affairs gave increased courage and hope to the anti-Nazi factions and caused them to stand firmer against Germany and Italy.

On the record, as at this point we leave it, we say--Europe is a cultivated obsession:
That the change in our foreign policy, so far as the executive will of Government has been able to change it, is such that only two years ago the unobsessed American mind would have rejected it with horror;
That emotionally, morally and politically we are already deeply entangled in the quarrels of Europe;

8 Wesley Winans Stout, editor, "If We Don't Have a War," The Saturday Evening Post, 211:22, May 20, 1939.
9 Loc. cit.
That so far as the executive will of Government has been able to commit us, we are committed not to be neutral if war comes in Europe, which means that we may be fighting again on European soil on the side of Great Britain, France and Russia under the slogan, "save democracy," but really in defense of the division of spoils that was made under the Versailles Treaty that we did not sign; and,

That for all of this the President of the United States is responsible.10

Senator George expressed the idea that Congress would not be easily influenced by European propaganda. He believes that when the issue of war is discussed in Congress it will not be considered lightly. He said:

It ought to be made abundantly plain and clear that we do not propose to carry the country into war; that when that issue arises there are those of us here, humble though we may be, who will not vote to have the country go to war. Anyone, whether in high or low place, who gives assurances to European nations that this country is ready to go to war and will go to war is simply misleading European nations, because the Congress of the United States and the American people have no idea of again engaging in a foreign war.11

The following quotation seems to add proof to the attitude just expressed.

Europe seems to be in a chaotic condition. London is rebuilding her parks into bomb proof shelters. The British Prime Minister and Hitler are in disagreement over Czechoslovakia. Everybody is emerging to acclaim a new peace, but at the same time are building bigger

10 Stout, loc. cit.
11 Ibid., pp. 22-102.
and more terrible weapons. The American people are saying: 'Europe is made. Praise be, we have no entangling alliances with it.'12

America and Japan. Mr. Abend points out in an article published on November 22, 1939, that Japan looks upon America as "The New Bad Man". It is true that the sympathies of America have been with the Chinese during the recent war against Japan, but the United States has tried to maintain neutrality by selling supplies to both sides. Japan, however, does not feel that we have been entirely neutral.

Neither Japan nor the United States wants war, but it is easily imaginable that Japan may be compelled to safeguard her right to existence. It is also possible that a war crisis will arise between the two countries in case the United States persists in its oppression of Japan, who, however, will never swerve from her devotion to the cause of the construction of a New Order in East Asia.13

There is only one thing which could drive the United States to abandon her neutrality. This would be the intolerable provocation on the part of Japan herself. Good judgment on the part of Japan should cause her to discontinue her anti-American campaign.

12 Wesley Winans Stout, editor, "Our Debt to Europe," The Saturday Evening Post, 211:24, November 19, 1938.

13 Hallet Abend, "Japan Picks on Uncle Sam," The Saturday Evening Post, 212:37, November 25, 1939.
National Unity. The World War strengthened the feeling of national unity and desires for national independence among the various nations of Europe. We are primarily concerned about the fact that these feelings exist today. The historical reasons for their existence are not to the point.

As peace approached, President Wilson proclaimed satisfaction of these aspirations after national consolidation as one of the aims of the war. This objective was unanimously accepted by all concerned.14

During the twenty years since the World War this experiment in consolidation has failed. Central Europe is divided in its attitude toward the settlement of the World War. Some nations are willing to fight to defend the settlement made by the Versailles Treaty, and others clamor for a crusade depending for success on the intervention of Heavenly powers.

CHAPTER V

ATTITUDES OF PEOPLE

Average citizen. War begins when diplomacy fails. A cynic once said, "War is merely the extension of diplomacy into the realm of force." 1

Responsible statesmen and their military and naval advisers, even though no war is expected, must at all times keep in close contact with military and naval activities. They must also give careful consideration to all foreign developments that might lead to war.

The average citizen is very careless and indifferent in regard to foreign developments or military and naval activities. He does not consider it his affair to inform himself thoroughly. Often an uninformed citizen will cling to an antiquated idea, but he will rebuke Congress severely for not giving it sympathetic consideration.

There are many isolationists in the United States. They insist that we should isolate ourselves from any European conflict. For everyone who is an isolationist, there is another person who believes that the theory of

isolation, if practiced, would destroy any possible chance the United States might have of remaining at peace in case of a major war.2

Underneath all the talk of peace and war the ordinary American citizen has one firmly rooted idea. This idea is that the United States should keep out of other nations' wars. The author of this article believes that the question would get a ten-to-one vote if it were put to a national referendum. The controversy is not whether or not we should stay out of war, it is how are we going to do it?

We pride ourselves on being a practical people, though in our view of international relations we are anything but that. It is time to face the facts—before it is too late, before the lure of a new crusade has led us, step by step, into the abyss of another war to make the world safe for democracy.

It is upon the road to such a war that we take the first step when we talk of boycott, when we dream of embargoes, when we visualize international control of aggressors by means of economic sanctions.

Let us not deceive ourselves. Any step taken to deprive a nation at war of essential supplies is an act of war against that nation. It makes no difference by what pretty name we call it; what matters is what the other fellow calls it.3

Youth. Robert James, a freshman at the University of California at Los Angeles, has clearly expressed the attitude of youth toward war. He said that he hoped some day to serve

---

2 Ibid., p. 23 ff.

3 Ibid., p. 64.
his country and humanity in a greater way than carrying a
gun on a battlefield. Life for young people is filled with
laughter, dancing, music books, and opportunity for enrich-
ment of the mind.

Is it true that the future holds life for us, or
death on ground red with blood and scarred by the claw-
ing of our nails as we squirm to die, Is there a future
for us? Guns are spewing shells, a war is coming, and
we are twenty.4

The future of these young people rests in the hands of the
generation ahead of them.

Youth does not hate the people of Japan, Germany, and
Italy who have been unfortunate and forced to live under a
government different from ours. Why should they be asked
to help murder the youth of these other lands?

Today war is coming. The same selfish forces that
asked the young of another generation to lie beneath
white crosses in Flanders fields are talking again of
saving democracy and of preserving international morality
...Can't you solve the world's difficulties through under-
standing and good will? Can't you prevent war by giving
a little of life to the oppressed peoples of the world?
Can't you let us live?

We must do what you say. If there is no other way,
we must give up our dream of life and breathe the stench
of gas-filled trenches before falling, a half-destroyed,
shapeless thing, education gone through the power of a
hand grenade, dreams drowned in the clatter of a machine
gun. Amid our studies we wonder at the things happening
around us. War is coming and we are twenty. Will you
ask us, too, to die?5

4 Robert James, "The Coming War," Atlantic Monthly,
161:843, June, 1938.

5 Loc. cit.
An article written by J.P. Marquand reveals the attitude of youth and also of the older generation. It shows the folly of youth and the wisdom of age. Youth seeks excitement and an opportunity to gain recognition and glory. It fails to see the horribleness of war. The parents who have gone through the agony of war try to persuade youth not to go. They try to point out to them the dangers and the reality, but all to no avail. War seems to be an outlet for youthful enthusiasm.6

David Garnett states, that in his opinion the article written by T.E. Lawrence, in the introduction to "Seven Pillars of Wisdom," is one of the most moving things Lawrence ever wrote.

It expresses the disgust and bitterness of the generation which had fought and won the war and which found that all it had fought for was betrayed.7

Mr. Garnett believes that the young men who fought valiantly to win the war were betrayed by the older men who made the peace. It is because of this betrayal that the world is facing war today.

We lived many lives in those whirling campaigns, never sparing ourselves any good or evil; yet when we achieved

6 J.P. Marquand, "Tell Me about the War," The Saturday Evening Post, 211:8, June 10, 1939.

and the new world dawned, the old men came out again and took from us our victory, and re-made it in the likeness of the former world they knew. Youth could win, but had not learned to keep, and was pitifully weak against age. We stammered that we had worked for a new heaven and a new earth, and they thanked us kindly and made their peace.8

The assumption behind all of our political turmoil is that war is a nasty thing but a cultural necessity. It is often excused on vaguely "noble" grounds.

I hold the belief that we have dawdled with a lesser meaning of war than is the truth. We have as a race (there are great individual exceptions) shunted our interest from the obviously real principle underlying armed conflict to a lesser and more easily compromised issue. War can be called a 'social evil' or a 'disease of man,' and firmly and justly denounced as such; war can be described in its every filthy detail, and denounced as such; war can be admitted to violate every decent social principle, but on these bases war can still be excused. The true basis of war, and the only one which cannot be tampered with to excuse war, is beyond the bounds of the individual race or creed ego; it lies in the fundamental position that man occupies among the creatures of earth. The principle of armed conflict is a direct reversal of the principle of human progress, which is constructive in nature. War is the smouldering and quick-to-flame passion of destruction which is the outpouring of animal rage and irresponsibility. War presupposes a disability to reason and to believe. The statesman who casts his lot in favor of war either cannot or will not be the man that his race and forbears have made it possible for him to be.9

America assumes that if she does not protect her industries, her financial investments, and her resources, she shall have lost her soul; and invaders will swarm over

8 Ibid., p. 328.
her territory and destroy the innocent people.

The author of the previous quotation believes that he has the right to be disloyal to any power that forces him to discard manly principles and become a beast. If aggressors are determined to conquer the world, let them conquer the world; let them conquer it and enjoy the fruits of their labor.

In 1933, in the United States, a ballot of over twenty thousand students was taken. The result showed 6,347 who proclaimed that they would fight for their country whenever they were called upon, 7,742 who stated that they would fight only if their country was invaded, and 8,358 who declared that they would not fight in any war whatever the circumstances.10

It was not stated what age the students were nor where the ballot was taken. The assumption is that they were college students.

A student in his junior year at Harvard made the following statement:

Yes, sir. But I'm no faddist. It simply seems to me that war is the last and stupidest error, and since governments aren't capable of preventing it, it's up to the individual. If enough private citizens refuse to go there can't very well be any war.11

A quotation by an ex-soldier shows the attitude of youth toward the thrill of war. When asked if he would go

---


again, he said,

Good God, no! When asked why he would not go to war again, he continued, I know about war because I've been to war. It's one part excitement nine parts boredom, childishness, and futility. Going to war twice would be like going up twice in an airplane: you've had the thrill--nothin left but the noise and monotony. I conscientiously object to discomfort, for one thing, especially when I know that it won't do anyone any good.12

This same fellow, Mr. Pennyfeather in the story, expressed the idea that if his son (but he didn't have a son) were to ask his permission to go to war he would consent because to keep him safe would be to cheat him of something precious: the chance of proving himself in adventure and sharing the spiritual release of self-forgetfulness in a common effort. He would also urge him not to believe anything that people told him in regard to the war being a holy crusade, or,

That there is anything to be won for your country or humanity. Don't go in the name of democracy, or patriotism, or for revenge, or principle, or even for glory. 'He who did well in war just earns the right to begin doing well in peace.' Browning said that of all people in Luria. It ought to be carved over every war office in the world.13

In time of war the young men are usually swayed by their emotions. They are taught to hate the enemy, to die for their country, and to love adventure. Their emotions

12 Ibid., pp. 66-67.
13 Ibid., p. 67.
are so highly aroused that when the war ends many of them feel cheated because they are left alive instead of having been permitted to die on the battlefield for their country.

At the present time, war seems to be a means by which young men could become aviators. Mr. Richards realizes that society does not approve of this attitude, and if he were the only one who had this attitude he probably would be an outcast from society.

I belong to a fraternity of young men widespread throughout the nation, young aviators with their 'wings' who want a chance to fly. We are young men who have earned every hour we have spent in the air. For the one hundred and seventy-five hours of flying necessary to obtain a commercial pilot's rating with the United States Department of Commerce we have paid a minimum sum of two thousand dollars, attending accredited aviation schools, learning to manage the required types of ships. Now, graduated and licensed as pilots, many of us are grounded, barred from commercial or government aviation by what seems to be the insurmountable barrier of specific and specialized requirements.

I want to go to war because I see in war an immediate and actual means to the beginning of my career.14

The requirements for aviation are often prohibitive to young men of moderate means. The Army, Navy, or Marine Air Corps require two years of college or university training. Commercial air lines require twelve hundred hours of flying. For boys who could afford neither, war would be a solution.

I want to fly. They want to fly. When we see within a national conflict the direct and certain means to our aim, we want to go to war. We selfishly and seriously realize that war may be the end as well as the way. We find that flying and death are upon a careful balance. And we know we would prefer either to the present uncertainty of wandering.15

The pain, sickness, dirt, fear, and boredom of war should be revealed. Every person who goes to war should first see it stripped of all its glory; then if he would still go, he should have his eyes open. On the tombs instead of "Died Gloriously for His Country" should be carved, "Died Gloriously in Search of His Soul."16

"Most men play football for the same reason they enter aviation in wartime--for glory."17

Poet. In the biography of Wilfred Owen, who was killed in the World War, his attitude was clearly expressed.

Already I have comprehended a light which never will filter into the dogma of any national church; namely, that one of Christ's essential commands was: Passivity at any price! Suffer dishonour and disgrace, but never resort to arms. Be bullied, be outraged, be killed; but do not kill...Thus you see how pure Christianity will not fit in with pure patriotism.18

15 Ibid., pp. 838-839.
16 Moffat, op. cit. p. 68.
17 Ibid. p. 70.
And among some notes for poems that he did not live to write are these:--

The unnaturalness of weapons...Inhumanity of war...
The insupportability of war...Horrible beastliness of war...Foolishness of war.19

Airman. The following quotation was taken from the biography of an aviator.

We talked of the Lea gu e of Nations and the prospects of peace and disarmament. On this subject he was not so much militarist as martial. The difficulty to which he could find no answer was that if permanent peace were ever achieved, the armies and navies ceased to exist, there would be no outlet for the manly qualities which fighting developed, and that human physique and human character would deteriorate.20

Soldiers and ex-soldiers. During the World War the soldiers fought valiantly because they were fighting for worthy ideals. They were fighting a war that could end wars; they were fighting "to make the world safe for democracy."

The following quotation reveals the attitude of an ex-soldier toward war.

For the war's sake at the start, during the long weeks at Passchendaele when he had seen men slaughtered in the thousands, uselessly, in that bog of mud, because generals would not admit their own mistakes, because politicians needed the sound of victories, however empty, to retain their office. He had grown bitter during his months in prison when he had seen the Germans not as monsters but as human beings, suffering under a fate not

19 Woolf, loc. cit.
20 Loc. cit.
of their choice or making. He had grown bitter during his journey home through France when he had learned from newspapers with what hate and greed the Allied diplomats were setting themselves to the framing of the peace terms. So this, he had told himself, was the war for justice, for civilization; the war that would end war. He had been fooled, he and his generation; fooled and trapped. He had come back safe out of the war, but he had come back to what? The same people who had fooled and trapped him then would fool and trap him now. What was it that they had asked of him? Four years of his life? They had had that. But they had had more than that. They had had his youth and they had maimed his manhood.21

During the World War the soldier was highly praised; but when the war ended, he was almost an outcast from society. He was disliked and unwanted in the society that he fought to save. Society seemed to think that cannon-fodder had no right to survive.

He was severely satirized on the London stage--sure mirror of public opinion--for wanting to exist as anything but the servant of the successful profiteer, the gentlemen 'of national importance' who was too precious to lose in battle.22

The average soldier knew very little concerning the peace that was made, but he had faith in Wilson.

We knew we were only the cannon-fodder which had chanced to escape, but we also knew that Wilson would make the world afresh, not for us--we were old men, finished, used-up--but for those who came after us.23


23 Ibid., p. 686.
Most of the people believe that America entered the World War for no material gain, but for the purpose of ending wars. This high moral purpose was defeated by the blunders of the French, British, and American politicians who are responsible for creating Hitlerism. They are responsible for forcing a new war on an unwilling world.

The peace which Wilson wanted to make—but which American politicians would not accept—has made America nearly as much to blame for the present war as the other countries.

It is too late, and recrimination is vain. Now I am haunted by the thought that American idealism will again precipitate this great nation into war. I hope it will not be so. In the last war, America did its generous best, and failed—whether through its own weakness or the weakness of others, I do not presume to say. But now it has only one task—to preserve in peace those inheritances of European culture which the coming years will see destroyed in Europe. The only possible future for Europe is that it shall be recolonized in years to come with the civilization preserved in an intact America.

The Douhet theory found its source in the book "Mastery of the Air", by General Giulio Douhet. He explained how future wars would be won by aerial action. Huge fleets of bombers would fly over enemy territory and destroy factories, cities, roads, food supplies, and homes. Military men the world over call terroristic bombing the Douhet theory.

Major Phillips, who no doubt has many followers in his belief, does not believe that Douhet's theory is prac-

24 Aldington, loc. cit.
tical. He points to Madrid as an example of proof. The belligerents learned the futility of assassinations and aerial terrorism as a method of war. Even after many attacks life continued in Madrid.

Terrorism from the air has been tried and found wanting. Bombing, far from softening the civil will, hardens it. Peace is not made willingly with murderers of women and children. Mussolini has not overlooked the lesson. He has announced to the world that Italy, the birthplace of Douhet, the prophet of aerial terrorism, scorns waging war on the civil population.25

The reasons aerial bombardments do not attain theoretical possibilities are that repair crews keep pace with aerial destruction and that terroristic bombing brings retaliation.

Many Americans believe that the best defense against aerial attack is a superior air force. In March, 1938, Major Phillips said that anti-aircraft guns were far superior to airplane defense.

He believed that tanks, as implements of modern warfare, were not proving as successful as most citizens believe they should. Most people do not realize how easily mines can be planted for tanks or how easily heavy artillery can stop them.

According to Major Phillips' attitude, airplanes and

tanks are useful in offensive warfare. First there is usually a heavy barrage by field artillery; then airplanes are sent out to survey the shelled district and bomb machine gun nests. The tanks are of some value then in preceding the infantry.

Virginia Woolf used this excerpt, from the biography of a soldier, to show why men went to war. It differs from some of the attitudes that are cited and shows that even the men who fight differ widely in their opinion of war.

I have had the happiest possible life, and have always been working for war, and have now got into the biggest in the prime of life for a soldier... Thank God, we are off in an hour. Such a magnificent regiment! Such men, such horses! Within ten days I hope Francis and I will be riding side by side straight at the Germans.26

Women. The women do not have and have never had the same attitude toward war that men have had. Virginia Woolf expresses the idea that men find some reason for fighting. They fight for glory, for necessity, or for the satisfaction of fighting.

There are three reasons which lead your sex to fight: war is a profession; a source of happiness and excitement; and it is also an outlet for manly qualities, without which men would deteriorate. But these feelings and opinions are by no means universally held by your sex.27

26 Woolf, op. cit., p. 586.
27 Loc. cit.
Women have never felt or enjoyed any of the results; but they are attempting through education to understand what war means to both sexes. Miss Woolf's belief is that education can play an important part in understanding war. It is necessary to have an understanding of politics, international relations, economics, philosophy, and theology in order to understand the causes which lead to war.

The uneducated person is not competent to deal satisfactorily with such complex questions as the causes of war when they extend beyond impersonal forces. People know that human nature, the reasons, and the emotions of the ordinary man and woman are factors that lead to war.

But though many instincts are held more or less in common by both sexes, to fight has always been the man's habit, not the woman's. Education and practice have developed what may be a psychological difference into what may be a physical difference—a difference in glands, in hormones. However that may be, the fact is indisputable—scarcely a human being in the course of history has fallen to a women's rifle; the vast majority of birds and beasts have been killed by you, not by us.28

In case of war, the women of the educated class do not have as important a part as the women of the uneducated class. The working women assist in the manufacture of munitions and war equipment. If they would refuse to do this, it would be an important factor in eliminating war.

The educated women, of whom most oppose war, have only

28 Woolf, loc. cit.
one rather insignificant weapon for opposing war. This small weapon is their vote.

Education is handicapped because of lack of finances. The cost of war is so great that there is only a small amount left for constructive education.

Bishop. The Bishop of Durham while speaking in the House of Commons made the following statement:

I am convinced that unless the dissidence in the very roots of our civilized world can be exorcised—and I doubt whether it can be, save by the bitter agency of war—our civilization will either become totalitarian or remain free.29

The Bishop is an active worker in the crusading faction of the international peace movement. When he uttered these words, he expressed the attitude of millions of people who are attempting to get their government to enforce their views.

Parents. Mr. De Sales said that during the Christmas shopping period of 1937 a department store in New York advertised that it would sell no military toys, such as tin soldiers, guns, bombing planes, tanks, battleships, nor anything which might develop a warlike spirit in young people.

At the same time the newspapers published material showing how children, under the reign of dictators, played with war toys which were close imitations of the real weapons they would be taught to use later in life. In Germany the merry-go-rounds have tanks, bombing planes, and armored cars instead of wooden horses.

These conditions lead us to the two conflicting attitudes concerning war. The parents of the younger generation believe that war toys are instruments of propaganda. Parents who are pacifists want their children to become more peace-loving, and parents who are war-minded want their children to become more bellicose. The pacific parents and the war-minded parents are faithful to their doctrines, but they are both trapped in a maze of logical contradictions.

Pacifist. Fr. De Sales says that the pacifist believes that war is evil and should be avoided. The less extreme believers in pacifism contend that the human animal in time, and with proper education, will develop his better instincts, and that they will triumph over himself and over the world. This attitude toward war is rooted in the philosophy of Rousseau, who believed that man was born good; but society and tyrants who ruled over it made man cruel, immoral, and wicked.

Rousseau, Chateaubriand, and their contemporaries believed that savages were noble and pure because they lived
so close to nature. The author of this article does not agree that savages were as peace loving and lamblike as these men believed.

"As for nature it appears to be neither good nor bad. In fact, it does not seem to fit at all in any system of ethics that we know of."

Pacifists claim that were it not for war-mongers, armament makers, imperialists, and swashbuckling tyrants that children of this modern age would always remain gentle and peace-loving.

The war worshipers claim to follow the law of nature. They say, "This planet is not a bed of roses. Man must keep trim for a constant struggle against nature and against other men, because the natural law is survival through fighting."

Both pacifism and bellicism appear to have logic up to certain points. Neither of them takes into account the complexity of human nature. They are largely responsible for the confusion of thought in which we find ourselves. They lead us to mental chaos by confronting us with riddles and paradoxes.

30 Raoul De Roussy De Sales, "War and Peace--a Reality," The Atlantic Monthly, 161:492, April, 1938.

31 Ibid., p. 493.
To warlike nations the ultimate goal is peace. War is a means to that end. They make war to impose peace. The pacifists have the same goal; but they face annihilation by refusing to fight, thus permitting their enemies, the war makers, to take possession of the world and rule by force. Their only alternative is to take arms at the last minute (probably too late) and wage a defensive war to save peace.

This is all very bewildering to the average intellect; and the countless millions of men and women who are neither fanatical hero worshipers nor hundred per-cent pacifists feel that there is something radically wrong in both sets of premises, and that both lines of reasoning lead to an absurd impasse.32

The average man agrees that human nature is an intricate mechanism, made up of conflicting elements. There is harmony only within certain limits under the control of reason. To try to isolate a group of human characteristics to justify a one-sided ideology is a fruitless task. Many people are so confused that they do not know whether they should fight or refuse to fight, nor when nor how, to save all that is dear to them.

The author of this article said:

I am conscious of being one of the many victims of thought, the most pernicious of all modern diseases, which leads me to say that no solution can be found to the riddle of war and peace until we succeed in reinstating some measure of balance in our minds.

32 De Sales, loc. cit.
The problem is not that of war or peace, but that of war and peace, because both eventualities confront us today, whether we admit it or not. To commit ourselves and future generations, to one single course of action for to-day and all times is not only unrealistic but immediately dangerous.33

Professor Mayer. In an article by Mr. Mayer, he tells about an experience of his while attending Oxford in 1929. The young men were taking the Oxford oath, but Mr. Mayer did not take it.

Of course I wasn't going to fight in any more imperialist wars, but something told me that the rest of the boys were. Something told me that these peace-time pacifists were bad company. Something told me that they wouldn't fight in any more imperialist wars except the next one. So I didn't take the Oxford oath.34

Of a dozen college friends, who were the noisiest kind of slacker in 1929, only one of them isn't eager to grab a gun and fight. This one is going underground to work for the revolution. Mr. Mayer is against him just as he is against the men who wish to go to war.

I'm against him, and it isn't because I've fallen for the democracy bunk again. It's because I haven't fallen for the democracy bunk or the revolution bunk either. I'm going to sit this one out for reasons all my own.35

The Nazi atrocities and propaganda changed these peace-time pacifists to soldiers.

33 Ibid., p. 494.
34 Milton S. Mayer, "I Think I'll Sit This One Out," The Saturday Evening Post, 212:23, October 7, 1939.
35 Loc. cit.
I'm afraid that when the heat is on me, when the finger points, when "America calls," I'll grab a gun, and the girls will throw roses and the home folks will say, 'There's Mayer; right there in the front.'

During peaceful times one often asserts a definite opinion concerning war. He has the prudence essential to making that choice; but as the war fever rises around him, he changes his opinion. One can not be absolutely certain of his convictions until he meets the problem face to face. When the emotional sweep that accompanies war begins to affect the people, it is difficult for one to exercise the prudence that permits him to choose sanely. When that time comes one thinks he is choosing wisely, but his choice is dictated by war hysteria.

I do not face this problem, now or when we enter the war, by thanking God that I am over-age or flat-footed. I do not face this problem by announcing that because of religious or conscientious scruples I will sing psalms or empty bedpans behind the lines. I do not face this problem by getting a bombproof job in Washington while the goofs go out and stop the bullets. There is only one way to face this problem, and that is to face it. I have to decide, now or when we enter the war, to stand up and fight or to stand up and oppose the war.

And so I exercise such prudence as the unpredictable future permits and I make my decision now. I make my decision to oppose this war, to oppose it now and when America enters it, and I make that decision despite my horror of 'the Berchtesgaden maniac' and my disinclination to set myself up as martyr to my ideals. I oppose the current war for three reasons. I think it will destroy democracy. I think it will bring no peace. And I think it will degrade humanity. And after I have

36 Mayer, loc. cit.
explained what I mean, I shall try to answer the arguments of the peacetime pacifists.37

In every war in which Americans have participated, this question has always arisen; is this war just? The majority of the American people were taught to believe that the World War was just. Mr. Mayer does not believe that the World War was just or that this war is any more just than the last one. Conditions might arise that would make it justifiable, but that is very doubtful. One must either make his decision at the beginning or postpone his decision until events prevent him from deciding judiciously.

It is possible that there are times when a war is just. There might be times when men could justly bestialize themselves in an effort to preserve their liberty. Mr. Mayer said, "I see no justice in saving Poland’s ghetto benches from Hitler. If I did I would not wait for ‘my country’s call’; I would get out and fight today."38

We were told, during the World War, that we were fighting to make the world safe for democracy. Today we are told that war is being waged to save democracy. We can conclude that the first World War destroyed Hohenzollern and gave us Hitler, and that the second World War will

37 Mayer, loc. cit.
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produce someone as much worse than Hitler as he is worse than Hohenzollern.

If Hitler wins the war, he will rule the world. The trouble seems to be that if the Allies win Hitler will still rule. Autocracy and Prussianism were crushed about twenty years ago by the lives of millions of men and the money that reduced the world to poverty.

Twenty years from now, 1960, Hitlerism, Prussianism, or whatever one prefers to call it will be as much nearer to ruling the world as it is today compared to 1920.

I am trying to keep my eye on the ball in spite of my hatred of a man called Hitler. Who is this Hitler, anyway? A man, like the rest of us, a man capable, like the rest of us, of acting like a man; but a man brutalized, as the rest of us may be, by war and the poverty of war and the animal degradation of war--a man, in short, behaving like an animal. Fascism is animalism. The wolves are Fascists; the bees have the perfect Fascist state. It is not Hitler I must fight, but Fascism. And I know, from philosophy and Freud, that it is not the sinner I must exorcise, but the sin. If I want to beat Fascism, I cannot beat it at its own game. War is at once the essence and the apotheosis, the beginning and the triumph, of Fascism, and when I go to war I join 'Hitler's' popular front against the man in men. I cannot fight animals their way without turning animal myself.39

Herbert Hoover. In the World War we paid a heavy price for a military victory. The three hundred fifty thousand who were killed or maimed have brought life-long sorrow to thousands of homes.

39 Ibid., p. 97.
This war placed nearly half a million persons on the pension list and the number will continue to increase. This means a huge tax burden which will lower the standard of living for generations.

Our vast expansion of agriculture during the war brought demoralizing effects in the period of readjustment following the war. The newspaper headlines since the war have been unemployment, bankruptcy, misery, national relief measures, and deficits.

The voice of experience warns us that whether we participate in this war today or not, we face a further quarter of a century of difficulty. If we do participate, we can expect another quarter of a century of impoverishment.40

President Roosevelt. The following quotation shows specifically how President Roosevelt believes concerning war.

(a) That 'we have an interest wider than that of the mere defense of our sea-ringed continent.' (b) That war, whether we engage in it or not, would be a catastrophe for the United States. (c) That the constant threat of wars--the week-end bullyings and seizures--are almost as intolerable as war because they halt business, disturb public tranquillity, threaten personal happiness, make the whole world into an armed camp. (d) That the freedom of all peoples to trade anywhere in the world on a basis of equality is a freedom that is a condition precedent to American prosperity. Such freedom is now sharply curtailed. It will vanish in the face of war. (e) That the collapse of the British and French empires would endanger the peace of the United States and cause such con-

40 Herbert Hoover, "We Must Keep Out," The Saturday Evening Post, 212:78, October 28, 1939.
vulsions that our own political and economic structure would be shaken down. (f) That fascist ambitions are not limited to Europe. They take the world, including South America certainly and North America possibly, for their province. (g) That we shall inevitably be drawn into war. (h) That, whatever the result of war, we shall undergo a revolutionary transformation in America. And (i) that common sense dictates, in the face of these premises, that the stupendous power of the United States should be used, not to punish the fascist states or rescue the so-called democracies, but to prevent a war.41

President Roosevelt suggested a ten-year peace period in which controversies between nations could be adjusted by rational conferences. His theory is "If we do not hang together, we shall hang separately."42

The President and the people agree that they do not want war and neither do they want the fascists to win a war. The people believe they will eventually have to fight Germany again, so naturally lend their aid and sympathy to nations opposing Germany. It would seem that according to this the people and the President want peace but their actions are making peace impossible.

Congress fears that we cannot stay out of war: so it increases our preparations for war.

If we really want neutrality and want to stay out of war we can do it.

42 Ibid., p. 835.
One way is to sell nothing to anybody; keep our ships off the seas; forbid our citizens to travel; order those abroad to come home or remain at their own risk. Japan avoided war in this manner for centuries. We could do it now.43

This might prove to be a very expensive plan and almost bankrupt the United States. If war is less evil and expensive, we can choose it.

Our other alternative is to follow the Baruch theory and sell supplies to all nations. By doing so we might get tremendously rich, but at the same time see the aggressors destroy the European democracies. If this happened, we might find ourselves friendless though wealthy and alone facing the nations of the world.

43 Cohn, loc. cit.
Chapter II of this thesis deals with the attitudes of the American people concerning national defense and foreign policy, neutrality and isolation, democracies, war strategy and equipment, and peace movements.

There are four points concerning national defense on which the great majority of Americans (according to the attitudes expressed in this research material) agree. The people are in favor of adequate national defense. They also agree that the entire Western Hemisphere must cooperate in the defense program. Very few of the people favor a defense program that would cause us to send an expeditionary force to Europe. The fourth main point on which there is agreement is that we can take advantage of our insular position by creating a dominant navy.

England built a superior navy and for many years, because of her geographical location, enjoyed safety from invasion. At the present time she is not impregnable because of the modern fighting equipment, especially the airplanes.

The distance between America and any possible enemy is so great that it will take years to perfect practical equipment for bombing raids from bases located on foreign soil. Our need is for a superior navy to prevent enemies from establishing airplane bases on or near our coasts.
Most people agree that our greatest danger is the Panama Canal. We need adequate protection for it and also a naval fleet for the Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans.

The attitudes differ greatly concerning the sale of war equipment. On p. 13, Chapter II of this thesis President Roosevelt indicates that by the repeal of the Arms Embargo we are using a method short of war to assist the democracies. Many people disagree with this principle and say that it is not right for a strong nation to protect itself by selling arms to weaker nations to fight the dictators in order to keep the stronger nation from entering war. Such a policy is unethical.

The majority of Americans want to isolate themselves from European conflicts, but they do not believe it possible to do so. The daily news causes them to become partial to one side and hate the other. Experience has taught them that favoritism and hatred eventually lead to war.

Mr. Henry L. Stimson favors letting the President choose his customers. By doing so, America, by her products, could control the outcome of the war.

Mr. Bernard Baruch has an opposite viewpoint. His belief is that in order to keep out of war America must assume an impartial attitude and sell products to all nations on a cash and carry basis.

The attitude of the people is divided between these
two viewpoints. It will take time and experience to prove the superiority of one of them.

The result of this research shows that the American people are firm believers in democracy. They hate a dictatorship type of government and would do anything, even go to war, to prevent the United States from falling into the hands of a dictator. The people who believe this way, and they are the great majority of the people, realize that they are in a dilemma. If they go to war to stop the dictators, immediately the United States will be transformed into a temporary dictatorship for the duration of the war. The people fear that when the war closes there would be no way of restoring the democracy.

If they assume the attitude of a Pacifist, the dictators will run wild over the face of the earth until the democracies are destroyed.

The attitude of the people toward modern armaments is almost unexplainable. Most of the people seem to be rather helplessly fascinated by the tremendous race for superiority in armaments. They seem to believe that economically the nations can not afford these expensive battleships, airplanes, and tanks; but the risk of national survival without them is so great that they grudgingly mortgage their children's lives to pay for the armaments.

During the past few years there have been many peace
organizations established. They do not always work together harmoniously, but their goal is the same. They want peace.

Mr. Mayer, P. 32 of this thesis, suggests that if we want a better world than this present war-torn, shell-battered one, we are going to have to start building it. The peace organizations seem to be working toward a better, more peaceful world.

He also suggests that if we are to rise above war, which is a material thing, we must make all material things secondary in our lives. In our philosophy, justice should rank first.

The concluding quotation in Chapter II, p. 36, is quite typical of the American person. Donald Moffat suggests that future hope lies in a league of nations which will be the outgrowth of the present league which was started at the close of the World War. He concludes this quotation with the idea that all nations realize they must unite or perish.

Chapter III shows the attitude of the people toward economic and labor problems, propaganda, and wartime presidential power.

It is an accepted fact that a war completely changes the entire labor situation of a nation. England has been undergoing this change recently in her war with Germany. The United States had a taste of it during the World War when the Government took control of the railroads.
When industry is completely disrupted by war, there are many complex problems to be solved, such as pensions, retirement, and insurance of employees. Through experience laborers have learned that these problems are solved at the expense of the laborers.

The American laborers have a feeling of loyalty and patriotism to their country, but they do not approve of industrial mobilization. Military regimentation and control would stifle this patriotic feeling, thus causing great inefficiency in production.

In case of another war the laborer is going to want to be sure that he and his employer are treated equally. He is not going to endure great limitations while his employer reaps vast profits from the Government.

Most of the people agree that it is economic stupidity to expect a modern war to be a profitable national investment or bring prosperity.

People are beginning to realize that if the money that is spent for war were spent for constructive purposes there would be no depression. This amount of money would greatly improve schools, playgrounds, medical care, roads, and the arts.

The American people have learned that every war brings a depression, unemployment, misery, and suffering. No one wants conditions like that, certainly not the progressive
American business man and the American laborer. Since war causes these conditions to exist, the business men and the laborers are beginning to ask that war be eliminated.

Abraham Lincoln said, "You can fool some of the people all the time, all the people some of the time; but you can't fool all the people all the time." This is the attitude that the people are taking toward propaganda. The majority of them are saying, "You fooled me once, but you can't do it again."

In modern warfare propaganda is one of the main weapons. It has a three-fold purpose. It encourages people to hate and fear the enemy. It secures favor from neutral nations. It attempts to discourage the people of an enemy nation.

The older people, who experienced the World War, fear propaganda. Their attitude is that when a war atmosphere is created and the machines of propaganda unload their sugar-coated lies, the youth of America will once more be deceived and led to the ghastly slaughter.

The majority of people fear war because of the increased presidential power that would be established. Mr. Herbert Hoover stated that the machinery has already been made, in case of war, to immediately transform the United States into a dictatorship. This increased power would give
the President the right to fix prices, take possession of
property, license business and regulate labor, and es-

tablish any necessary agencies.

Chapter IV shows that the people of America have always
been opposed to European alliances. They realize that our
situation is entirely different from that of Europe with all
its complex, irritating problems; therefore, they want to
remain free from any entanglements.

Most of the people feel that the United States has
been interfering in a half-hearted manner. The truly Am-
erican idea is to go all the way or none. If we are going
to influence the policy of European nations, we shall have
to fight if necessary to uphold this policy. We can not
continue to break down the European policy of appeasement
unless we intend to fight in European wars.

The attitude of the United States Congress, expressed
by Senator George, is that Congress will not be easily in-
fluenced by European propaganda. Congress does not plan to
carry the United States into another war.

Most people believe that the United States has tried
to be neutral to China and Japan, but Japan does not feel
that the United States has been impartial. Japan is deter-
mined to carry on her campaign for a New Order in East Asia.
The United States has no intention of interfering unless
Japan goes too far with her anti-American campaign.
The majority of people believe in national unity and national independence. At the close of the World War, President Wilson attempted to incorporate this principle in the peace terms. It was accepted at the time, but since then it has failed.

The American people understand now why this experiment in national consolidation failed. The people of Europe are filled with age-old hates and prejudices that a peace treaty could not destroy; and America is not willing to assume the risk that would be involved if she entered into an agreement of national consolidation.

Chapter V of this thesis deals with the attitudes of people. It expresses the attitude of the average citizen, youth, poet, airman, soldier, women, Bishop of Durham, parents, Professor Mayer, Herbert Hoover, and President Roosevelt.

The average citizen is often uninformed and often clings desperately to an antiquated idea about war. About half of the common people favor isolation and half of them oppose it. They are almost unanimous in their belief that we should remain free from entangling alliances with Europe.

The youth of America are mostly very much opposed to war. This attitude, typical of most young men, was clearly stated by Robert James, a freshman at the University of California at Los Angeles. He said that he hoped someday to be
able to serve his country in a better way than carrying a
gun on the battlefield.

J. P. Marquand says that youth looks only at the ex-
citement and opportunity to gain glory. Most of the young
people fail to see the horribleness of war. This re-
search material did not make clear what percentage of the
youth accepted this attitude.

Burket Kniveton, Jr. expresses the attitude of a
pacifist. He believes that any person has the right to be
disloyal to any power that forces him to become a murderer
and beast.

In 1933 a ballot was taken which shows the attitude
of over twenty thousand students. Twenty-nine percent would
fight for their country whenever they were needed. Thirty-
three per cent would fight only in case of invasion. Thirty-
eight per cent declared they would not fight in any war re-
gardless of the circumstances.

Frank Richards, a young aviator, wants war because it
offers an opportunity for him and other young men to get
flying experience.

The conclusion that could be drawn is that youth dif-
fer in their attitudes toward war, with the majority of them
desiring peace and an opportunity to live prosperous lives.

Past experience has shown that the emotions of youth
are easily aroused. A military band, a uniform, and a little
propaganda make war a glorious adventure to many well-
meaning, peace-loving young men.

In an airman’s attitude, p. 69, the idea is expressed that permanent peace would eliminate armies and navies. Human physique and character would deteriorate because there would be no war to serve as an outlet for manly qualities.

The attitude of ex-soldiers shows how they were disillusioned after the war ended. They were heroes while they were fighting; but when the war ended, society frowned upon them as if to say, “What right has cannon-fodder to return to society?”

The majority of ex-soldiers were disappointed in the peace that was made. They fought and risked their lives to win, but the war lords and greedy politicians made a peace entirely different from the principles for which the soldiers had fought.

Not enough women expressed their attitude, in the material used in this thesis, to furnish a basis for definite conclusions on women’s attitudes.

Virginia Woolf suggested that fighting was a habit that belonged entirely to the men; but women were trying, through education, to understand it. According to her, women have only two ways of combating war. One is to vote for politicians who stand for peace; and the second is to refuse to assist in any way at any time in the production of war materials.
Many people agree with the Bishop of Durham, who expressed the belief that he feared that only by war could the dissidence in our civilization be exorcized. This will eventually lead to totalitarianism or freedom.

The parents usually try to rear their children to accept the attitude of their parents. War-minded parents teach their children to play with miniature toys of war equipment.

Peace-loving parents often refuse to patronize stores that handle toys such as guns, tanks, and bombing planes. They do not approve of children's playing with these kinds of toys. Most parents believe that a child's early training influences him toward war or peace.

Professor Mayer believes that war never accomplishes its purpose; it leaves the world in a more chaotic condition than it was before the war; it degrades civilization and brutalizes men; the war lords, who should be destroyed, sit safely behind the firing line. Because of these reasons his attitude is positively against war.

Herbert Hoover states that the last war brought many economic disruptions which are not yet adjusted twenty years later. If we have another war, we can expect nothing but a prolongation of impoverishment and suffering.

President Roosevelt does not want war, and he does not want the fascist nations to win a war. This attitude,
though very dangerous, is accepted by the majority of the people. The President and the people realize that this attitude makes peace almost impossible because of the resentment that it brings from the fascist nations.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * *

Criticism of articles from the standpoint of literary quality and propaganda.

Virginia Woolf, Chapter V, p. 69, quotes from the biography of an airman. The airman's attitude was that permanent peace would dissolve the armies and navies. If this happened, there would be no outlet for the manly qualities which fighting developed; thus, human physique and character would deteriorate.

This attitude is widely accepted because no one wants men to degenerate into a multitude of effeminate fops. It seems to be purely propaganda for the maintenance of large armies and navies. The article as a whole does not advocate this theory. This is only an excerpt revealing an airman's attitude.

Educated, thinking people do not agree with the airman's attitude. They immediately sense the propaganda in it, because they know that war does not build superior men by murdering the perfect specimens and leaving the unfit at home to produce posterity.
One look at the white crosses in Flanders Field and one trip through a military hospital would convince any sane person that war destroys manly qualities instead of building them.

The article by Frank Richards is an example of extreme selfishness as well as propaganda favoring war and military aviation. In this article he says the cost of learning to fly is prohibitive to the average young man. He would selfishly but willingly see his country go to war, squander billions of dollars, and pour the best blood of American youth upon the battlefields that he might learn to fly!

The articles by President Roosevelt and Herbert Hoover are tainted with political propaganda. They have few if any literary qualities.

The article that seemed to possess the greatest amount of pure literary quality was written by Robert James, a freshman at the University of California at Los Angeles, California.

This article has enduring qualities because of the unselfish philosophy that it expresses. He reveals a strong desire to serve his country in a better way than dying on the battlefield.

Life for young people is filled with laughter, dancing, music, books and opportunity for enrichment of the mind. Is it true that the future holds life for us, or death
on ground red with blood and scarred by the clawing of our nails as we squirm to die? Is there a future for us? Guns are, spewing shells, a war is coming, and we are twenty.  

In this article he shows how youth helplessly obeys the orders of the older generation. It is the older generation who makes war and the younger one who fights it. The young people of America do not hate the people of other countries until war comes; then they are taught to murder and hate their fellow beings.

Today war is coming. The same selfish forces that asked the young of another generation to lie beneath white crosses in Flanders Fields are talking again of saving democracy and of preserving international morality... Can't you solve the world's difficulties through understanding and good will? Can't you prevent war by giving a little of life to the oppressed peoples of the world? Can't you let us live?  

We must do what you say. If there is no other way, we must give up our dream of life and breathe the stench of gas-filled trenches before falling, a half-destroyed, shapeless thing, education gone through the power of a hand grenade, dreams drowned in the clatter of machine gun fire. Amid our studies we wonder at the things happening around us. War is coming and we are twenty. Will you ask us, too, to die?  

This article has literary value because of its philosophy and its compactness. The wording, choice of ideas, organization, and effective use of repetition of "War is coming and we are twenty" cause it to strike a deep note of sympathy for the young generation.
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This article shows the feeling that exists between Japan and the United States.


This article shows the honor given to soldiers during a war and the scorn of society after their return.


The falsity of war propaganda.


Revealed by this article is the attitude of Americans toward European mastery and European propaganda.


This article contains the attitude of the people toward the United States mixing into European politics.

This shows the effect of modern news devices for spreading propaganda.


This article shows the result of a ballot of over twenty thousand students. They express under what conditions they would fight.


Contained in this article is a comparison of war expenditures and constructive peace expenditures.


This is a valuable discussion on economic and political isolation.


This article shows how people desire peace, but they let their actions get them into war. It also reveals President Roosevelt's attitude toward neutrality.


This article is a discussion of the influence of toys on the minds of children. It reveals parent's attitudes for and against toys that are miniature war equipment.

This article shows how war immediately changes labor and industry.


In this article the dangers of embargoes and isolation are discussed.


David Garnett expresses his praise of the article written by T. E. Lawrence, in the introduction to "Seven Pillars of Wisdom".


This article shows the work of Andrew Carnegie and the present condition of peace movements.


This is a discussion of national defense as a means to peace.


This article discloses the threefold purpose of war propaganda.

This article shows how the race for superiority in armaments is leading to war.


Robert James, a youth of twenty years, reveals his attitude toward war.

Johnson, Paul S. "Hitler Wasn't Bluffing." (In The Saturday Evening Post. vol. 211, p. 5 ff. February 12, 1939).

This article shows the need for systematic and immediate national defense.


A young pacifist expresses his views of war.


This article is a discussion of European alliances and national defense.


The futility of diplomacy without military and naval strength is shown in this article.

This article compares the attitudes of youth and age concerning war.

Mayer, Milton S. "I Think I'll Sit This One Out." (In The Saturday Evening Post. vol. 212, p. 23 ff. October 7, 1939).

This is a good article which shows how war destroys the democracy in nations and in men.


This article reveals the power and influence of war time propaganda. It criticizes books, especially history books, because of their propaganda.


This shows that the partial attitude of Americans toward democracies tends to lead us into war with dictators.


This is a discussion of the Doughet Theory.


This shows favorable the attitude of young aviators toward war.

This article shows how little is gained from money spent in war.


This shows how the economic measures of the United States have been a contributing factor to war.


This is a discussion of the effects of the Arms Embargo.

Stout, Wesley Winans, editor. "If We Don't Have a War." (In The Saturday Evening Post. vol. 211, p. 22. May 20, 1939).

President Roosevelt's attitude toward European alliances is discussed in this article.


The idea is expressed here that national defense should be kept out of politics.

This is a discussion of European alliances. It states that Americans are happy that we have no entangling alliances.


This article shows how the President's power would increase to the equal of a dictator's power if America should enter into war.


The absurdity of some economic views concerning war is shown here.


This article shows the need for national defense and criticizes our abstract foreign policy.


This shows the amount of cash money the Federal Government has paid to the soldiers of all American wars.


This article shows the bitter and disappointed attitude of an ex-soldier.

The justification for United States isolation is discussed in this article.


This article shows the conflict of Christianity and patriotism.