


SWASTIKA
THE NAZI TERROR

SWASTIKA

THE NAZI TERROR



JAMES WATERMAN WISE

NEW YORK • 1933

HARRISON SMITH AND ROBERT HAAS

**COPYRIGHT, 1933, BY JAMES WATERMAN WISE
PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BY QUINN & BODEN COMPANY, INC., RAHWAY, N. J.**

CONTENTS

Foreword	9
I The Advance Guard of Hate	13
II Psychic Factors	21
III Out of Their Own Mouths	33
IV The Brown Terror	47
V World Reaction	66
VI Boycott	88
VII The Cold Pogrom	100
VIII What Can Be Done?	115

*For mankind are one in spirit, and an instinct
bears along,
Round the earth's electric circle, the swift flash of
right or wrong;
Whether conscious or unconscious, yet Humanity's
vast frame
Through its ocean-sundered fibres feels the gush of
joy or shame;—
In the gain or loss of one race all the rest have
equal claim.*

JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL

FOREWORD

BY DECREE ISSUED IN BERLIN MARCH 12, 1933, THE Nazi banner together with that of the Old Empire was proclaimed the flag of Germany. Upon it was inscribed the Swastika—symbolizing hatred of the Jew—and in that sign the new German Government, with Hitler at its head, declared and is waging official and relentless war upon 600,000 of its own citizens.

That war is the subject of this book. Its antecedents, its conduct, its effects, and above all its implications bear in a double sense on the contemporary scene. First, as they affect, in common with events in all lands, the highly intricate and closely related mechanism of international life. Second, as they present an issue in human values which includes but transcends the fate of German Jewry, an issue which, made in Germany, must be met everywhere.

That the world is aware of these implications is clear from the far-flung and profound reaction to the events of the last months. Quite apart from Jewish protest, civilized opinion stands aghast at the reports from Germany. Increasingly so. For these reports no longer deal with the fierce attacks and brutal outrages

perpetrated upon German Jews during the first days of Nazi accession to power. Concerning such reports there was, in the beginning at least, the possibility of exaggeration and hysteria. Moreover, hideous as they were, there was the explanation if not the excuse that these were the deplorable incidents of an overthrow in government, concomitants of a tragic but temporary period of transition.

Days have lengthened into weeks, weeks into months. But despite an iron rigidity in censorship, the reports from Germany to-day are infinitely more alarming than the first so-called atrocity tales. They no longer tell of Storm Troop attacks upon civilians in the streets, of homes invaded, of individuals subjected to indescribable indignities, of terror and sudden death in the night. These have not ended. But they sink into insignificance compared to the reports which now come from Germany—not despite censorship but with its full sanction: Reports vaunting the organized, open campaign against German Jewry upon which the Nazi Government has embarked.

This campaign to-day engages the attention of all peoples. Not yet fully informed as to its exact nature and extent, they evidence a growing sense of unease and concern. For it embodies concepts which the world had considered as archaic and outgrown as the belief in witchcraft. Since such concepts, however, have become both the central fact and the dominant mood in the polity of a great nation, an attitude toward and a course of action on them must be adopted.

If that attitude is to be informed and that course a

wise and just one, it is necessary to present more facts than are yet widely known, to coördinate these facts, and to relate them in historic perspective and to contemporary events. To that end there are included in this book, sections which trace the background of the present situation as well as the psychologic factors which played so large a part in producing it.

While all that follows is in the hope of explicating that situation, its essence may be stated here. It is the attempt on the part of an overwhelming majority to uproot and extirpate a minority group from its midst. The manifest injustice of the Versailles Peace Treaty, the unwillingness of the German people for democracy, the economic crisis in which Germany finds itself, the innate and inbred German love of the imperial and the imperious—are obvious and potent factors in the present situation. But they are only its background. The foreground is the minority phobia which provides the Nazi Government with political principle and economic program, with immediate objective and ultimate aim. It is the dominant motif of the New Germany.

The minority in question happens to be Jewish. I use the word happens advisedly. For, if the configuration of German life is such that the minority there subjected to the *delenda est* formula must be the Jew, it might well, under other circumstances and elsewhere, be a wholly different racial or religious or national group. Thus the situation which the German Government creates as it wars upon the Jew is potentially applicable to minorities of all kinds and in all lands. Especially to America—whose genius consists in the will of

differing groups to struggle together toward common objectives—the German situation presents a grave warning. The Swastika of Hitler's Jewish hatred constitutes a challenge alike to all majorities and minorities holding that the common right to existence and equality is basic to any civilization worthy the name.

I

THE ADVANCE GUARD OF HATE

“**E**S TUT NICHTS, DER JUDE WIRD VERBRANNT!” (IT matters not, the Jew goes to the stake!) is a saw old alike in Teuton folk speech and political action. The people chosen by destiny to provide a scapegoat for mankind, has nowhere so fully discharged its tragic function as in Germany. Not that other lands have failed to make use of their Jewish minorities in like fashion. Or that both in Europe and America there have not been parties and leaders who have sought and gained power by exploiting hatred of the Jew. But Germany provides the classic instance of this phenomenon. There it took its modern and scientific source; there it developed a philosophy, a vocabulary, and a vogue. This background must be recalled and understood fully to gauge the character and strength of the weapon forged and to-day being wielded by Hitler with devastating effect.

Anti-Semitism—the very name which to-day connotes active hatred of the Jew—was coined in Germany some fifty years ago. Its sponsor was the then new science of ethnology which propounded the theory that Jews were

members of the Semitic, as opposed to the Aryan peoples, and that their psychic and spiritual traits were of necessity hostile to and unassimilable with one another. This deduction was accompanied by scientific strictures on the inferior nature and origin of the Semites, and equally scientific eulogies of the superior characteristics and destiny of the Aryans. In 1872, Friedrich von Hellwald, writing in the weekly journal *Ausland*, stated:

The Jews are not merely a different religious community, but—and this is to us the most important factor—ethnically an altogether different race. The European feels instinctively that the Jew is a stranger who immigrated from Asia. The so-called prejudice is a natural sentiment. Civilization will overcome the antipathy against the Israelite who merely professes another religion, but never that against the racially different Jew. The Jew is cosmopolitan, and possesses a certain astuteness which makes him the master of the honest Aryan. In eastern Europe the Jew is the cancer slowly eating into the flesh of the other nations. Exploitation of the people is his only aim. Selfishness and lack of personal courage are his chief characteristics; self-sacrifice and patriotism are altogether foreign to him.

Hundreds of articles, pamphlets and books echoed and elaborated this thesis in the years that followed. The amazing popularity it gained may be ascribed to the social and political trend of the German times. Extreme nationalism, then rampant in every country of Europe, was whipped into a very frenzy by the German

nationalists. Anatole Leroy-Beaulieu, French Catholic scholar, wrote:¹

The nineteenth century will rank in history as the age of nationalities. National feeling, following abruptly upon the cosmopolitanism of the eighteenth century, constituted the chief strength of the hundred years that followed the Revolution. Under our very eyes, and largely, through our exertions, it transformed Europe, working miracles the like of which history could not recall; bringing the dead back to life, and making the halt walk again. It is dangerous to have so formidable a power arrayed against one; and in more than one country the Jews have realized this by experience. The experience was due to no fault of theirs; it was one they could not avoid or avert. National feeling, over-excited by its triumphs or by its sufferings, was bound, in its passion, to assail the men of alien blood, and who—in some instances but a short while before—had arrived from foreign countries. Every nation resents the presence in its body politic, of what seems to be a foreign element. Thus it came about that, in Germany, Teutonic exclusiveness arrayed itself against the “Semites.”

Characterizing anti-Semitism as a German importation, he continues:

Our age has a liking for learned formulas; especially is Germany fond of covering its hatred with a

¹ “Israel Among the Nations.”

scientific veneer. The theories which the conqueror of Alsace-Lorraine held in regard to race and nationality were made to apply to the sons of Israel. The Germans bethought themselves that not only had the Jew no Teutonic blood in his veins, but he was not even of Aryan stock, or, as they say in Berlin, of Indo-Germanic stock. He was considered an Asiatic, a Semite, brother to the Arab, cousin to the Carthaginian; by virtue of which fact there was no room for him beneath the Gothic wings of the Hohenzollern eagle. Rather was his presence in the midst of the Germans a constant menace to the genius of Germany, a danger to *deutsche Kultur*, the mother and nurse of modern civilization. And this cry of alarm, uttered by the Germany of Bismarck, reverberated with that peculiar resonance which the trumpet-blasts of victory give to the popular voice. The summons that issued from Berlin found an echo along the entire frontiers of Germany.

Such a cry of alarm could have arisen only in a nation uncertain of its national strength, unsure of itself. Homogeneous France or England could not have uttered it. The fantastic fear that the character of the German people and the unity of German life were endangered by so small and powerless a group as its Jews, could have been felt only because that character and unity did not yet truly exist. Bernard Lazare, in his history of anti-Semitism, writes:²

² "Anti-Semitism: Its History and Causes."

Long ago, in Spain, the persecution of the Moriscoes and the Marranos was an attempt to eliminate a foreign element in the Spanish nation; and in the same way the Jews were regarded as a strange tribe, a horde of deicides, whose aim was by propaganda to infuse their spirit into the Christian peoples, and, in addition, to obtain possession of great wealth, the importance of which was becoming apparent even during the early years of the Medieval period. Anti-Semitism, at present, finds different expression from that of former times; the charges brought against the Jew have also varied, in that they are formulated after a different fashion and are given a basis of ethnologic and anthropologic theory; but the causes have not altered appreciably, and modern anti-Semitism differs from the anti-Judaism of former times only in that it is more self-conscious, more pragmatic, and more deliberate. At the bottom of the anti-Semitism of our own days as at the bottom of the anti-Judaism of the thirteenth century, are the fear of, and the hatred of, the stranger.

Yet this fear and hatred were not confined to the ignorant or the weak. "The Jew," wrote Richard Wagner, "is the plastic demon of the decline of mankind." Nietzsche promulgated and popularized a philosophic paradox that the Christian character of the Jew and of Judaism threatened to corrupt the rugged virility of the Nordic superman. And Professor Heinrich von Treitschke asserted that "even in the circles of best educated men who ordinarily spurned every thought of

religious intolerance with abhorrence, echoes to-day as if from one mouth 'the Jews are our calamity.'"

The Assembly of anti-Semites summed it up when in Berlin on July 15, 1877, they declared that "the Jew is about to strangle the native idealism of Old Germany; the Jew threatens to corrupt German character, German fidelity, German purity, German probity." And Leroy-Beaulieu, recounting this pathetic plaint, comments with a not inexplicable sarcasm: "This seems somewhat ridiculous to us outsiders; all these German virtues must be very insecurely grounded in the German heart if a handful of Semites are able to uproot them."

As a matter of fact, those who translated the theories of the ethnologists into a political program were neither naïve professors nor troubled musicians. Committed to reactionary and militaristic policies, they were astute enough to recognize the potentialities of anti-Semitism as a means to their end. Combining the advantages of a scientific jargon and a popular prejudice, it could be and was used against every liberal and democratic tendency in German life. Brilliantly camouflaged in the hands of Bismarck, violently paraded by Court Chaplain Adolf Stoecker, and crassly exploited by countless imitators, it became the stock in trade of German reactionaries before the War.

That their violent diatribes and drastic proposals were not translated into anti-Jewish action was due to three causes. First, the general understanding that they themselves did not expect to be taken too literally, that their inveighings and denouncings were largely for election

day consumption. Second, the resolute and unyielding opposition of the liberal and socialist parties which—fully aware of the tactics of their foes—were determined to defend Jewish rights as a first and strategic redoubt in their battle to maintain and advance the cause of a free and enlightened Germany. Third, the normal and even favorable economic conditions which made it impossible to win the masses to the grotesque thesis that the welfare of the fatherland was imperilled by a scattering of obviously harmless fellow citizens.

Yet, though no official or overt policy against the Jew was adopted, there was evidence in plenty that the reactionary party had not sown the seed of their ill-will in wholly barren ground. "Racial and cultural anti-Semitism met with great success," writes Professor Ismar Elbogen:³

Hardly any branch of science was free from anti-Jewish prejudices. Luminaries of science at the German universities brought up many generations of academic youths in this disgusting spirit and they immediately poisoned the minds of the masses and infected all the strata of society with their hatred. Social as well as economic discriminations against the Jews resulted, but the reaction which took place in the political life was even more perceptible. Although the government professed adherence to the constitution, actually, by means of "administrative fraud," as Theodor Mommsen termed it, they tried to exclude Jews from the possibility of holding state offices, re-

³ "History of the Jews."

fused to allow them to advance into leading positions, and kept them from military and naval careers.

The crop of hatred resulting from this planting was not to be reaped until a war, a revolution, and an economic debacle had blinded the common sense and broken the morale of the German people. There can be no doubt, however, that the ceaselessly iterated charges of the anti-Semites sank imperceptibly but deep into the German consciousness, there to lie fallow until, in a mood of bitterness and blind anger, their latent power for evil was cynically evoked and deliberately transformed into a national mania.

2

PSYCHIC FACTORS

WHEN THAT CLASSIC PERVERSION OF WOODROW Wilson's fourteen points known as the Versailles Treaty was presented to Germany, Count Brockdorff-Rantzau protested, "We have no illusions as to the extent of our defeat and the measure of our impotence. . . . We have no intention of absolving Germany of all responsibility for the war . . . but we expressly intend that Germany, whose people was convinced that it was fighting a defensive war, should not be saddled with the whole responsibility."

But Germany was as helpless to shed the guilt of war as she was to save her economic and territorial skin. The treaty that she signed retained unmodified the protested Article 231, stating with inescapable clarity that "the Allied and Associated Governments affirm and Germany accepts the responsibility of Germany and her allies for causing all the loss and damage to which the Allied and Associated Governments and their nationals have been subjected as a consequence of the war imposed upon them by the aggression of Germany and her allies." Thus on June 28, 1919, Germany stood in the

court of world opinion a confessed criminal among the nations. It was a burden too terrible to be borne.

Had Germany won the war, the assumption of its responsibility would readily have been transformed in the national mind into a claim of achievement. It would have been epic. Laureates would have arisen to sing its praises, legends would have been woven about its heroes. Failing of this, the years 1914-18 appeared a monstrous and purposeless demonstration of barbarism, unacceptable as a concept, galling, intolerable.

Implicit in the disproportionately cruel terms of the treaty that Germany was forced to sign was the self-righteous unloading of guilt on to her by the Allied and Associated Governments. Having thus routed the last irksome vestiges of their own culpability from their political consciences, they were prepared to reëstablish friendly relations with Germany. Germany appeared willing to reciprocate the friendship, but under the externalities of diplomatic and economic acceptance, she rejected and regurgitated the rôle assigned her. The sin she had been forced politically to name and to confess became insupportably hideous. Had she not been too crippled and too disorganized within, she might with the waging of another war have proven her indifference to her guilty status. But denied this only safety-valve and unable longer to endure it, Germany cast viciously about her for a whipping-boy. And found him, immemorially accredited, helpless to defend himself or to escape, within the boundaries of her land and the margins of her shame.

It is difficult to convert content into aggression. Had

the people of Germany been wellfed, sheltered and amused, they might conceivably have sublimated their sense of guilt into the pursuits of prosperity. Had they been even normally employed, their signature on the document of guilt might gradually have resolved itself into a formal gesture. But Germany was racked from within and without. Hands and bellies were empty. What had survived the war had been laid waste by revolution. An inescapable feeling of unrest and a demoralizing sense of fundamental insecurity obtained. There was a surfeit of the inactivity of despair. The high suggestibility of the individual or the mass at such a time is the recognized meat of party politics. Through the long tension of thirteen years the Nazis channelized, deepened and directed the river of spleen.

Any accessible minority people would have served the purposes of scapegoatism. But Hitler recognized the peculiar qualifications of the Jew for the part. Aside from the indispensable fact of its minority status, German Jewry was inevitably the object against which all the self-loathing, humiliation and physical hunger of Germany could vent itself. Long in the land, deeply in and of its culture, a familiar of its political and scientific thoroughfares, yet racially distinct, the Jew was a German and he was not. Of exactly the proper proportion of identity and difference, he provided the perfect object for a transference of guilt. It is tragic and ironic to note that the very effort of the Jew to be assimilated into the German genus betrayed him most completely into the hands of his enemies. Even in early childhood mimicry is recognized as a stimulus of rage. It is argued

that in mimicry one may perceive one's own flaws in another and strike out against them with no pain to the ego. Thus the most successfully assimilated Jew became the likeliest target for the Nazi, and his willingness to abandon his own as bespoken by his assimilability, made the violence of the Hitlerite seem rather a furthering of suicide than the murder which it was.

More than a year ago the psychic bases of the present Judeo-mania in Germany were brilliantly presented by Dr. Nahum Goldmann, who wrote that¹ "the whole new wave of anti-Semitism in Germany is an extremely complicated sociological phenomenon and comprises much larger circles than the National-Socialist movement alone."

Dr. Goldmann expounds with incontrovertible insight and clarity the factors prerequisite to an understanding of the success of the Nazi campaign against the Jew. His analysis follows:

The fantastic rise and success of the National-Socialist party are plain evidence of the powerful motives which have given birth to and nourished it. Five or six years ago this party consisted only of a small gang of fanatics and demagogues; to-day it is not only the strongest party in Germany, but also one of the most important factors in European politics. The unbelievable extent of this movement indicates that petty negative motives like envy, greed, hatred cannot be made to account for the rise of Hitlerism.

¹ "The Psychology of German Anti-Semitism," *Opinion, A Journal of Jewish Life and Letters*, March 21, 1932.

To try to explain it as the product of such petty negative forces alone would be not only too facile an accounting for this disagreeable phenomenon, but also, from a Jewish angle, self-deception. Some definitely positive forces must have been at work to create not only a new political party of millions of people, but to inspire them to a point of fanaticism.

In trying to classify these various forces we are able to discern three different groups of motives. The first group comprises old traditions, for German anti-Semitism is not an outgrowth of the present post-war period but a definite tendency which more or less permeated German life throughout the nineteenth century and made Germany the source of *scientific*, i.e., theoretical and ideological anti-Semitism. The second group of motives embraces mass-psychological processes which, in the years since the armistice, belong rather to the realm of pathology. The third group, which leads a great part of the German people to fight against Jewry, results from a new mental attitude of the rising generation.

The great influence traditionally exerted by anti-Semitism upon the German people throughout the nineteenth century has resulted from two main factors. The first is the predominant position of Jews in Germany. There was hardly any country in the world—until a short time ago—in which Jewry played such an important rôle and held a position so totally out of proportion to its numerical strength. German Jews not only exercised their influence in the economic and

intellectual life of the German people, but even in the political sphere they played an important rôle despite the fact that they could not take any direct part in it. They did this rather indirectly by way of intellectual influence through the formulation of new political ideas, e.g., Marx and Lassalle as the creators of modern Socialism; Stahl—though baptized, still a Jew—as the founder of the Prussian Conservative Party; and many Jewish publishers and politicians as organizers of the Democratic party. This outstanding position in German public life has been one of the chief causes of the strong, “permanent” German anti-Semitism. The other factor which is more important, is based upon the peculiar psychology of the German people. It is a people of unique gifts, perhaps richer in its potentialities and specific abilities than any other; as great in industry as in music, in practical organization as in abstract metaphysics, to instance the polarity of its capabilities.

But, even at this very day, the German people has not found the true outward form of its inward character. . . . Here lies, perhaps, the intrinsic reason for the innumerable difficulties which the German people have again and again caused in European politics; the reason also for its jumpiness and its incalculable position which the rest of the world rightly perceives as a source of incessant disturbance.

I mention this because in it may be found the roots of German anti-Semitism which has always been more a psychological than a purely economic or political movement. It is characteristic of the extremely com-

plicated, antagonistic, fermenting, and chaotic nature of the German people that it can so easily be influenced by other nations outside its frontiers and by minorities inside, at the same time that it is fighting against these very influences. The predilection of the German for everything foreign . . . is not only one of the recognized peculiarities of the psychology of the German nation, but also an explanation of the amazing rôle the Jews have played in German culture. . . . The people cannot help feeling the strength of Jewish influence and trembles for the purity of its own national genius. Hatred is always a sign of inner weakness. Strong men and strong nations ignore the enemies or influences they reject; whereas those who are not strong enough to resist the influence of others have to endure it and hate those who dominate them.

. . . The deepest hatred in human relations is always preconditioned by the closest intimacy. If we look upon German anti-Semitism from this angle, we can distinguish it as a consequence of Jewish strength and German insecurity. . . . It is fundamentally an expression of mass-psychosis.

.

This thought leads us to the second group of motives for anti-Semitism in Germany: those arising from the psychology of the German people after the war. Since 1918 the inner uncertainty, the torment and the contradictions of the German character have been even more accentuated. The lost war has had the effect of a neurosis on a great majority of

the people. They suffer from the defeat as from an unfortunate shock upon soul and nerves. They cannot recuperate because they are mentally not strong enough to lose the war like gentlemen, to acknowledge the defeat to themselves, to forget it, and liberated from the consciousness of it, to turn the page and start a new chapter of their history.

This mental behavior of a majority of the German people is a most arresting and tragic case of mass-psychosis—the mental infection of an entire nation. The people resort in their suffering to a kind of reaction which is only too well known in psychiatry; they refuse to admit to themselves the very fact which causes their suffering. Millions of people are living now in Germany who, despite the fact that they know that the Allies won the war, will not admit that fact to themselves. At least they will not recognize it as the outcome of a just and fair battle fought with equal weapons. The very thought that Germany could have lost the war is insupportable, and in this emergency they seek some means by which to explain a fact that has obviously happened against the laws of nature. Demoniactal forces must have been at work to bring it about and in the search for these forces they seize on the Jews as the most natural objective. For generations a great part of the German people had been educated to see in the Jew the permanent scapegoat for its ills, and now the fact that the Jewish Socialists played a leading rôle in the German revolution can also be used against them. Thus they were held responsible for the defeat as well as for every disad-

vantage that had ensued from that debacle. Obviously this root of anti-Semitism will not be eradicated as long as a major part of the German population suffers from the neurosis. This also accounts, more than any other reason, for the depth of hatred, the passionate rage, and the brutality of Hitlerism.

Whoever has read any products of German anti-Semitic propaganda and literature in the last ten years must be revolted by the bestiality of the insults and invectives, by the confessions of feelings expressed in these prints. It is hardly necessary to be a student of psychology to realize that such a phenomenon, if it occurs in a nation of the spiritual and cultural level of the German, can be understood only as a mass-psychosis, as a mental ailment of hundreds of millions of people. If we could afford to disregard the practical consequences of this mental poisoning, our reaction to this phenomenon would be pity rather than indignation.

Logical argumentation and proof by facts and documents, that the Jews are not responsible for the defeat and that the German revolution has been caused by totally different factors, have not the slightest effect. The passionate propaganda campaign, launched by Jewish organizations in Germany to combat anti-Semitism with statistics and documents, impresses us as rather naïve. In the age of Freud it ought to be known that mental ailments cannot be cured with logic, since logical argumentation will make the patient only more furious because he will feel the weakness of his position and is bound to react to it with

more rigorous resistance and more acute hatred. This psychopathic situation is also the reason for the many contradictions in the anti-Semitic accusations, some of which, if seen from a logical viewpoint, seem to be almost humorous in the way they annul one another. Jews have caused the war and Jews have stopped it; Jews are the masters of Capitalism and Jews are the chieftains of Bolshevism; Jews dominate international politics and at the same time they are concerned with the politics of Jewish solidarity only. It is not a question of logic or of proofs but rather of a diseased mind seeking a symbol for its hatred, an outlet for all its rejections and aversions.

Besides these two groups of psychological motives, we are aware of a third which, seen from a historical angle, may be considered most important and dangerous. It is an entirely new phenomenon founded not in psychopathic reactions but in spiritual and political tendencies.

A new conception of politics among a great part of the younger generation of the German universities explains a great deal of the attitude of the leaders of the anti-Semitic movement. In previous periods the intellectuals of all nations, and especially the students had always been against anti-Semitism which, during the nineteenth century, had been the monopoly of demagogues, politicians, petty-bourgeoisies, and similar elements. The intellectuals had always been liberal, youth always progressive, and both therefore opposed to anti-Semitism. To-day, however, the sit-

uation is reversed in Germany—and not only in Germany. A considerable part of the intelligentsia is inclined toward anti-Semitism and, what is much more important, the major part of the student body approves it. This vital fact means that anti-Semitism will not quickly disappear from the German stage. These youths will only start to play their rôle in German life five or ten years hence, and will then only have their chance to implement their anti-Semitic tendencies.

The change in the attitude of these classes is based on a profound change in our cultural and political ideology. The great political and social ideas of the nineteenth century—individualism, liberalism, democracy, toleration, in brief, liberty—are being consciously rejected. Contemporary youth has a new conception of the nature of the State which is more strict and severe and disciplined. It tends in the direction of the collectivistic ideal. These youths accept Communism or Fascism—which have much more in common than one might suspect at a hasty glance—and they certainly have in common the fight against the liberal ideals of the nineteenth century. The entire atmosphere of that liberal century is being ridiculed. Respect for minorities as well as toleration of dissenters is depicted as developing a chaotic situation which must be vanquished by the lofty new conception of the nature of the State.

This is the most profound cause of the attitude of the major part of the German intelligentsia against the Jews. Very rightly they feel that the Jews are

the natural born champions of these ideals. Jews as a minority are ready to fight and to die for them. Wherever the state demands the hundred percent standardization of its citizens, it must annihilate the independent and individual existence of the Jews as Jews—and the best example of this is provided by Soviet Russia which certainly is not deliberately or officially anti-Semitic. Those German intellectuals who have established the theories and the ideology of National Socialism and who are the spiritual leaders of Hitlerism are conscious of this fact. Their fight against democracy is identical with their fight against the Jews as the champions of democracy. Their raging hatred against the “Jewish Press” is not hatred against Jews alone, it is equally directed against all liberal journalism.

The causes and root of German anti-Semitism elevate the whole subject to the plane of a problem of historical significance and also demonstrate its international importance. This is really one of the great spiritual conflicts between the eternal ideals of liberty, toleration, and liberalism on one side, and national militarism, collectivism and dictatorship on the other. The battle has run its course through all history and now has again become the central problem of our day.

3

OUT OF THEIR OWN MOUTHS

“THE GERMAN HAS NOT THE SLIGHTEST NOTION OF how a people must be misled if the adherence of the masses is sought,” wrote Adolf Hitler in 1924.¹ The phenomenal rise to power of the Nazi party is explained in this cynical boast of political sophistication by its leader. Since first he made it, he has supplied the most thorough and effective instruction in the art of deliberate misleading which history records.

It is in the light of this boast that Hitler and the movement which is interchangeable with him, must be viewed. His is no case of misguided fanaticism in a naïve and untutored man. Hitler is fully aware of the absurdity and mendaciousness of his propaganda. Far from hiding or denying, he revels in it. “To win the sympathy of the broad masses,” he wrote, “you must tell them the crudest and most stupid things.” He has and does.

We have already seen that the German stage was set and the actor-audience impatient for any illusion

¹ “*Mein Kampf*” (My Struggle), by Adolf Hitler. Quotation deleted from 12th edition, 1932.

through which it might forget its misery and despair. Magic, strong and black, was required, and the magician who sways the German scene to-day was ready to furnish it. His recipe was an old and simple one. Nothing, he held, could rouse the nation from the slough of despond in which it had sunk save a common purpose. And since any positive or creative purpose was by the very nature of the times precluded, he chose to unite Germany by means of a common hate: hate of the Jew.

The story of that hate is Hitler's history. By means of it he captured the first Munich beer-hall audiences which supplied the nucleus of his party. And, as the increasing response of his followers confirmed the shrewdness of his choice, he made it the foundation and the capstone of his "unalterable" party program. Resorting to it as an escape whenever otherwise insoluble problems arose, widening its scope to include every aspect of domestic politics and international relations, deepening its intensity to the point where unchecked violence seemed the inevitable channel for its expression—Hitler attained his goal.

This is set down neither in depreciation of the man's ability nor power. No estimate of the present German Chancellor could be more incorrect than that of an incompetent nonentity swept to incongruous heights by the illogic of events. Even the showmanship and the forensic effectiveness which have been advanced as his only leaderlike qualities, fail to explain his career. They merely divert attention from the Jew hatred which he has made his medium; they serve only to allay the fears

of those who will not recognize the dimensions of his evil.

.

To gauge the present status of the war being waged by the Nazi Government against the Jews of Germany, its campaign of approach must be traced. Originating with Hitler's calculated formula of hate, it established its object as a point of reference for all the ills that German flesh or spirit was heir to. In its earliest and crudest stage the campaign may be termed scapegoatism, impure and simple. Edgar Ansell Mowrer, for ten years Berlin correspondent of the *Chicago Daily News*, depicts it thus:²

If Germany lost the war, the Jews betrayed it.

If the Kaiser and the grand old order had to go, the fault lay with the Jewish revolutionaries.

If money vanished during the inflation, look for it in the pockets of Israel.

If you were unemployed, you need merely note how many Jews still had good safe jobs. If as lawyer, physician, scientist, professor, teacher, artist, success did not smile upon you, it was because the Jews had taken the best for themselves.

When a high school youth failed in his mathematics, it was because Jewish influence in German schools caused overimportance to be laid on numbers and rationality: true Germans "think with their blood."

² "Germany Puts the Clock Back," by Edgar Ansell Mowrer, 1933.

If a shopkeeper went broke, the proper course was to break the windows of the Jewish department store. If a manufacturer could not keep up with technical methods, the fault lay with Jewish usurers in the banks. For whereas German capital is "creative," Jewish capital is "appropriative."

In short, if girls went wrong and religion decayed, if Germany paid reparations to negroid French and greedy Americans, if abortion became common and architects built flat roofs and the rumba swept the globe, the fault of it all lay with the Jews!

Aided by his lieutenants, Feder and Goebbels, Hitler speedily graduated from this comparative kindergarten of hatred. They orientated their instrument of ill-will upon every issue confronting the German people. Thus on the vexed question of banking and the interest on loans, the Nazis discovered a profound if elusive distinction between two types of capital. The one they labeled Jewish, the other Christian. The Christian or *schaffendes* capital was defined as employed in industrial and constructive enterprises. The Jewish or *raffendes* capital was described as pertaining to loans, mortgages, etc., and therefore parasitic. Despite the obvious difficulty that Jewish and Christian capitalists were indistinguishably engaged in both varieties, it became a party fetish that, on assumption of power, "Christian" capital was to be safeguarded, "Jewish" expropriated.

No weapon in the armory of hate was more cleverly employed than the bogey of Marxian revolution. The natural antipathy of the German spirit to radical change,

the insular position which since the war had been foisted on the nation, the repellent yet attractive proximity of the Communist experiment—all were concentrated and directed upon the menace of the international Jew. For was not the Jew the international people par excellence; had not Russia been dragged into Communism by Jewish conspirators; were not Jews in Germany and elsewhere disproportionately active in the organization of labor; above all, was not the evil genius of internationalism—Marx himself—a Jew? In a frenzy of non-sequitor, Hitler affirmed, “If the Jew wins over the world with the help of the Marxian doctrines, then their crown will be the wreath of death for mankind . . . so I believe in the spirit of the Almighty Creator. I shall defend myself against the Jew, I shall fight for the work of the Lord!”

Most ingenious of all the mechanisms employed in the Nazi campaign was its approach to the religious question. To denounce Judaism as an inferior faith and a subversive creed, as Christian apologists had done in all ages, did not suffice. Not only must Judaism be destroyed but Christianity must be purged of all Jewish aspects. The practical difficulties of this purification—in view of the land, language, race and faith of the authors of the Old and New Testaments as well as the central figure of Christianity—failed to discourage the Nazi crusaders. The true Jesus, it was discovered, following the hints of Houston Stewart Chamberlain, was “through and through un-Jewish, rather he was Indo-Germanic, he was German!” And Christianity, to be genuine, must therefore be revised to harmonize with its founder’s new

nationality. "Nordicus" comments on this transformation as follows:³

It is modestly admitted that Christianity has attained its true worth through the Germanic character given it through the Reformation. . . . This heroic Teutonic spirit rather than Christianity based upon love will be the new keynote. Christ's doctrine of forgiveness and loving thine enemy are obviously out of place in a country that must preach eternal enmity to the "French swine." Nazi pastors will be expected to dilate upon the heroic character of the ancient German gods—even though they be heathens—since they express the real, aggressive, positive Christian spirit. The love-thy-neighbor-as-thyself Christian will be taboo. Any portion of the Christian doctrine that smacks too much of Jewish influence must be forgotten.

As the Nazi philosophy developed, the gap widened between the cross of Christian love and Hitler's *Hakenkreuz* of hate.

The keystone of this structure of hatred was of course the obsession of race and blood. Thomas Mann, in the "Magic Mountain," introduces a debauched and degenerate character whose only justification for existence in his own eyes is that, whatever else his shame, he is at least not a Jew. Hitler set about inculcating a not dissimilar sense of pride in the German people. Divided, disorganized, and disunited, Germany could at least find

³ "Hitlerism, the Iron Fist in Germany," by "Nordicus."

solace in its Aryan blood. Into this citadel let no Semite penetrate.

With the slogan, "No Jew can be a German!" Hitler set about the regeneration of the fatherland. The state which he visioned was to be a "racial" one. Its unity (and here lies its basic difference from Italian Fascism with which it claims kinship) was to be a unity of blood. Alfred Rosenberg, philosopher of the Nazi movement, outdid even his leader when he rhapsodized over "the belief embodied in the sublime knowledge that Nordic blood represents the mystery which has replaced and vanquished the ancient sacrament."⁴

Having solved the racial mystery—a task which science rejects as impossible—the Nazis turned to incorporating their hate of the Jew into a concrete political program. The document in which this is accomplished and which may be described as the constitution or rather, the repeal of the constitution of the New Germany, is divided into twenty-five sections. Of these, seven deal directly with the disenfranchisement, the pauperization, and the expatriation of German Jewry. A detailed and an illuminating analysis follows:⁵

Point number 4: "A citizen can be only one suited to the state. The latter can be only one who has German blood, without regard to confession. No Jew therefore can be a person suited to the state." Here the rights and duties of citizenship are denied the

⁴ "The Myth of the Twentieth Century," by Alfred Rosenberg.

⁵ "Hitlerism, the Iron Fist in Germany," by "Nordicus."

Jew. Under a Hitler régime he must live as a non-citizen.

Point number 5: "Any one not a citizen can live in Germany only as a guest and must remain under legislation for foreigners." In other words, Jews can be deported at the will of the government, since they do not enjoy the privileges of citizenship and are classed as foreigners.

Point number 6: "Only the citizen has the right to determine the guidance of the state. Therefore we demand that every public office, no matter what kind, whether in the Reich, state or county, be filled only by citizens." Thus the Jew is summarily shoved back into the Middle Ages and refused the right to vote and to hold office. The rights granted him by the German Constitution are to be changed—in some manner.

Point number 7: "We demand that the state be obliged first of all to give the citizen a chance to earn his livelihood. If it is not possible to sustain the entire population of the country, citizens of foreign nations (*Nicht-Staatsbürger*) are to be deported." No German must be unemployed in the Hitler-Reich. In order to elevate the jobless into economic paradise, all Jews having jobs or earning a livelihood must make way when Germans blessed with pure Aryan blood live on the dole. Jewish business men, doctors, lawyers, professors, all may be deported if there be any unemployment whatsoever. Where this army of Jews will be sent is not made clear.

Point number 8: "Further immigration of non-

Germans is to be prohibited. We demand that all non-Germans who have immigrated to Germany since August 2, 1914, be forced to leave the Reich immediately."

Point number 23: "We demand a legislative battle against conscious political falsehoods and their diffusion through the press. In order to make possible the creation of a German press, we demand that

"(a) All editors and co-workers of newspapers appearing in the German language must be persons suited to the state (*Volksgenosse*);

"(b) Non-German newspapers must have the permission of the government in order to appear. They must not be published in the German language;

"(c) Legislation must prohibit the financial participation of non-Germans in German newspapers; if this be disregarded the guilty newspaper will be banned and the non-Germans immediately deported."

Thus according to the program the press, regarded as an important factor in the political control of Germany, must be cleansed of all Jewish influence. Every newspaper criticizing Hitler's anti-Semitic policy will be muzzled if the least bit of Jewish backing be found.

Point number 24: "We demand freedom for all religious confessions in the state, in so far as these confessions do not offend the morality of the German race." There will be freedom of religion in the Hitler Reich, that is, for all except Jews.

Points 4 to 8 (concerning rights and duties of citizenship), point 23 (concerning the press), and point

24 (concerning religion), are aimed directly at the Jews. In the rest of the program: points 1 to 3, foreign policy; points 11 to 13, administration of justice; points 14 to 19, industrial program; points 20 to 22, education and administration of youth; and point 25, administration of the state, the problem of anti-Semitism remains as a fundamental principle.

Such is the new Hymn of Hate which Hitler intoned and with which he captured control of the German Republic. Lest it seem strange that this program was of so limited and negative a kind one need only recall the quotation with which this chapter opened. At all events, save for the general desire to rebuild a mighty nation, there is no other organized, intelligible, unified concept advanced by the Nazi Party. For on economic points where its paradoxes and contradictions are not wholly meaningless, the program "stands foursquare for nothing at all." Oswald Garrison Villard says of it:⁶

Hitler's economic views are vague and contradictory, not to say childish, and always subject to change without notice. . . . One of his many utterances on the gold standard reads thus: "For Germany this question is not important anyway, since we have but little gold!" Soon, however, he stated after all he did have some ideas about the proper gold policy of Germany, but "our economic ideas are something we do not propose to uncover now. They are, if you please, patented." . . . It would be hard to find a clearer case of the ignorance and the shallowness of

⁶ "The German Phoenix," by Oswald Garrison Villard. 1933.

this man who assumes that he alone is entirely fitted to lead Germany out of her troubles.

Indeed, the Nazi Party has frequently been made uncomfortably aware of the hash of Nationalism, Capitalism, Socialism, and even Communism which makes up its program. In a moment of revelatory candor, Joseph Goebbels, its chief of propaganda, lamented, "If I had founded the party I should not have put out any program at all." Can there be any wonder that the Nazi leaders turned ever and again to the sure ground of Hitler's intuition concerning the efficacy of hate? On that rock the Nazi church is founded.

Having secured the theoretic bases of the movement, Hitler set out to translate its tenets into action. The German people must be given a foretaste of the sweets of victory which a despoiling of the Jew would bring. Those who were amazed at the outbreaks which coincided with Hitler's final victory have but to consult the record to learn that no act committed since that date with official connivance but can be paralleled in the preceding years. Everett R. Clinchy, Secretary of the National Conference of Jews and Christians records:⁷

Actual past experiences wherever National Socialists obtained control of municipal provincial Government has shown the determination to carry out the anti-Jewish policies outlined in their program. When National Socialists were for a time in control of the Government of Thuringia, the Jewish method of slaughtering animals was forbidden, and the National

⁷ "The Strange Case of Herr Hitler," by Everett R. Clinchy.

Socialist Minister of the Interior, Frick, now a member of the Cabinet of the Reich, introduced in the public schools of the province the recitation of prayers in which appeals were addressed to the Almighty to rid the country of the "enemies of Germany." In other places, National Socialists dismissed Jewish actors, opera singers, university professors and public officials. National Socialists in the Prussian Diet introduced a statute providing for the confiscation of the property of East European Jews who entered the country after August 1, 1914.

In a list of one hundred criminal acts committed against Jews in the year 1932, the following instances are chosen almost at random.⁸

- 6.—January 24th:—The University of Berlin was closed on account of renewed anti-Semitic riots. Jewish students were injured and had to be taken to the hospital. As they were carried out from the hall on stretchers, the Nazis accompanied the stretcher bearers chanting the song,—"Jewish Blood Spurts from the Knife." More than forty students, women among them, were injured.
- 15.—March 11th:—Nazi attacks upon Synagogues happened during services in Duesseldorf and Emden and the homes of the Rabbis were attacked. In Duesseldorf the Nazis fired shots at the windows of the Synagogue, smashing the

⁸ "Anti-Semitism in Germany in 1932," by Dr. Trude Weiss Rosmarin.

panes and through this opening proceeded to aim missiles at the congregants.

- 28.—May 20th:—The first act on the part of the Nazi leaders who won a victory in the recent diet elections at Anhalt was to adopt a measure compelling Jewish children to imbibe Christian education. The diet abolished the separation of religious education from the State Schools and introduced compulsory Christian education for all children attending State Schools.
- 44.—June 20th:—Three Hundred Nazis marched through the streets of Breslau and terrorized Jewish passersby, shouting, "Let the Jews go to Palestine." The Nazis attacked a Jewish funeral procession just opposite the Police Headquarters. They shouted: "Here one Jew is leaving for Palestine, and we will soon get rid of the rest."
- 68.—August 11th:—A bomb was discovered in a Synagogue in Cologne. Police arrived in time to remove the bomb before it exploded. Many Jews were attacked at the gate of another Synagogue in Cologne.
- 80.—August 30th:—A 250-year-old Cemetery in Aschersleben was desecrated. A number of the tombstones were removed and some were smashed.

As Nazi strength increased and government authority relaxed, the record grows blacker. Hitler had written, "If you fail to see your name maligned in the Jewish

press in the morning you made no good use of your time yesterday." Conversely, his followers deduced and were explicitly instructed that anti-Jewish violence would be munificently rewarded in the hour of party victory. The conclusion was a foregone one.

I have chronicled this campaign of hate, and recorded these instances of persecution occurring before Hitler's accession to power, not so much for what they were as for what they portended. What followed was inevitable. A doom had been invoked. A broken and embittered nation had been "misled" for ten years toward *Der Tag*. Not as of old *Der Tag* of open combat against an equal foe—but of pillage, of rapine and of murder committed one hundred against one upon defenseless men, women and children within Germany's own border.

4

THE BROWN TERROR

IN THE SHADOW OF AN APPROACHING DOOM, MEN TEND to deny its reality. When the world declared war in 1914, the conflict was of such proportions that it was scientifically demonstrated and universally accepted that it could not continue more than six months. When Hitler came into power, it was commonly held, both in and out of Germany, that the terror which he and his party had prophesied and promised could not transpire. Yet transpire it did—to an extent which even those who dreaded it most had not dared to fear; on a scale which even its conjurers had not dared to hope. For more than a decade the Nazis had sown the winds of hatred. Within a fortnight of their victory the whirlwind of violence and bloodshed had been reaped.

One is loathe alike to read as to recount what took place. Its evil savor and its harrowing details blanch the heart. Yet to omit them were to falsify the record. Whatever the ultimate verdict of mankind, it is needful to set down and to make known these outrages and atrocities. No milder terms can be applied. Nor can the justified disrepute into which these terms fell after the

War be suffered to obscure the facts. Even though many of the atrocities then reported have since been discredited as propaganda, it does not follow, as the Nazi Government adroitly suggests, that propaganda and atrocities are synonymous. Whether or not they have been so in the past, they are so no longer in Germany.

The evidence of outrages and atrocities committed against Liberals, against Communists, and in greatest measure against Jews, is incontrovertible. Apart from the sworn testimony of victims and attested depositions of refugees, the reign of the Brown Terror is recorded in the despatches from Germany by foreign correspondents of the press of the world. These men are not the foes either of the German people or of its present government. They have no political, racial or religious ax to grind. Many of them have established homes and personal ties in Germany. They know that the good or ill-will of the Government can lighten or make their work infinitely harder. And in the last months they have been made acutely aware that any unfavorable reports will jeopardize not only their professional activities but their personal safety. Yet it is from them that the most damning evidence comes.

Faced by this evidence and the deep resentment it evoked throughout the world, the Nazi Government has had recourse to three devices. First, a blanket denial of all charges. Goering, who is Prussian Minister of the Interior, declared on his assumption of office: "I refuse to turn the Police into a guard for Jewish stores." Two weeks later he categorically denied all outrages and stated, "Not a single Jewish shop in Germany is pre-

vented from doing business. Not a single synagogue has been damaged. Not a single Jewish cemetery has been despoiled."

Since this demonstrably false statement reassured no one, and since the press despatches to other countries were too numerous and too unanimous to brand as wholesale falsehoods, the Nazi Government took a second tack. Goebbels, Minister of Public Enlightenment and Propaganda, according to the Berlin correspondent of the *London Times*, "confirmed all that the responsible foreign press has published—namely, that there have been beatings, killings, and house visitations by private individuals." He called attention to the fact, however, that the Nazi accession to power had been more in the nature of a national revolution (Hitler insists it was a strictly constitutional proceeding) than a change in government. Thus it was inevitably attended by certain untoward "incidents" of which Jews had been the victims, but for which the Nazi Government could in no wise be held accountable. This, despite the fact that all revolutionary activities had been conducted by the Nazi Party and its Storm Troops.

Finally, it was urged that the "incidents" in question had ended; that they had been maliciously distorted by enemies of Germany and that they could be dismissed as gross exaggerations of the facts. In this defense the Nazi Government had one ally—the natural disinclination of the human mind to credit as possible the news which came from Germany. Despite this will to disbelieve, however, there can to-day be no question that the atrocities and brutalities reported from Germany,

far from being exaggerated are incomplete and understated accounts of what took place.

There is the incriminating fact of the iron censorship which exists in Germany to-day. That censorship is exercised in two directions. First, upon the German press itself. The special correspondent of *The Manchester Guardian* writes that "there is not a word in the Press. Any newspaper that dares to give even a hint of the truth would share the fate of hundreds of newspapers that have been totally ruined by the terrorist dictatorship." Moreover, the Government has made every effort to block the foreign correspondents of Germany in their attempts both to ascertain the facts and to communicate them. Under such circumstances what conclusion is possible save that the little that has come to light is proof not of more but of less than the whole truth.

Even more damaging to the claim of exaggeration, is the silencing fear on the part of the victims that any word they may utter will bring further and yet more terrible reprisals. This holds true, not only for those still in Germany, but even of the statements of refugees, and of letters mailed from beyond the German border—full of fear lest what they say or write may cause those who still remain in Germany further anguish.

Whatever the Nazi Government may say concerning exaggerations, it will be months and perhaps years before the full measure of the Brown Terror may be appraised. But it is already certain that that terror will prove in degree and in extent to be even worse than the world yet knows or than is here recounted.

.

Before citing the evidence a word must be said as to who constitutes the victims. They are for the most part Jews. Despite the political antagonism of Hitler to Communists and to Liberals, the largest measure of official rage has been directed against Jews. This has been both in line with the Nazi policy which we have traced, and because Jews furnish the easiest and most obvious targets. Too, Jews have been victimized regardless of the political party to which they belong. Liberal and radical Gentiles of all groups have suffered under Hitler. But the most conservative of Jews have been no less subjected to the Brown Terror than the most radical of Communists.

It is not possible to give here a detailed and complete account of what took place following the election of March 5 and Hitler's appointment to the Chancellorship. The nearest analogy is to be found in the ancient Teutonic custom of *Freimacht*—the customary night of license granted to warriors by their commander after a victory, a night in which order and discipline were abandoned in an orgy of bloodlust and revenge.

The analogy is inadequate, however, since the Nazi *Freimacht* lasted not for a night but for weeks. Nor is its end yet in sight. Thus in a cable to *The New York Times* dated March 25, Edmund Taylor writes:

On the nights of March 9 and 10, bands of Nazis throughout Germany carried out wholesale raids calculated to intimidate the opposition, particularly the Jews. As hundreds have sworn in affidavits, men and women were insulted, slapped, punched in the

face, hit over the head with blackjacks, dragged out of their homes in night-clothes and otherwise molested.

Most of these incidents have been admitted by the authorities, but officially they asserted they were carried out by irresponsible hands. Reliable witnesses, however, declare that in the literal sense of the word there were no mob scenes at all. Perpetrators of the outrages were all uniformed Nazis.

The following more detailed accounts of what transpired are divided into two main groups. The first consists of reports and dispatches culled from the reputable press of the world and in every instance carrying the authority of a journalist of recognized standing. The second comprises letters, statements, and affidavits of the victims themselves. In each case the identity of the individual is known and the authenticity of the material published is vouched for by the present writer.

In a series of articles in the *New York Evening Post*, its special Berlin correspondent, H. R. Knickerbocker, describes the course and extent of the Brown Terror in the following terms:

An indeterminate number of Jews have been killed.

Hundreds of Jews have been beaten or tortured.

Thousands of Jews have fled.

Thousands of Jews have been, or will be, deprived of their livelihood.

All of Germany's 600,000 Jews are in terror. . . .

It is impossible to ascertain how many Jews have been killed. The newspapers are suppressed, the oppo-

sition is terrorized and the families of the victims would be the last to utter a protest.

It is only possible to estimate in the vague term "hundreds" how many Jews have been beaten, tortured and robbed. The only means of information is through personal knowledge, by word of mouth and in those cases where the Jews are of foreign nationality and have complained to their consulate.

The foreign Jews whose consulates have protested to the Foreign Office of maltreatment and savage torture number around 150. The Polish Embassy alone had an imposing list of affidavits to submit to Herr Neurath. They comprised more than 100 instances wherein Jews had been attacked in their homes or places of business, robbed at the point of revolvers and taken to torture chambers where men "in the uniforms of storm troopers" have beaten them with leaden balls. Nine American Jews were beaten or otherwise maltreated. Altogether, since the native Jews outnumber the foreigners by 100 to 1, it is conservative to estimate that during the first days of the terror "hundreds" of Jews were tortured.

In the London *Daily Herald* of Monday, March 27, its special correspondent replying to the challenge of Goebbels that no one "can name one single Jew that has met his death in the course of the national revolution" states:

I am in a position to answer to-day the challenge of Dr. Goebbels, the Nazi Propaganda Minister, and to name more than "a single Jew" who has met his

death in the course of the national revolution. First let me give three names, not one, to answer Dr. Goebbels.

Max Neumann, a Jewish merchant from Königsberg, was seized by the local Nazis, taken to their tavern and beaten until his body was one raw wound. Pepper was then spread on the wound and the mutilated body was returned to the family. Fearing to take the victim to a Königsberg hospital, the family rushed Neumann to Berlin. He was admitted to the hospital there, but died of blood-poisoning on the third day.

Kindermann, a Jewish youth from Berlin, was kidnaped by Nazi Storm Troops, taken to their house in North Berlin, and there beaten until he collapsed. The family did not know where the boy was until they received a letter informing them: "Your son is in the mortuary." Kindermann was buried in the Jewish Weissensee cemetery. Whoever wishes can convince himself, as I did, of the truth of the story.

Krel, a Jewish youth from Berlin, was taken to the Nazi headquarters and there tortured to death. The family was officially informed that Krel had committed suicide by jumping out of the window from the fourth floor.

I mention these three names only because they are dead. No more harm can be done to them. I have in my possession the names and addresses of many Jews who have been brutally mishandled, beaten, flogged but not killed.

I have spoken to a victim of one of these outrages,

a Jewish youth in the twenties. He was one of a group of five Jews who were flogged until they were unconscious. "I could count only until the tenth stroke," he said. "After that, I no longer knew whether my own or some one else's body was being beaten into pulp with india-rubber whips."

In like vein is the dispatch sent by the representative of the Jewish Telegraphic Agency from Berlin, March 18. He writes:

The effect of Hitler's call for discipline is beginning to wear off. For several days after the publication of Hitler's communique, violence subsided somewhat in Berlin, although there were sporadic outbreaks in the provinces.

Nazis yesterday attacked the Berlin slaughter-yard, maltreating a number of Schochtem (butchers), and injuring one. There have also been a number of individual attacks in the Jewish quarter of the Grenadierstrasse. Individual Jews have been attacked, and these assaults are continuing.

Unknown persons entered a synagogue in the Grenadierstrasse and terrorized the worshipers. It was only the timely arrival of the police that saved the worshipers from violence.

In parts of the provinces Nazi violence is of a more serious character, if only because the police are rather unwilling, or unable to interfere. At Munich, the venerable Rabbi Baerwald was pulled out of bed at night by unknown persons. He was dragged from the house and taken out into the street, where he was

placed against a wall by hooligans, who pointed rifles at him. The aged rabbi believed that his end had come when the leader ordered the others to fire. However, the hooligans, instead of firing, burst out laughing. They then disappeared, leaving the rabbi, who had collapsed, unconscious on the street.

This dispatch of the Jewish Telegraphic Agency is, incidentally, confirmed by the correspondent of the *Chicago Tribune*.

H. R. Knickerbocker writing in the *New York Evening Post* of April 5 attests the reliability of the following instances of the Terror: "All cases cited here are either confirmed by personal investigation by the *Evening Post* correspondent or are citations from affidavits filed with foreign diplomatic representatives."

I sat beside the sickbed of a young Jewish matron who told me the following incident:

On March 14—two days after the Hitler decree against terror—four men dressed in the uniform of the storm troops broke into her home as she was on her way out. They threw her into a corner and proceeded to demolish the apartment.

She cried: "But I am not a Communist!" They answered: "You're a Jew." Then one seized a knife, grabbed her arm and gashed again and again at her wrist. She screamed, but he kept on cutting. Then they must have become frightened, for suddenly all four fled.

She reached the telephone and called for help. Luckily he had failed to cut her artery. Afterward

they called the police, and a detective exclaimed: "Incredible!" but he believed it when he saw her wrist.

When this story first became known by word of mouth most people exclaimed: "Incredible!" but the *Evening Post* correspondent is able to testify that he personally saw the wounds.

March 15, about 10 o'clock in the evening uniformed men took four Jewish guests from the Café Engländer in the Schoenhauserallee to a storm troop barracks in the Schillingstrasse, where 400 marks of theirs were confiscated. Their protocol reads, "They were beaten by the uniformed men with blackjacks until they were unconscious and when they revived they were forced to lick the blood from one another and from the table."

This last item should suffice. The protocols are sworn statements.

Among the mass of depositions by the victims themselves, it is possible to present only a few typical documents. Yet they should prove ample. The first are included in a note recently submitted by the Polish ambassador in Berlin to the German Government complaining of the attacks made on Polish subjects in Germany and demanding action. The text of the note is as follows:

In Berlin:

On March 8th, Isaac Gordan, of 19, Alte Schoenhauserstrasse, was attacked at 8 P.M. by people in uniform, who beat him into an unconscious state with sticks.

On March 9th, Isaac Adler, of 5, Linienstrasse, and his son were terribly beaten. The windows of his shop were smashed.

The same day, in the Sachs Café, Hillel Celtbaum, of 16, Muenzstrasse, was beaten till he streamed with blood. Eight hundred and fifty marks which he had on him were taken away from him.

The restaurant of Moses Pariser at 12, Alte Schoenhauserstrasse was entered by persons wearing uniform, who beat the customers with rubber cudgels. They threw all the food off the buffet and threatened to kill everybody, and then ordered the restaurant to be closed. Four days previously, at 2 P.M., twelve persons in uniform had hunted all the customers out of the same restaurant and had then demanded 250 marks from Pariser for carrying out a police search.

The same day, at 6:45 P.M., Aron Lizband, of 31, Grenadierstrasse, was attacked in the Linienstrasse. He and his parents were terribly beaten till the blood ran down them. On the orders of the uniformed persons he was compelled to close his shop.

In Magdeburg:

On March 8th, at 11 o'clock at night six persons, some in uniform, entered the hotel of Hannah Brzostowiecko. They fired a revolver and beat all the visitors in the hotel lounge. Many were stabbed with knives. Brzostowiecko's daughter, who wanted to call the police, was dragged away from the telephone, the furniture was wrecked, the windows were smashed and a great deal of damage was done.

In Worms:

On March 9th, Chaim and Moses Armianer and Herman Gruenbaum were called into the premises of the Storm detachment of the Nationalist Socialist Party. They were beaten and were compelled to flog each other. In addition, Gruenbaum was compelled to pay 300 marks.

The following letter was sent from Zurich by a distinguished Berlin attorney after his escape from Germany:

Zurich, March 29, 1933.

I thought it wiser for me, my wife and my child to come here for the present and to wait and see how things would develop and whether I could return to Berlin and resume my practice. It is impossible for me to put into a few words everything that I have seen and heard and lived through in the last few weeks in Germany. I am a veteran of the war. Nevertheless I had to listen to the shouts of "*Jude Verrecke*" of the organized bands of demonstrators marching past my house. Daily there were attacks upon people and kidnapings, the most terrible kinds of mistreatment of any number of people of my acquaintance who were known to have Democratic or Socialistic views, or simply because they were Jews. These latter are according to the view of those who have the power in Germany now, *ipso facto*, criminals. In Berlin at the present time it is barely possible for two people to speak aloud to each other. Every letter, every telephone conversation is watched. In spite of that, how-

ever, as is the case in all periods of tyranny, news travels rapidly from mouth to mouth and when certain statements are confirmed from various quarters we know that they must be true. Naturally, in the case of such reports, there are occasionally mis-statements or exaggerations. But on the whole the terrible reports are understatements rather than exaggerations, for the simple fact that many of the victims or their relatives are afraid to mention them because they would be subject to further persecution. The formal statements of the *Centralverein* of German Citizens of the Jewish Faith and of similar organizations are to be read only in the light of this terror. In general the mildest threat is now sufficient to compel a Jew living in Germany to do or say anything. When I left Berlin a few days ago I had the feeling that I was living in a condition of a constant and continuous pogrom worse than those that once took place in Russia because there the pogrom started and ended at a definite time. You will probably have heard by this time of the terrible pogrom in Koenigsberg of which the most important and leading Jews of the community were victims. Here in Zurich I received from an absolutely reliable source the confirmation of the terrible reports from Koenigsberg. The relatives of the Jews who had been attacked and wounded did not dare even to bring the poor victims to the hospitals in Koenigsberg but had to transport them to Berlin and many succumbed to their wounds in the course of the transportation to Berlin. It was only foreign protests, especially that of

America, which prevented even worse happenings, a greater number of kidnapings and bloody beatings and possibly one big general pogrom.

I beg you most fervently to withhold my name in passing on the contents of this letter and for heaven's sake not to allow my identity to be brought to light, as I may possibly have to return to Germany, and I would in that case certainly be lost. Therefore please mention my name to no one. Possibly I should not have written this but how can I keep quiet at the sight of the blood of my people that remains unavenged.

In a letter published in *The Nation* under the title "Escaping the German Hell," by a correspondent for whose authority and responsibility the editors vouch, occurs the following:

You do not know how lucky you are, dear M., to be in the United States. If you had stayed in Germany, I assure you, you would now be among the dead. Two young men among my friends in Berlin were arrested. Both families have been informed of the death of their sons. If they had been shot immediately after their arrest it would have been a terrible tragedy, but the poor boys would not have had to suffer infernal torture. Their brothers told me they were terribly beaten up and brutally treated. One of these young men was a Reichsbanner man, healthy, tall, and strong. A week after his arrest his people were informed that he was in the hospital on account of a nervous breakdown; some time later they were told that he had died of heart failure. The other

young man was a journalist. Four days after his arrest his parents were informed that he had died of tuberculosis and heart failure. In reality he was perfectly healthy and fit. I do not know what his political attitude was. His brother went to the morgue to take a last look at the corpse. It was covered, and he could see only the head, which showed distinct marks of a terrible beating. He insisted on seeing the whole body and asked for a post-mortem examination. This was refused in the following words: "If you don't get the hell out of here and shut your mouth about this, we'll do the same thing to you!" The bodies were not returned to the families for burial.

. . . The atrocity tales are in truth "tales," since the atrocities are committed behind closed doors in all secrecy. In the streets everything seems to be very peaceful. However, in Berlin in the Friedrichstrasse, No. 132, there is a Nazi home in which there is a room whose walls are all smeared with blood. Even the Nazi neighbors of the building are said to have protested against the daily and nightly screams and cries of the tortured victims. This report I received from Dr. L. M., who as a Berlin reporter has heard the screams himself, and knows some of the victims.

The final document comes from an American woman and is sent from Paris:

DEAREST FAMILY:

You have received my cable telling you where I am. I have been through a *horrible, horrible night-*

mare. Writing about it upsets me terribly. L. and H. were sent by God.

Things in — since Hitler came in were quiet. There was excitement in the air but nothing happened. Friday night L. and H. and a few members of the family came to dinner. L. had a cold and was in bed. They all left about 11:00 o'clock. About 11:15 the bell rang furiously. I was already in bed. L. and I jumped up frightened. We heard shouts saying if you don't open the door we'll break it down. The porter downstairs opened. Then our immediate door bell rang. L. said: "Who is it?" "Open, it is the police." We opened the door, and five Hitler men in uniform entered, one with a bayonet. My God, my God, I am crazy when I think about it. They asked if L. was armed. Of course he was not. Then they asked where the telephone was, and I pointed to the other end of the apartment. They thought I was going to use it so they threw me on the floor. It is all so horrible. I went to the bedroom where they were with L. They asked for our passports and as L. turned to get it, four of them jumped on him and beat him terribly. His head was cut open, his hand half broken. They kept saying: "Jews, we hate you. Fourteen years we are waiting for this chance and to-night we will hang you all."

I kept begging them to stop. They left L. unconscious and came to me. I told them I was American. One of them struck me with a club and said why did you marry a Jew. They wanted to enter J.'s room. I begged and pleaded and said my baby is an Ameri-

can. Again they shouted, "Jews, we hate you." They took my American pass, L.'s pass, and my German pass. After they got the passports they beat L. again.

The nurse was off that evening and I alone. The parents sleep at the other end of the house. It is a miracle they did not hear. I begged them not to go there as the old lady has a very bad heart.

How can I tell you what I went through? I got L. on the bed. His face I shall never forget. Blood streaming all over him, dazed and bewildered. By that time M. came down. We got a doctor, a Gentile, as we were afraid to call a Jew. He dressed his wounds and wanted to take him to a hospital. It was after midnight and I tried to get the American Consul. After one hour I reached him. He called the police, but they are Hitlerites too. I was afraid they might return. That night I shall *not forget*.

In the morning L. went to the hospital. When the parents found what happened the mother-in-law got a horrible heart attack. We thought she was dying.

Father-in-law prayed all morning. I went to the Consul with L. and they were all excited. I had to sign ten affidavits about what happened. The papers were sent to the American Ambassador in Berlin.

They tried to locate my passport at the Hitler headquarters but could not.

The American Consul was marvelous. They gave me a new passport immediately and told me to leave —. They took me to the train, as it was dangerous. I am in Paris with H. and L. They are the most

wonderful friends. Please thank them for all they have done for me and J. I shall stay here until things quiet down. Ask H. to show you L.'s pajama coat covered with blood.

God help the poor Jews who are not American. I believe that my experience will help them, as it was officially reported.

Hope you are all well. I am so tired. Love.

Be careful not to mention names. It may be dangerous.

So much for the evidence of suffering, the record of persecution. It is but a minute part of what is already established by unassailable witnesses. It does no more than hint at the muted anguish of those who dare not speak. And it is here collated and published, not in order to harrow or incite, but because, while the peak of this bloody business seems for the moment to have been passed, it is not yet ended. Nor is there any assurance that it will not again assume the same ghastly proportions. Up to now—save for denials and minimizations—the Nazi Government has given no sign of being aware of its responsibility for and in the matter. Until it does, the fact and the facts of the Brown Terror cannot be permitted to pass from men's minds and hearts.

5

WORLD REACTION

“THIS IS A MATTER OF INTERNATIONAL CONCERN,”
T declared Viscount Cecil speaking before the House of Lords of the barbarities perpetrated by the Nazis against the Jews of Germany. His word epitomized the reaction of mankind. Perhaps never before in history have the internal events of one country so swiftly become a matter of world import. A tidal wave of revulsion swept civilization into a storm of moral protest.

In analyzing this world reaction, certain facts stand out. Foremost, perhaps, its spontaneity and immediacy. It was inevitable that Jews in all countries would raise their voices and hands against the heavy wrong put upon their German brothers. It was predictable that they would call upon their Gentile fellow-citizens to participate in their efforts. But the non-Jewish world neither waited that call nor needed the stimulus of Jewish example to arouse it. As immediately, as instinctively as though the victims had been of their own races and faiths, the nations responded to the ordeal of German Jewry. In England, in France, in Italy, in

Russia, in Poland, as in America, non-Jews vied with Jews in the expression of amazed indignation.

Equally significant was the unanimity of the world's reaction. It was not limited either to liberals or conservatives. Lines of political demarcation like those of creed and nationality merged in a common protest. The tribunes of world opinion—from Communist Russia to Fascist Italy—spoke with a single voice. Nor was their reaction formal or superficial. It bore no trace of the conventional politeness of indifference. Characterized by profound concern, it expressed itself in blazing resentment. And it has not ebbed nor ended.

It is possible here only to outline the nature and development of that reaction, since it found expression in all tongues and through such diverse channels as government inquiries, religious pronouncements, and the press. Typical of the last is this excerpt from *The Manchester Guardian* of March 13:

The rumors which have long been circulating of a Nazi terror are given substance by the news which reaches us from Germany; organized, authorized murder is both possible and common in Germany today. If there is not the open massacre which many feared before the election, there is a secret terror. Its organizers learn from Italy and Russia. "Auxiliary police" who make their prisoners sing a Nazi song before they fill them up with castor oil or beat their faces out of recognition are doing better than their prototypes. The sinister buildings in the Friedrichstrasse and the Friesenstrasse recall the quiet prisons

of the Moscow Cheka or that Rome Palazzo where so many odious tortures were inflicted upon prisoners in 1923 and 1924. How can a great and civilized nation like the Germans tolerate these horrors?

And in America, *The New York Times*, in an editorial on March 30, entitled "The Larger Question," stated:

The German Nationalists are forcing the world to see something more than a "Jewish question" in the Reich. By their methods and manifestos they are taking the matter out of the realm of narrow race hatred and making it appear one of humanity and civilization itself. The proposal is not to deprive 600,000 people in Germany of their lives, but only of their livelihood. "You take away my life who take away the means by which I live." There is to be, moreover, a sweeping condemnation of children to ignorance as well as to starvation; the doors of opportunity are to be slammed in the faces of ambitious and talented youth; a whole series of medieval restrictions and oppressions are to be revived. To crown all, if humane citizens of other countries venture to raise their voices against what seem to them barbarous measures, striking down the innocent along with the guilty, the victims are to be held as "hostages" until foreign governments take steps to silence the expression of generous and liberal sentiments. . . .

The thing has already gone far beyond an attack upon a single race or religion. No appeal to age-long prejudice will suffice in a case like the present. Funda-

mental issues of humane and civilized government have pushed into the background the claims and charges with which the ferocious agitation in Germany started. Feelings have been roused which transcend political boundaries or definitions of race. No matter what people are called, or what religion they profess, the modern world cannot sit by in silence when they are singled out for exceptional punishment in the mass. Germans ought not to forget the outcry of the modern world over the Turkish massacre in Bulgaria years ago. Sympathy and aid for Armenian sufferers and outlaws had nothing to do with their descent or language or religious beliefs. They were thought of as helpless human beings in the habitations of cruelty, and that was enough. It is enough to-day.

One thing the German Government may set down for certain. It cannot compel citizens of other nations to be dumb in the presence of what they consider an outrage upon the finer professions and ideals of modern States. If they kept silent, the very stones would cry out. Chancellor Hitler may think it possible to suppress within Germany everything he does not like, but outside Germany his edicts will not run. He cannot suppress the deep and humane instincts of civilized men and women. They may hold one view or another of the political activities of Jews in Germany, but they are bound to protest against the proscription of an entire element of the German population. . . .

There are few finer examples of religious brotherhood in action than the instantaneous response of the Church to the Nazi persecution of Israel. Christendom seemed literally to have been stabbed awake by this un-Christian injustice. On other occasions in the long history of their suffering, Jews had bitterly and justifiably wondered at the incongruous silence and apparent indifference of the Church. In the last months that silence has been eloquently broken. Clear and strong are the words of religious teachers of all faiths, indicting the irreligion of the treatment accorded the Jew by so-called German Christians.

An appeal to the German people to end the persecution by the Hitler régime was issued by leading representatives of all American denominations on March 22. The appeal reads:¹

¹ The following names were affixed to the appeal:

NEWTON D. BAKER, former Secretary of War.

GEORGE GORDON BATTLE, member of national board, Pro-Palestine Federation of America.

ELMER E. BROWN, chancellor New York University.

S. PARKES CADMAN, former president the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America.

RICHARD S. CHILDS, president the City Club of New York.

HENRY SLOANE COFFIN, president Union Theological Seminary.

BAINBRIDGE COLBY, former Secretary of State of the United States.

MARTIN CONBOY, former president of the Catholic Club.

ROYAL S. COPELAND, United States Senator for New York.

J. HARRY COTTON, pastor First Methodist Church, Columbus, Ohio.

JOHN W. DAVIS, president Association of the Bar of the City of New York.

We fully recognize that the German people have a right to choose such rulers and such form of government as they may wish; but this recognition only heightens our right and duty to appeal to them not to permit continuance of the present acts of aggression, injustice and violence toward Jews in Germany. We appeal to them to prevent these attacks against all that civilization has gained for tolerance and understanding since the Dark Ages. The problems of this deeply troubled world can be solved only through mutual good-will and coöperation among all races; and unless chaos is to inherit the earth, it is the sacred duty of every member of the human family and every supporter of the Christian Faith to counteract this

STEPHEN P. DUGGAN, director the Institute of International Education.

AMOS I. DUSHAW, member of national board Pro-Palestine Federation of America.

HARRY EMERSON FOSDICK, minister the Riverside Church.

JAMES W. GERARD, former United States Ambassador to Germany.

WILLIAM GREEN, president American Federation of Labor.

CARROLL HAYES, president the Catholic Club in the City of New York.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, minister the Community Church.

LUCIUS R. EASTMAN, former president the Merchants' Association of New York.

WILLIAM T. MANNING, Bishop of New York.

MARTIN T. MANTON, former president the Catholic Club in the City of New York.

FRANCIS J. McCONNELL, former president the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America.

J. A. MECKSTROTH, editor-in-chief *The Ohio State Journal*, Columbus, Ohio.

FREDERICK B. ROBINSON, president College of the City

subversive, un-Christian and inhuman propaganda which is abroad in the world and is now so painfully manifesting itself in Germany. We cannot but regard with profound dismay these recurring instances of ominous reversion to intolerance and persecution in a land which has been a home of culture, justice and progress. We are deeply moved by the outrage and folly of acts which seemingly aim at human degradation, and which violate the most elementary human rights.

To this our solemn appeal and protest we add our deep expression of sympathy for those who have been the victims of this violence, and our desire to co-

of New York and chairman of American League for Human Rights.

GEORGE E. ROOSEVELT, president Roosevelt Hospital.

CHARLES EDWARD RUSSELL, president Pro-Palestine Federation of America.

HARRISON M. SAYRE, chairman Foreign Policy Association, Columbus, Ohio.

ALFRED E. SMITH, former Governor of the State of New York.

RALPH W. SOCKMAN, former president the Greater New York Federation of Churches.

JOHN THOMPSON, pastor Episcopal-Methodist Temple Church, Chicago.

CHARLES TREXLER, president the Greater New York Federation of Churches.

CHARLES H. TUTTLE, president the Greater New York Interfaith Committee.

ROBERT F. WAGNER, United States Senator for New York.

GROVER A. WHALEN, former Police Commissioner of the City of New York.

GEORGE W. WICKERSHAM, former United States Attorney General.

operate with our Jewish fellow-citizens in the relief and the protection of their Jewish brethren in Germany.

In England, the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Earl of Iddesleigh, who spoke as a communicant of the Roman Catholic Church, associated themselves in their capacities as churchmen with the Marquis of Reading when he urged in the House of Lords that His Majesty's Government "use such legitimate means as are within their power, to let Germany know what is the opinion in this country and what is felt by the British people." And countless pulpits throughout the Christian world echoed the word of Bishop William T. Manning of New York:

None of us, whether we are Jews or Christians, none of us who call ourselves Americans, have the right to be indifferent to such acts. Such action against any race or group of men anywhere in the world is the concern of all of us because those men are our brothers and have the same rights before God that we have. . . .

The Christian religion calls upon men not only for justice but for brotherliness toward all, and in these days of world crisis we see clearly that we must sweep out the spirit of hate and fear, and banish war and draw all nations together in brotherhood and fellowship, if civilization is to be saved.

Race prejudice, oppression, religious persecution, have no right to exist anywhere in this world, and we have no right to condone or countenance them.

While the expressions of governmental concern were necessarily more guarded and diplomatic than those of the Church and the press, their import and earnestness were no less evident. Sir Austin Chamberlain, former Foreign Secretary of Great Britain, and close to the present British Ministry, declared on April 10:

I want the German Government to think of the impression which its attitude toward fellow-citizens within its power must give the world of what its attitude to other nations would be if it were in a position to force its will. Germany met her fate in 1918 because, in overweening pride and egocentric vanity, she was unwilling to allow other people to live as they wished, but was determined to dominate and impose her will on the remainder of the world, and we see again kindling in her internal affairs the same spirit at a moment when she is asking the Disarmament Conference—and other States expressed willingness to grant it to her—equality of status. . . .

Germany is asking reconsideration of any portion of the Versailles Treaty which is shown to be unduly harsh. Before you can revise those treaties, before you can reconsider them, you must be quite certain that that domineering spirit has departed from the Germans. Before we can return to their level, we must be sure they seek equality for their own security and to maintain peace and not to threaten the security of other nations, and I say, with the sense of responsibility which must attach to a person who has

held the position I have, that it ill becomes Germany to be so narrow or overbearing or exclusive.

Sir Alexander MacFadden put the matter even more bluntly at a meeting of the Royal Institute for National Affairs in response to a bid by Prince Bismarck, unofficial Nazi envoy to England, for British sympathy toward the Hitler régime. He said:

I ask Prince Bismarck to take the following message to Germany. Undoubtedly many influential people in England developed a real friendship for Germany since the War. But now they openly declare their sympathies to lie more with France than with the Germans. As long as the German Government acts in the fashion it is doing at present it is useless to expect that Germany will receive fair play, which it complains it does not receive because nobody believes the news emanating from Germany which we consider to be officially tainted. The anti-Jewish persecutions are causing irreparable harm in Germany, especially in an economic sense.

Similar expressions have emanated from nearly every important government. As to official American action on the outrages, a more detailed account will follow. It is in place, however, to quote here from the significant statement of Senator Robert F. Wagner of New York, German by birth, and powerful in the councils of the Democratic party and of the nation. For it is typical of the attitude expressed and unexpressed of the leaders in American political life.

The emergence of this destructive spirit is of concern not alone to the Jewish people; it is a menace not only to the German people; unless it is dissipated it threatens to blot out every prospect of progress, to poison the very springs of our civilization.

The lesson of history is that the black brigade of religious discrimination does not limit its attack against any one people or any one creed. The Jew, the Catholic, the Protestant have in turn been the victims of its blind abuse. The fields of Europe have too often been fertilized with the blood of such conflicts. Proudly we thought we had brought that miserable chapter of human history to an end. Is it now to be reopened? Is the shameful record to be lengthened? Or will the aroused force of public opinion, alive to the danger, muster the support of men and women of good-will of all nations and all creeds to expose and stop the villainy of a malicious minority? . . .

I cannot emphasize too strongly that the concern of the American people does not rest alone upon the narrow ground that some of our citizens are reported to have been molested. Our concern is not limited by the common kinship of our Jewish citizens with the Jews of Germany. Our interest and anxiety are in response to the universal call of humanity. We are moved by the realization that in the little world we live in there can be real tranquillity nowhere as long as violence prevails anywhere.

.

When word of the Nazi terror first reached the Jews of the world—united to its victims by the bonds of race and love—they were for a space stunned with pain. Not only with the pain of bereavement and anxiety but with the probing of an ancient hurt. It was as if a hideous specter had arisen from the realm of ghosts. Then out of their sorrow they determined to find means whereby to abate and, quickly as might be, to end the tragedy which had befallen their brothers in Germany.

The task they faced was overwhelmingly difficult. They were wholly without physical or military weapons. Unable even to communicate with their stricken fellow Jews, they could not counsel with them as to what might be done. Two courses were open. The first was to exert all possible pressure upon the German Government to cease its anti-Jewish campaign. The second was to summon to their cause the intangible but potent ally of public opinion.

Both courses were adopted. Everywhere great gatherings evidenced the will of world Israel to align itself with the fate of German Jewry. In many lands, notably in England, in France, in Argentina, in Poland and in Palestine, it was felt that while the Brown Terror raged, Jews should not have economic traffic with Germany. Nationwide boycotts were declared and, in some instances even without official declaration, they went into general and telling effect.

In the United States, the initiative was taken by the American Jewish Congress which, together with affiliated organizations and divisions, represents a membership approximating 400,000. It sought first, by co-

ordinating its efforts with those of the Independent Order of B'nai Brith and the American Jewish Committee, to unify the action of all American Jews. The Congress quickly perceived, however, that it must choose between unified inaction and independent action. It moved forward alone.

At a conference of Jewish organizations held in New York on March 19, it was determined by profoundly moved and deeply resolved representatives of American Jewry to make solemn protest against the "damnable outrages of Hitlerism." This decision was taken after the advisability of such action had been heatedly debated. Dr. Stephen S. Wise, upon whom, then and since, leadership devolved in this defense of Jewish rights and honor, voiced the conviction of the overwhelming majority of those present when he declared:

How can we expect the Christian Leaders of America to speak out against Hitlerism if they learn that Jews themselves deem it unwise to make public protest? The time to challenge this thing that comes out of the depths of hell is now, while it is happening. Jews must come out of hiding. The program of the American Jewish Congress must be this: Germany must be made safe for every Jew who lives in that country.

The first effort of the Congress was to enlist the cooperation of the State Department. On March 22, following representations made by Bernard S. Deutsch, president of the American Jewish Congress, and Dr. Stephen S. Wise, honorary president, the State Depart-

ment requested the American Embassy at Berlin to investigate the situation and to submit a report. On Sunday, March 26, Secretary of State Hull confirmed in a telegram, the text of which follows, the fact of "widespread physical mistreatment of Jews" and "picketing of Jewish merchandising stores and instances of professional discrimination":

You will remember that at the time of your recent call at the department I informed you that, in view of numerous press statements indicating widespread mistreatment of the Jews in Germany, I would request the American Embassy at Berlin in consultation with the principal consulates in Germany to investigate the situation and submit a report.

A reply has now been received indicating that whereas there was for a short time considerable physical mistreatment of Jews, this phase may be considered virtually terminated. There was also some picketing of Jewish merchandising stores and instances of professional discrimination. These manifestations were viewed with serious concern by the German Government.

Hitler, in his capacity as leader of the Nazi party, issued an order calling upon his followers to maintain law and order, to avoid molesting foreigners, disrupting trade, and to avoid the creation of possibly embarrassing international incidents.

Later, Von Papen delivered a speech at Breslau in which he not only reiterated Hitler's appeals for discipline, but abjured the victors of the last election not

to spoil their triumph by unworthy acts of revenge and violence which could only bring discredit upon the new régime in foreign countries. As a result, the Embassy reports that the authority of the regular police has been reënforced.

The feeling has been widespread in Germany that following so far-reaching a political readjustment as has recently taken place, some time must elapse before a state of equilibrium could be reëstablished. In the opinion of the embassy, such a stabilization appears to have been reached in the field of personal mistreatment, and there are indications that in other phases the situation is improving.

I feel hopeful, in view of the reported attitude of high German officials and the evidences of amelioration already indicated, that the situation, which has caused such widespread concern throughout this country, will soon revert to normal. Meanwhile, I shall continue to watch the situation closely, with a sympathetic interest and with a desire to be helpful in whatever way possible.

At the same time the press of the country pointed out that President Roosevelt had withheld the appointment of an ambassador to Germany and that this delay might well be construed as a tacit demand that the new German Government give satisfactory evidence of the cessation of its anti-Jewish program and the restoration of internal stability. Moreover, it was obvious that—due to the expression of concern, manifested in the investigation ordered by the State Department, and to similar

measures adopted by Great Britain—the German Government felt constrained to discontinue at least the most crass and overt aspects of its anti-Jewish campaign.

In the meantime the American Jewish Congress had formulated a four-point program which it communicated to the German Ambassador, Wilhelm von Prittwitz, for the German Government. These four points which may be characterized as a minimum demand are:

1. An immediate cessation of all anti-Semitic activities and propaganda in Germany.
2. The abandonment of the policy of racial discrimination against and of economic exclusion of Jews from the life of Germany.
3. The protection of Jewish life and property.
4. No expulsion of East European Jews, Jews who have come into Germany since 1914.

While these more formal and diplomatic efforts were being made, a mighty wave of Jewish indignation gathered force against the unabated outrages, committed and condoned by the Nazi Government. This indignation culminated in a series of mass meetings of protest held throughout the United States by Jewish and Christian organizations under the auspices of the American Jewish Congress.

The greatest of these meetings was held in New York on March 27, at Madison Square Garden. The situation in Germany was one to induce hysteria, even fanaticism. A thousand police and an army of plain-clothesmen were detailed to guard against outbursts and unruliness. Excepting to organize the twenty thousand within the

Garden and the thirty-five thousand in the streets outside, there was no need. The spirit that pervaded the colossal mass of humanity was one of subdued sorrow in the face of dire disaster. The speakers were greeted enthusiastically and their resolute words were cheered, but for four hours only the controlled indignation of outrage and the dignity of grief obtained. For the addresses were patently meditated and of unforgettable importance in the annals of right-thinking.

Those who voiced their protest on this occasion were not, for the most part, Jews. They included William Green, President of the American Federation of Labor; Bishop Francis J. McConnell, former President of the Federated Council of the Churches of Christ in America; Dr. John Haynes Holmes, of the Community Church; John P. O'Brien, Mayor of New York City; Bishop William T. Manning; Charles H. Tuttle, Chairman of the Interfaith Committee; Senator Robert F. Wagner; and former Governor Alfred E. Smith of New York. It is not possible to republish here the full texts of their addresses. Yet certain excerpts from these addresses cannot be omitted, for they sum up the major aspects of the world reaction evoked by Nazi persecution against the Jew.

Dominant throughout was the purpose of those who spoke—Jew and Christian alike—to appeal to the reason and conscience of the German people. No nation has ever been addressed with fuller faith and confidence in its will to justice. Especially was this evinced by John Haynes Holmes, who, as pacifist during the war, had never spoken a word against Germany:

What shall we do in such an hour? "Cry aloud and spare not." Yea, protest till the very stars shout back the echo of our cry. Such a cry will be heard, as it has already been heard. It will be answered, as it already has been answered. And not only by Hitler, but by millions of German men and women who are bewailing with us this night the horror of their country's fate. For Hitlerism is not to be confused with Germany nor the Nazis with the Germans. These people are what they have always been, the lovers of music and art, of learning and religion, of home and friends. In the grim fury of war, we maligned and betrayed them. In the fierce vengeance of the aftermath of war, we outlawed and degraded them. We drove them to despair, which has now changed, as it always changes in the end, to desperation. Let our cry, therefore, be a cry of shame for ourselves as well as of blame for them. Before it is too late, let us confess our sin, our share in this awful terror of our day. And let us do what we should have done long since, reach out our hands to our stricken brethren in the Reich, and, understanding them, trusting them, loving them, join with them in ridding Germany and the world of this monster born of terror and black night.

O Germany, thou land of culture and religion, of truth and virtue, of Luther and Schleiermacher, of Kant and Hegel, of Bach and Beethoven, of Goethe and Schiller, of Heine and Mendelssohn, of Reinhardt, Feuchtwanger, and Albert Einstein—*Deutsch-*

land, Deutschland, thou wilt not, thou canst not, fail us in the end.

The profound sense of international accountability for the welfare of mankind was stressed again and again. In his address Bishop McConnell said:

There is a document still in existence to which Americans are supposed to pay a good deal of attention, namely, the Declaration of Independence. When the American Colonists found it necessary to make a severance with the people of Great Britain, they used this very striking phrase. Through their great spokesman they said, "When it becomes necessary for one nation to sever the bonds that connect it with another, a decent respect for the opinions of mankind compels that they set forth the reasons for the separation."

"A decent respect for the opinions of mankind"—that is the thought in my mind to-night. What we have had in the past few weeks is an indecent disrespect for the opinions of mankind. It is about time that some leaders and some nations began to discover that the world is getting more and more closely and intensely into a Brotherhood of Nations, at least a Community of Nations, and that it is growing up every day with increased international sentiment, and people are thinking in international terms. When the writers of the Declaration of Independence talked about a decent respect for the opinions of mankind, their respect was so decent that they thought of the good opinion of men who were six weeks away,

measured in terms of a sailing vessel. Now you know what goes on throughout the whole world over night, and we can reach Germany within a week. And if we are going to have that Community of Nations that we all talk about, then there has to be a public sentiment among the nations to which the nations must conform.

William T. Green, speaking on behalf of organized labor, emphasized the basic interests which the great mass of the German people, as well as workers throughout the world, had in common with the victims of the Nazi program of economic segregation and oppression:

. . . In voicing our protest against the outrages perpetrated upon the Jewish people in Germany, there is no intention or purpose on the part of the American people to interfere in any way whatsoever in the political affairs of that great Nation. We accord to the people in all countries the right which we claim for ourselves to establish our own form of government. We accord to them the right to establish their own form of government, to manage their own economic and political affairs and to settle their common problems as prescribed by their own form of government. But, when any nation violates the laws of humanity, shocks international conscience, engages in persecution of minorities and follows a primitive, barbarian course toward helpless men and women who have committed no crime and who become the victims of racial hate then the voice of the American Federation of Labor will be heard in solemn protest. We will not remain passive and unconcerned when the

relatives, families and brethren of the Jewish members of our great economic organization are being persecuted and oppressed. We will come to their defense because the bonds of brotherhood which bind us so closely in a great economic organization make their great human problems a part of our own.

I come to-night in the name of Labor protesting, in its sacred name, against the atrocities which are being perpetrated upon the Jewish population of Germany. I transmit to the officers and members of the German Trade Unions, the masses of the people, the hosts of labor in Germany and to the Jewish people an expression of sympathy and interest. Labor in America wishes them to know that it is not unmindful of the suffering to which all of them are being subjected and that it fully appreciates the difficulty and the distressing experience through which they are now passing.

We pledge to them our moral and economic support. We will render every assistance possible and do all that lies within our power to bring about an end of the campaign of persecution which was so unjustifiably launched against the Jewish people in Germany.

Alfred E. Smith with uncompromising directness addressed a solemn warning to the Nazi Government:

No nation can afford a record of persecution. . . .

The new administration in Germany is seeking a place in the great family of nations, and like coming into a court of equity, they must come in with clean

hands. And they cannot expect fair treatment from the nations of the earth if they in turn refuse that fair treatment to their own people.

The moral judgment of mankind had spoken. What would Hitler and the New Germany reply?

6

BOYCOTT

HITLER AND THE NAZI GOVERNMENT WERE NOT IN-sensitive to the amazed indignation of civilization. Instead of taking steps to end it, however, their response was an example of effrontery as colossal as history records. They constituted further reprisals against their victims for the sympathy and protest which their suffering had evoked. In a special communique to *The New York Evening Post* it was declared that:

The most extraordinary feature of this announcement by Germany's governing party is its unconcealed challenge to foreign Governments. The official statement declares, "Until Governments abroad take measures against anti-German Jewish propaganda, the Government of the Reich will take no measures against the National Socialist anti-Jewish defense movement in Germany. When the Governments abroad suppress anti-German propaganda, the Gov-

Acknowledgment: The author wishes to express his gratitude to Mr. Norman Winer for his help in collating and preparing the material in this and the next chapter.

ernment of the Reich will take measures to check the anti-Jewish movement in Germany.”

“In other words,” as *The New York Times* put it, “if newspapers in other countries continue to print the news and to say what they think, if citizens of Great Britain and the United States venture to reprobate the severities practiced or proposed in Germany, then the fury of Nazi rage will be let loose upon their helpless victims.”

The form which the “Anti-Jewish Defense Movement” was to take, it was further announced, would be a nationwide boycott against Jews, the slogan of which was, “No German shall buy any longer from a Jew.” Characterizing the boycott as a “counter-active measure,” Goebbels, Minister of Propaganda and Public Enlightenment, proclaimed:

Drastic legal proceedings will be undertaken against the atrocity campaign which has been unloosed in America and England by interested Jewish circles against the new German régime. A blow shall be struck at the intellectual movers and beneficiaries of these treasonable machinations, most of whom are Jews of German origin.

Strangely, the world remained unconvinced of the “defense” character of the boycott. A dispatch from the special correspondent of *The Manchester Guardian* on March 30, stated:

The world-wide protest against Hitlerite anti-Semitism has by no means caused the renewed drive

against Jews. That drive was intended in any case and had long been a part of the Hitlerite program. The protest has only been exploited by the Hitlerite dictatorship to justify that drive in the eyes of the German public—indeed, to make it commendable. This has been done by representing the protest as a kind of Jewish conspiracy against the new régime and as an attempt to discredit the whole German nation.

It is to counteract this conspiracy that the German Government is ostensibly taking renewed action. That is to say, Jews in Germany are being made to suffer afresh not only according to plan but also with the intention of making Jews outside of Germany cease protesting. The German Government, in other words, is simply practicing blackmail.

But it was not only the Nazi campaign promises of thirteen years which belied retaliatory origin for the boycott—the terms of which were mild compared to the lurid pictures which had been drawn for it in advance. Events in Germany since March 5 proved indisputably that, long before public opinion had had time to solidify in protest, the machinery of a boycott had been prepared and oiled. It was ready for instant action. Hardly had the election passed when it was set in motion. Nazis stood with megaphones before the large Berlin department stores warning the populace not to enter or to purchase from them. In the provinces the boycott had been even more strenuous. Shop windows were being smashed in Gotha and Koenigsberg on March 11, and

in Duesseldorf and Gladbach and elsewhere pickets were impassable. On March 24—still several days before the protest meetings were held in America and in other countries—the press of the world reported picketing, window smashing, obstruction, and boycotts throughout Germany. And if further confirmation were needed, Goering admitted on March 25 that Jewish shops had been looted or closed. This admission was confirmed in the always restrained and understated language of diplomacy by Secretary of State Hull, in his report to the American Jewish Congress, which specified: “picketing of merchandising stores and instances of professional discrimination.”

The fact of the matter was that, far from being a spontaneous or retaliatory boycott as the Nazis claimed, it had been planned for months and even years; the protests which had been made throughout the world served merely as the most palpable excuse for its perpetration. This is borne out by the following excerpt from the letter of an American, long-time resident in Germany, who wrote immediately after the boycott had been instituted:

They claim that all this was done in retaliation for what was done to Germany in foreign countries. Could any country in forty-eight hours have a complete list of every Jewish shop in Germany? This, mind you, included seamstresses, little shoemakers, tiny shops in basements that sell vegetables—this was organized to the *n*th degree.

.

On March 28, Nazi headquarters formally ordered the boycott to begin on Saturday, April 1. This was done despite urgent pleas by Gentile leaders in German industry, who warned that it must inevitably react adversely upon national business conditions. The order contained eleven specific points of instruction, the more important of which follow:

1. Local committees were to be formed to direct the campaign, "for the practical and systematic execution of a boycott against Jewish business establishments, goods, physicians, and lawyers."
2. The committees were to protect foreigners, as "the boycott was purely a defensive measure that is to be directed exclusively against German Jewry."
3. "No German shall buy any longer from a Jew or let any wares be offered to him by a Jew or his subordinates. The boycott must be universal. It is supported by the entire people and must strike Judaism in its most sensitive spot."
5. "The committees shall watch the newspapers closely with respect to the extent that they participate in the intelligence campaign of the German people against Jewish atrocity propaganda abroad. Newspapers not doing so, or doing so only to a limited extent, are to be removed from every home inhabited by Germans. No German business concern shall advertise in such papers. They must be ostracized as being composed only

for those of Jewish stock and not for the German people.”

7. The boycott “must be pushed forward into the smallest peasants’ villages in order to hit Jewish tradesmen in the rural districts.”
8. The boycott starts universally Saturday, April 1, at 10:00 A.M. It shall continue until lifted by order of the party management.
11. “Do not hurt so much as a hair on a Jew’s head. We will accomplish this baiting by the sheer pressure of these measures.”

In conclusion the order proclaimed: “On National Saturday Judaism will know against whom it has declared war.” And as a final filip of contempt, the direction of the boycott was entrusted to Julius Streicher who had, previous to the Nazi accession to power, served a prison term for disseminating a libelous ritual murder accusation against Jews.

On March 30, supplementary instructions were issued. Committees were to ferret out Jewish businesses and “it shall be established what business enterprises are owned by members of the Jewish race. Religion does not matter.” The Nazi Storm Troops were to be ready to man pickets at 10:00 A.M. on April 1 and “in order to identify Jewish establishments, posters or signs showing yellow spots on a black ground shall be affixed at the entrances.” Meanwhile, the population had been swept into a frenzy of excitement by a flood of propaganda. “Strike at the world enemy,” the *Voelkskische Beobachter* flashed in huge headlines. Every newspaper,

including even those owned by Jews, was drafted and every broadcasting station in Germany was utilized for "hour-long blasts of anti-Semitic execrations and warnings that any German who fails to participate in the boycott will prove himself a traitor to the fatherland."

The first announcement of the impending boycott was sufficient to translate its injunction into immediate action in many towns throughout Germany. On March 29, the official German news agency admitted that "in the last few days countless Jewish shop windows have been broken" and on the same day forty-eight Jewish shops in Berlin were picketed and closed by Nazis.

In the meantime, contrary to expectation, the outside world had not been intimidated by this program of governmental gangsterism. The tide of protest, instead of having been turned by it, continued to advance. International effects on German commerce and industry were already beginning to be felt by the German Government. And powerful economic and political elements within Germany itself brought pressure to bear against the proposed boycott. It is impossible to tell just what mixture of influences and motives affected the decision, but on March 31 it was decreed that the boycott was to be limited to one day. This retreat was marked, however, in the belligerent and provocative formula of Goebbels, who declared:

To-morrow not a German man or German woman shall enter a Jewish store. Jewish trade throughout Germany must remain paralyzed. We shall then call a three-day pause in order to give the world a chance

to recant its anti-German agitation. If it has not been abandoned at the end of that respite, the boycott will be resumed Wednesday until German Jewry has been annihilated.

With this introductory malediction, the day of boycott dawned. 30,000 Nazis picketed Jewish shops in Berlin alone. Scores of motor lorries rolled through the streets bearing anti-Jewish placards. Platoons of Nazis marched carrying banners, calling upon the German people to avenge itself on Israel. Yellow badges had been plastered over all Jewish shops, and signs posted liberally about the windows read: "Germans beware. Do not buy from Jews." A few Jewish stores were desolately open in the morning. By afternoon all were closed. No Jew did business that Sabbath Day.

Just how effective the boycott was, may be deduced from the following report of an eye-witness. Written by an American woman in Berlin, it escaped the inquisition of censorship by being smuggled out of Germany.

I will try to give you an idea of my experiences of yesterday—Saturday, April 1. I have had many experiences in my life, but nothing I have ever gone through can compare with this Nazi boycott in retaliation for "the atrocity propaganda" against the Germans. No blood was shed, that is true, but the humiliation of the Jews—the absolute helplessness of their position—the cowardliness of those brutes in carrying out to the last vestige the most minute details on orders from above beggars description. . . .

I wanted to see for myself just what was happen-

ing and so went down the *Kurfurstendam*, a street much like Fifth Avenue in New York—very long, block after block of both large and small exclusive shops interspersed by large coffee houses and movies. Here, on a Saturday afternoon, it is a sort of promenade and window shopping, but the sight that met one's eyes yesterday! On the large windows of all shops bearing even the semblance of a Jewish name . . . on office buildings where Jewish lawyers, notaries, or doctors have their small signs, they smeared over the signs of the Jews and pasted small placards, "*Juden, geht nicht hier!*" (Jews, don't enter here!) . . .

I went down the street to my dressmaker. Throughout the entire street, on both sides, every Jewish shop was pasted with these signs. An hour later, after a mass meeting in the *Lustgarten* where Minister Goebbels again took the opportunity to wildly agitate, I returned to the street and what a sight met my eyes. These young devils like a lot of hungry wolves let loose (it was the first time they had been allowed to really go after the Jews as they had been promised in all of the rabid Nazi speeches by their leaders) with banners filled with red paint and with large paint brushes, rushed from one shop window to another, and not satisfied with having put huge posters against the Jews thereon, painted in huge letters at the side of the posters *JUDE*. These were followed by other troops with white paint buckets who hastily painted a large Shield of David on the same windows. It was a concerted action, completely

organized so that one atrocity followed upon the other. . . .

Thank God that the other countries know, and, despite what this country is preaching that the mass meeting of the Jews in England and America has reacted injuriously to the Jews in Germany, I tell you this is not so. No matter how much they suffered in humiliation and insult last Saturday, it is not one hundredth of what we are all convinced was planned. According to their real program (the Boxheim documents and others) they had intended not only to close the shops but to plunder them everywhere and do a lot of other things far worse than what they did, and which they brag about as having been carried out in strictest discipline. Hitler made the statement that the "people" wanted to carry all this through themselves and that only by organization and by their storm detachments and the regulations which they carried out to the letter were atrocities averted. That wasn't it. They were *afraid* now that the outside world knew, to carry out completely what they had so systematically planned and organized—a huge pogrom.

The official boycott ended at nightfall. Its effect upon German Jewry has not yet ended. That effect measured in economic terms was enormous; in human terms, immeasurable. Georg Bernhard, former editor of the *Vossische Zeitung*, a refugee because of his liberal views and Jewish race, estimated the effects of the boycott in an article published in Copenhagen. He wrote:

. . . The Jews may reopen their shops, but who will buy from them? The official boycott is withdrawn, but the actual boycott continues. The Jewish business world in Germany was brought under moral and spiritual pressure. Nothing can be worse than the fear that the Damocles sword may fall any day. One must go as far back as medieval times to realize how strong is the feeling of dejection and uncertainty and the deterioration gripping German Jewry.

Besides, the general unemployment growing out of the anti-Semitic excitement last year had left many Jews unable to obtain employment in the larger companies. German retail concerns then began in ever increasing degree to act in accordance with the motto, "Gentlemen prefer blondes," and this sad condition has now become hopeless.

The damage which has been inflicted on the poorest part of the German population—that is to say, all those who live on the work of their hands—now, thanks to the one-day boycott, has been made irreparable. That day breaks down for the Jews the labors of the 100 years since the liberation of the Jews.

.
If the Nazi Government had hoped by the ruthless efficiency of the boycott to silence Jewish protest and to inhibit foreign criticism, it was grievously disappointed. The spectacle of a nation being constrained by its government to wage economic war, if only for a day, against its own citizens, served but to strengthen the conviction that every protest had been amply warranted; that Hitler and his followers were resolved by the worst means to justify every evil report concerning

them. The loss to German Jewry sustained on April 1 and the gains to the German Government were surely a pyrrhic victory. *The Daily Telegraph* of London correctly evaluated them:

Perhaps the appropriate comment on the "success" of the anti-Jewish boycott throughout Germany on Saturday is that of old Caspar in the poem—"It was a famous victory." But it certainly was not a victory of reason or judgment. The day will come when the German people will wish the senseless story expunged from their annals, and will wonder what madness drove the leaders of the triumphant Hitlerite Revolution to choose so shameful a way of celebrating the dawn of the new era. It is "Young Germany," as the Nazis style themselves, which devised this mode of self-expression. When "the midnight of intoxication" is past, and they come to their sober senses, they must surely realize that Saturday's proceedings were not at all grand and heroic in character—and the Nazis really seem to aim at the heroic—but were, in fact, contemptibly sordid and mean. The new Nazi "frightfulness" was not even frightful. It was called off before it reached that dangerous pitch. . . . It may give Herr Goering and Herr Goebbels satisfaction to pretend that if the "Judean campaign" is not resumed on Wednesday it is because their brave front has scared the "foreign atrocity-mongers" and German boycotters into better behavior, but none will be deceived. The Judean campaign has been called off because the German Government realized that it would ruin Germany if it continued.

7

THE COLD POGROM

WORLD-WIDE POLITICO-MORAL PRESSURE, AND THE fear of economic self-injury, induced the German Government to end its official Jewish boycott. No change of Nazi mind or heart was effected. The arrogant boast of resumption, unless the world "recanted" was not made good. But that its withdrawal was ominous for the future of German Jewry was clear from the statement of Julius Streicher, head of the Central Boycott Committee:

I have a feeling that the battle [the boycott] will not be further taken up Wednesday. This will prove a disappointment to millions of Germans, but discipline must be observed in any event. It was not easy to yield, but Adolf Hitler can only proceed one step at a time.

One step at a time! But let no one imagine that the Nazis, thwarted for the moment, were resourceless or without further plans of persecution. If the lurid and spectacular procedure of a national boycott must be abandoned, there were equally effective means of gain-

ing their end. Means which they trusted would reassure civilized opinion and rob their victims of that sympathy which, for a space, had seemed to save them. With this purpose they inaugurated what is technically and officially known as the "cold" pogrom—economic annihilation and moral degradation, effected through legal measures and without physical violence.

The basis for such a pogrom had, as we have seen, been carefully and systematically laid in the party's official program. The racial or Aryan state it visioned, supplied the rationalization of its real objective: the destruction of the Jew. Moreover, what the party program demanded, Hitler re-affirmed before the Reichstag on April 6, as the aim of his government: "The purification of the people, especially the intellectual classes, from foreign influences and racially alien elements."

There were other important motivations for instituting the "cold" pogrom. A host of camp-followers had been drawn to the Nazi standard by promises of future emolument in return for their support. Unless they were to be disaffected, those promises must be kept. The importance of this economic basis is stressed in a dispatch from the special correspondent of *The Chicago Tribune* who wrote on March 30:

Back of the anti-Semitism of Hitlerism one gets the impression that economic pressure, particularly among the members of the ruined middle class, accounts for many of the attacks against the Jews. Like every revolution, the Nazi revolution is seriously

concerned with the spoils of war, and in this case the normal spoils—political and administrative jobs—do not seem to be enough to satisfy the appetite of the victors. . . .

It is openly alleged in some quarters that the agitation over Jewish propaganda and reprisals abroad is being staged by government order as a pretext for economic sanctions against the Jews. It is evident from conversations with Nazi leaders that the authorities aim to take a number of jobs of all sorts away from the Jews and give them to Christian supporters of the régime.

There was, too, a political basis of the “cold” pogrom. The other plank in Hitler’s program comprehended revision of the Versailles Treaty, recovery of war-lost German possessions, and restoration of German military glory. These objectives were obviously distant and difficult of achievement. It must be months, perhaps years, before they could be adduced as party triumphs. In the meantime, popular attention could be diverted to the purging of 600,000 “corrosive cells” from the body national of 64,000,000 helpless Germans!

It would be an error to suppose that the “cold” pogrom began only after the boycott was withdrawn. That incident merely concentrated upon it the full attention of the Nazi party. But it commenced a full month before—immediately upon the accession of Hitler to power. Since then it has gained in momentum, widened in scope, deepened in intensity. To-day it is in

full swing, silently crushing its victims according to plan—a terrible tribute to the ruthless and sadistic genius of its perpetrators.

It will be instructive to survey the hierarchy which has by proclamation and edict carried on this legalized “cold” pogrom. The decrees may be separated: those of the President, the Reich Cabinet, the individual Federal Ministers, the several States, the Municipalities, and the “coördinated” professional organizations. From top to bottom there is uniformity of purpose and method, each one ruling in its sphere.

It was on February 28, that President von Hindenburg promulgated the “Enabling Act” which permitted his Nazi Chancellor to encroach upon “personal freedom, including the freedom of speech, the right to form associations, and to assemble,” to invade the privacy of mail, telephone, telegraph, and dwellings. These rights, granted by the Constitution, it suspended. On the same day the President acted for the “defense against malicious attacks upon the Government of the National Uprising,” providing prison terms for willful or grossly negligent injuries to the Government or a State or “the parties or associations which are behind these governments.”

This effectively silenced both criticism of, and complaint concerning, any measures the Nazis might adopt against their opponents. Official dignity could not well exceed “enablement.” But these Acts not only enabled but fostered Nazi violence. The gates were opened for the subordinates.

The capitulation of the Legislature of the Reich was

a foregone conclusion after the elections of March 5. The Reichstag confessed itself a lapdog and bade its master rule. While the tactical advantage of allowing the Nazis and the true Germans to purge their country rather than have the Government do it was clear. Still the Cabinet did not refrain entirely from legislation. On April 4, obviously inspired by the humane qualities which characterized the national uprising, the Cabinet promulgated a law forbidding slaughter of cattle without first stunning them; by coincidence the Jewish *Shechita* prohibited such stunning. On April 8, the new Civil Service Law was approved by the Cabinet and promulgated by Dr. Frick, the Reich Minister of the Interior. It barred all non-Aryans (except those who fought at the front or who lost a father or son in the World War) from any position in Federal, State or Municipal Civil Service. Those whose misfortune it is to be 25 percent Jewish are non-Aryans, as are the unfortunates married to Jewesses.

On April 12, the Cabinet decided that student corporations would be formed in the universities. But even matriculated Jews could not be members of the student body. On the same day the Government barred Jewish political editors from its press conferences. On April 19, it was announced that Dr. Frick was preparing for the Cabinet its quota law for Jewish university students. On March 20, the official Court Bureau announced the purging throughout Germany of the offices of the prosecuting attorneys and the removal of Jewish judges from the Criminal to the Civil Courts. But by March 31, there had been a change of heart and all Jewish lawyers

and judges were removed, including Chief Justice Kurt Soelling, a convert to Aryanism, and a rival of the Chancellor himself in virulent anti-Semitism. Now the Cabinet is deliberating as to the Jewish quota of lawyers who will be allowed to practice—whether a percentage rule will be strictly adhered to, or whether those who had been admitted prior to 1914 will also be privileged.

The individual ministers, not shackled by formalities, cleaned house more rapidly. Thus, Dr. Hugenberg, one of the three Nationalists in the Cabinet, has announced the immediate expulsion of all Jews from the organizations affiliated with his Ministry, such as the Corn Exchange and the Agricultural Council. Nor will the Government Grain Trade Company buy from Jews.

Next in order of descent come the State Ministers. One of the most true-Brown of the Nazis is Commissioner of Justice, Hans Frank of Bavaria, who on March 27, stole a march on the Reich in barring all Jewish judges and denying Jewish attorneys the right to appear in criminal cases. His fellow-Bavarian Minister of Finance on April 7 announced that those Jewish community taxes which had been collected from Jews for the support of their synagogues would not be disbursed to them. In Prussia on March 31, the Diet petitioned the Minister of Education for dismissal of all Jewish teachers and for limiting Jewish students—not only in universities—but in lower schools to 1 percent. Hans Hinkel, under-secretary in the Prussian Ministry of Culture, announced on April 7, that Jewish artists and managers (only geniuses excepted if they passed

muster) would be barred from German theater and opera. Meanwhile Jewish professors had steadily been forced to resign from such institutions as the Universities of Breslau, Westphalia, and Kiel, and on April 13, Dr. Bernhard Rust, Prussian Minister of Education, "granted leave of absence" to thirteen noted Jewish professors and three non-Jewish Marxists. In order that the faithful might not be impatient at these niggardly displacements, Dr. Rust announced on April 18 that new oustings would follow.

We now drop another step in the hierarchy to the municipalities. Berlin on March 18 decreed that no Jewish lawyers or notaries were to be employed in municipal affairs. On March 22, its municipal employees were discharged, and it was announced that the city would buy from Nazis only. Frankfurt was not long in emulating Berlin. In Brown Munich, as might be expected, similar measures were taken, and the Superintendent of Schools went farther to announce that, in the next term, no Jewish children would be allowed in Christian schools, nor would Jewish school doctors be allowed to treat Christian children. On April 7, the Municipality of Baden showed its patriotism by discharging all Jews. Others, announced and unannounced, have similarly protected their Teutonic purity.

The professions and trades, with such official inspiration, were not lacking in zeal. The Bar Association, dominated in the cities by Jews, has at last been liberated, and the Physicians' and Dentists' Societies, with noble aspirations for the health and well-being of man-

kind, have joined in barring Jews from their organizations. Even the Government's strict limitations have not satisfied these fervent eugenicists who demand that the Jewish virus be absolutely and completely exterminated from their professions, in which "the confidential relations are so favorable to further germ incubation." Moreover, the Medical Association has decided to bar Jews from the Public Insurance Company business, which has furnished the bulk of doctors' incomes. In one way or another the greatest physicians of Germany have been driven from hospitals and clinics throughout the Reich.

The Theatrical Exchange as early as March 11 ordered withdrawal of Jewish artists and managers. On April 8 the German Motion Picture Federation announced it would not buy from Jewish salesmen. On April 12, the Association of German Journalists voted to eliminate Jews. Similar laws are being prepared for music critics. The purging process invaded the realm of sport (!) on April 13, when both the Football Federation and the Track and Field Sports Association barred Jews from international competition.

Perhaps no single aspect of the "cold" pogrom is more portentous than its fanatic support by nationalist German students. The universities and secondary schools have long been used as Nazi incubators. But their hatred of the Jew reached a new pitch of violence under the official drive. On April 8, the German Student Association comprising 100,000 members, announced the following "campaign of enlightenment":

The Jew is our most dangerous opponent.

The Jew can only think Jewishly. If he writes German he lies.

We demand that all German students despise the Jew as an alien.

We demand that the censor compel all Jewish works to appear only in Hebrew. If they appear in German they must be clearly marked as translations.

The German language must be used only by Germans.

In the third week of the campaign every student must purge his own library of all un-German books which may have been thoughtlessly acquired. Every student must search the libraries of his friends and acquaintances, and delegations from the students' associations will search the public libraries. On the tenth day of May all this degenerative literature will be consigned to the flames.

So speak the future leaders of the New Germany!

We have traced in crudest outline the program of the "cold" pogrom. Taken together with the stringent regulations against emigration, its objective is clear: to make it impossible for the Jew, forbidden to leave Germany, to live in it.

Already the effects of this legalized infamy are to be seen. It has succeeded, even in so short a time, in expatriating from Germany men who are among its chiefest intellectual and human assets. Their constantly increasing number includes Albert Einstein, Lion

Feuchtwanger, Stefan and Arnold Zweig, Georg Bernhard, Max Reinhardt, Ernst Toller, Emil Ludwig, Bruno Walter. Nor is the list of the expatriated limited to Jews. Thomas and Heinrich Mann as well as Gerhardt Hauptmann dare not, as liberals, return to the fatherland. As to the effect of these banishments on Germany, *The Manchester Guardian* says:

In effect it is death to all the best elements in German culture, common to all civilized members of the community, whether they are Jew or German.

The special contribution of the Jews to German life cannot be overestimated. Without them its arts might almost have remained the merely local creations of a few Teutonic tribes. What the Jews have contributed to economic and industrial life is no less great. But attacks on any one who happens to be both a Jew and a man of culture show that Storm Troopers reject this civilized element, which is neither Jew nor German but European. . . . With all the understanding in the world and every desire to see an accomplished revolution turn to Germany's good, one cannot without a sense of disgust see booted and spurred Storm Troopers force a great nation to revolt against its own culture, to manhandle and expel a race with whom Goethe recognized his affinity, and to acclaim a philosophy of history and national life proper only to Goths and Vandals.

The efficacy of the "cold" pogrom in shattering the economic structure of Jewish life in Germany is already apparent. Countless Jewish businesses and business men

have been ruined, thousands of Jewish doctors and lawyers, as well as other professional men, have been disemployed, and the lists of those who face bankruptcy and starvation are lengthening. The most primary charities and relief are to-day required by families which a few months ago were wholly independent and self-supporting. On April 25, the Jewish Telegraphic Agency sent the following report from Innsbruck:

Jewish breadlines in Germany are doubling over night, the number of the helpless leaping from thirty to eighty thousand in less than a week, according to authoritative reports received here to-day. Estimated last week at thirty thousand, the crowd of German-Jews absolutely dependent on the soup-kitchens for subsistence is given to-day as between sixty and eighty thousand.

Most of these are ruined middle-class folk, shopkeepers, white-collar workers, and professional people who have been forced to give up their means of livelihood by the economic anti-Semitic measures instituted by the Nazi administration. The few who still possess some means of subsistence are bravely sharing their depleted fortunes with those who have nothing whatever left, but the number of those who are able to give assistance is rapidly diminishing, as all who can are fleeing abroad. Meanwhile the mass of Jews dependent on charity is doubling and trebling. This is especially true in the provinces, where the Jews are isolated as stringently as though they were within prison walls.

In Chemnitz, passports have been confiscated from all Jews, and orders have been issued prohibiting them to leave town. Unable to find aid within the city, and powerless to seek aid elsewhere, they are in a virtual death-trap.

The full record of what the Jews of Germany are undergoing has not been, and can never be, set down. Its significance can be grasped only in terms of human tragedy and spiritual anguish. For Hitler and his government have in substance declared the Jews of Germany to be enemies of the public weal, outlaws in their own country. Only when one recalls that this outlawry is no longer the theory of a minority party, but the official enactment of an entrenched dictatorship, is the full measure of the catastrophe apparent.

Some inkling of the effects of the "cold" pogrom may be gleaned from two or three documents typical of hundreds which have been recorded and tens of thousands which cannot be set down. The first is the report of a distinguished American lawyer, made upon his return to the United States, after a visit in Austria where he interviewed large numbers of German refugees.

I feel that no useful purpose will be served by detailing the instances of vicious brutality which these eye-witnesses related to me. These instances, distressing as they are, are the merest fringe of the persecution which is systematically being developed for visitation upon German Jewry in its entirety, and as such should, I believe, be relegated to a minor place in any discussion of the situation.

At the time these refugees spoke to me—and it is only a matter of a few weeks past—they spoke in terms of what plans Hitler had. The Jews were to be removed from the Bench and the Bar; from the medical profession; from all official connection with the Government; from all positions in the universities, etc.

Before my return to the United States, these fears had already been translated into fact.

I had hoped and believed, while listening to their recital, that their fears were exaggerated. Events have shown that they were not. I am therefore now more inclined to accept at par everything that was told to me as to Hitler's plans and the party program.

I was told that the economic emasculation is to be carried forward until the German Jews are the lowest of the proletariat and form a cushion of beggars, upon which the Hitlerite structure may be rested.

The degradation is to be virtually complete, with perhaps one percent of the Jews tolerated in their erstwhile pursuits, but of course, as marked men. The economic and social annihilation is to be all embracing, so that the Jew within Germany will again welcome a ghetto existence.

The resignation of Professor James Franck, Nobel Prize winner in 1925, from Göttingen University is a specific instance of the "cold" pogrom in action. In a letter to the University rector he writes:

I have requested the authorities to relieve me of my office, but I shall try to continue my scientific

work in Germany. We Germans of Jewish descent are being treated as aliens and enemies of the fatherland. We are asked to have our children grow up in the knowledge that they must not profess themselves to be Germans. Although those who served in the war have received permission further to serve the State, I decline to avail myself of this privilege. Even so, I appreciate the viewpoint of those who deem it a duty in these times to continue at their posts.

Not all victims of this latest phase of the Nazi Terror are in position, as is Professor Franck, to resign of their own free will in protest against the fate of their fellow Jews. To the vast majority no other course is open. Typical of their fate is this letter written by a distinguished physician and scientist, whose family since the Middle Ages has lived in Germany, and who has been a leader in the communal life of his city. This letter, mailed from across the German border, strikes perhaps the most plaintive and tragic note of which human experience is capable.

I have arrived here to-day to take care of my foreign correspondence which at home would require great caution and a thousand reservations. The point has been reached where I must approach friends abroad as an applicant, for our lot is untenable. I have been removed from all positions. My son-in-law, as well as I, like all Jewish physicians, may not practice any more in the state medical societies and so our financial ruin is sealed. It is impossible to let the children grow up here where—at least for the

time being—they are exposed to every kind of degradation. One has the feeling of being dishonored. If one could only get out of the witches' cauldron. The "cold" pogrom has dispossessed us. The intellectual professions—the physicians, lawyers and officials are hit the hardest. . . . I feel so ashamed to have to write such a letter after a life of duties fulfilled and of honor. . . .

To this status has the third German Reich, led by Hitler and established by the Nazi Party, reduced the Jew. For what it has done, there is neither example nor parallel in the antiquity of primal brutality, in the Middle Ages of religious persecution, or in the darkest days of Tsarist Russia. It is the apotheosis of cold and cunning cruelty. A bloodless war of extermination which gives no quarter and recognizes no non-combatants. A war which is waged without pity, without honor, and without ruth.

8

WHAT CAN BE DONE?

SUCH IS THE RECORD OF THE SWASTIKA. WE HAVE traced its stages—an ethnologic hypothesis, a pathological expression, a political pretext, a national program. To-day in its complete and unchallenged supremacy there may be read the doom of German Jewry. The first encroachments of that doom are already manifest. Short months ago it walked in blood and terror. Yesterday it took the form of brazen boycott. To-day it moves resistlessly and in silence toward the despoiling, the degrading, and the destroying of its victims.

It is with this incontestable evidence before us that the question is raised: what can be done? No single or simple answer may be made; no decision can be reached out of hand. At the very outset there is the all but paralyzing knowledge that whatever means are employed, whatever efforts made, they will be seized by the Nazi Government as excuses for inflicting even more terrible wrongs, more cruel hurt. Faced by this situation, only the shallow and insensate could offer hair-trigger judgment or cock-sure counsel.

Yet certain conclusions are inescapable. However impolitic it may seem, or even be, to oppose it, this evil may not be mutely borne. Silence in all tongues including the German, is acquiescence. And even though it appear the better part of indignation, acquiescence in infamy is humanly and morally impossible. Thus, it is in a sense only incidental, that the dictates of wisdom and expediency confirm the necessity for action.

Should the Nazi Government succeed in terrorizing the conscience of mankind and silencing its protest, then surely the Jews of Germany are lost. Not only because their safety—if it hangs upon the expressed opinion of the outside world—is no safety. But let it once be conceded that their fate is the affair of no one beyond the German border, and the last instrument of intervention will have been surrendered.

Efforts made in behalf of German Jewry, however, must be undertaken with gravest care, planned in utmost deliberation. Haphazard or ill-considered measures will prove not only ineffective, but perilous, though no peril could be as great as that of inaction. Four potentially effective courses of action are open.

I. *The effort to alleviate present sufferings.* Thousands of refugees have fled Germany in the last months. They are without means of support and without a destination. The countries in which they have found temporary haven cannot or will not permanently harbor them. The first and most obvious task is to ease their lot. Financial succor, while an elementary requisite, cannot meet the present need. This can be met only by

making it possible for these exiles to emigrate somewhere. In order to do this, immigration restrictions must be liberalized and humanized wherever possible, at least to the extent of the immediate emergency. *The Manchester Guardian*—recognizing the advantage which may accrue to England as well as the human obligation involved—urges the adoption of such a course:

We should seize the chance now given us to reassert our love of freedom, not only for ourselves but for any who, himself deprived of it, asks us to give him refuge. We may be able to welcome some of the refugees to Palestine, of which we hold the gates. We can certainly welcome them to this country. The "National" Government would on this occasion well deserve its name, it would represent the nation, if it opened its doors to the unhappy members of a race which from its earliest days was ground between the powers of the north and the south, of the east and the west, was dispersed over the face of the earth, and has never, by pagan or by Christian, been allowed wholly to rest.

A similar viewpoint has been expressed by leading members of the United States Senate and House Committee on Immigration. A bill providing for an increased quota for expatriated German Jews has been introduced by Congressman Dickstein of New York. It is at present under consideration. Every effort should be made to bring home to the Department of Labor, within whose province the question ultimately falls, the justice and wisdom of such a policy.

The question inevitably arises as to the feasibility of opening the doors of Palestine to great numbers of German Jews. As the National Jewish Homeland, it seems the logical, the inevitable, place for them. In the present emergency, the super-caution of permitting only those to enter who are immediately and demonstrably within the economic absorptive capacity of the country, is patently unfitting. A Jewish Homeland, if it means anything, means a land in which homeless Jews may find a home. This stand has been taken by the Zionist Organization of America. It has urged (a) that Great Britain, the mandatory Government, "make possible the immediate admission into Palestine of a maximum number of refugees": (b) that the League of Nations "organize and establish a commission on which the United States be invited to be represented, with power to undertake the execution of a plan for the settlement in Palestine of as large a number of Jews as Palestine may be placed in a position to absorb; and that such commission be given authority by the League of Nations, in coöperation with the Mandatory Government and the Jewish Agency for Palestine to find the means to finance the operation."

But efforts to provide a haven and a home for those who have already escaped or been driven from Germany, do no more than scratch the surface of the problem. The fate of German Jewry cannot be solved in England, in Palestine, or in America. It must be solved in Germany. And it is necessary to consider how that fate may be safeguarded and secured.

II. *The appeal to Germany.* The extreme unlikelihood of success in such a course is apparent, yet it must be attempted. An appeal to the present German rulers, however, would be an emptier than futile gesture. They have shown themselves too resolved and implacable in their hate to be approached with considerations of reason and of equity. The Jew has ceased in their eyes to be an object of rational conduct. He has become an obsession. In addition, the Nazis are so committed to the theory and practice of their war against German Jewry that retreat is psychologically impossible. Hitler might well argue with Macbeth:

. . . I am in blood
Stepp'd in so far that, should I wade no more,
Returning were as tedious as go o'er.

The only possible appeal is not to the German Government, but to its people. The difficulties in making it are manifest. They include that censorship which makes it as hard for the German people to-day to know the opinion of the outside world as it is difficult for the world to secure full and accurate information concerning Germany. But despite this obstacle, and the more serious one of the adherence of the majority of Germans to the Nazi Party in the last elections, a distinction must still be made between the nation as a whole and its present Government.

That there are millions of Germans who shrink from and reprobate the Jewish phobia of the Nazi Party there is no doubt. That it is difficult and dangerous for them to speak is also clear. Yet they must make their

condemnation felt. Even Hitler cannot obliterate half a nation. And as Alexander Hamilton¹ declared, "It is impossible to exculpate a people that suffers its rulers to abuse and tyrannize over others." It must be demonstrated to the German people that, in their struggle to secure a broader justice for themselves from other nations, they are hopelessly prejudicing their case by tolerating a supreme injustice.

III. *The appeal to international opinion.* Technically and theoretically no nation has the right to intervene in the internal affairs of another. In practice such intervention is a common international custom. And in view of the desperate case in which German Jewry stands to-day, such action is justified alike by international procedure and humanitarian considerations. Especially in the United States there is reason to urge that the good offices of the Government may be still further employed at this time. Ample precedent exists for such action. In a letter to the *New York Times*, Max J. Kohler recalls that:

As far back as 1870 Charles Sumner, as chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, when offering a resolution of inquiry into Rumanian anti-Jewish atrocities, said he did so "in the interest of humanity and in that guardianship of humanity which belongs to the great Republic."

Mr. Kohler cites leading instances of American governmental representations on behalf of persecuted Jews abroad. They include:

¹ Quoted from "Alexander Hamilton" by Johan J. Smertenko.

- (1) Secretary Forsythe's course in 1840 under President Van Buren's direction, on behalf of the Damascus Jewish blood-accusation victims.
- (2) Our State Department representations and Minister Fay's successful efforts in Switzerland to remove anti-Jewish domestic statutory discriminations.
- (3) President Theodore Roosevelt's vigorous protest in connection with the Kishineff massacre in 1903.
- (4) American abrogation in 1911 of the Russian Treaty of 1832 because of discrimination against Jewish citizens.
- (5) President Wilson's course in connection with representatives of the other great powers at the Peace Conference in 1919 to safeguard the status of racial and religious minorities.

It is not too much to ask or to expect that the United States Government, in keeping with these precedents, move forward immediately and vigorously.

Similar appeal may be addressed to the League of Nations. There are definite clauses in the Covenant of the League, under the terms of which representations not only can but should be made. An example is Article 23, the first part of which reads:

Subject to and in accordance with the provisions of international conventions existing or hereafter to be agreed upon, the members of the League (a) will endeavor to secure and maintain fair and humane conditions of labor for men, women and children, both

in their own countries and in all countries to which their commercial and industrial relations extend, and for that purpose will establish and maintain the necessary international organizations; (b) undertake to secure just treatment of the native inhabitants of territories under their control.

Apart from these general provisions the protection of minorities is one of the pillars on which the League rests. It has entered into solemn covenants with the German nation which agreed to furnish "full and complete protection of life and liberty as assured to all inhabitants, without distinction of birth, nationality, language, race or religion."²

It is certain from the following resolution adopted by the American Jewish Congress on April 19 and forwarded to Washington and Geneva that action, looking to intervention, both by the United States Government and the League of Nations will be sought.

WHEREAS, the Hitler Government is pursuing a relentless and ruthless policy of persecution and repression against the Jews in Germany, and

WHEREAS, it is the avowed intention of the German Government to deprive the Jews of their civic, political and economic rights; be it

RESOLVED, that this Conference of Jewish Organizations initiate action for the gathering of signatures to a petition to be presented to the United States Government and to the League of Nations protesting against the inhuman attempt of the Ger-

² *American Journal of International Law*, October, 1919.

man Government to deny to a peaceful and law-abiding element of its population the full civic rights and the elementary right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, and to petition them to use their good offices to the end that justice shall be done to the Jew in Germany.

In addition to employing the foregoing channels of international representation, a continued and renewed appeal to the enlightened opinion of mankind may be made. Such opinion has already aligned itself as unalterably opposed to the war of extermination being waged in Germany to-day. But that opinion must be organized and directed, and if it is to be effective, there must be behind it a unified plan of action. No aspect of the situation is of greater import. Particularly in liberty-loving lands, it is necessary to emphasize the truth—that the battle of the Jews of Germany for survival and for honor is the battle of all free peoples. Recognition of this fact is growing. *The Springfield Republican* writes editorially on this aspect of the German situation:

While the Jews happen to suffer the first shock of the Fascist assault upon freedom in Germany, there is a much broader front upon which the offensive of the Fascist movement is hurling itself. All liberal and democratic aspirations are in the zone of fire.

By their protest meetings both in England and in this country, the Jews are fighting the battle of democracy and liberalism against the aggressions of resurgent autocracy, their ancient enemy. It is a battle of varying fortunes and phases in periods of revolu-

tionary change; the present period of world-wide depression has placed on democracies a strain pitilessly exposing their weaknesses, and the reaction against them is observable even where they had become most firmly established.

In America we cannot be hypercritical of Fascist Germany, in view of the range of intolerance and persecution in our national life. Yet the division between these opposing forces, broadly envisaged, does become more distinct as the tide of reaction rolls up.

It may be that in revolting against the worst aspects of Hitlerism, the Jews are making themselves the spearhead of the counter-offensive that must eventually reclaim the lost provinces of emancipated humanity.

In that perilous and exposed position, the Jews of Germany deserve, and have the right to count upon, the reënforcement of those whose battle they wage as truly as their own.

IV. *The exertion of economic pressure.* Necessary and immediate as are the measures contemplated in the preceding paragraphs, they cannot be relied upon alone. Up to the present time, the Nazis have shown themselves callous to reasoned argument. Other weapons of defense must be sought in the struggle for Jewish rights. It is inevitable that economic pressure should be employed to bring the present German Government—not to its knees—but to its senses.

The use of that weapon is both distasteful and dangerous. But Germany has declared open and official war

upon its Jewish population and there can be no shrinking from or avoidance of the issue. In many lands a boycott of German goods exists to-day. The institution of these boycotts has not yet been carefully calculated or highly organized. They have been rather the reflex and instinctive refuge of a scattered race without army or navy, without diplomatic representatives or state department.

In the United States no such boycott has yet been officially established, though it has been repeatedly urged. Mr. Aaron Sapiro and Mr. Samuel Untermyer have been among those who hold that it is not only justified, but that no other course of action can prove efficacious. And non-Jewish individuals and organizations have come forward to support their view. Other organized and responsible leadership, however, including that of the American Jewish Congress, has held that every other means must be attempted, and every other avenue of approach explored, before recourse to it. But the conviction grows—nurtured by every new dispatch from Germany—that no other road is open.

It is not yet known just when, and in what form, and to what extent a boycott will be established. But that such action is imminent and demanded by events grows daily surer. If the Nazi Government persists in outraging civilization by demolishing German Jewry, it must be prepared to accept the consequences of its crime and folly. Those consequences, in view of the responsible position of Jews throughout the commercial and industrial world, may give serious pause even to the hate-blinded rulers of Germany.

Such in outline are the potentially effective courses of action to save German Jewry from its impending doom. Their unavoidable limitations leave much to be desired. Whether they can avert the tragedy—greater than that already obtaining—which threatens, there is much to doubt and more to fear. This at least is certain: no means must go unattempted, no weapon unused in this struggle for human and Jewish rights.

.

A word must be added as to the ultimate implications of the Swastika. Its threat is not limited to German Jewry, to political democracy, to world peace. It menaces the very basis of civilization. For, in essence, it is a return to the tribal mood and to the savage mind. Such, indeed, is its purpose and its boast. Difference and distinction it abhors. Uniformity and the imposition of a single mold are its objectives.

To-day that uniformity is conceived in racial terms. The homogeneous group, the Teuton tribe, the Aryan state—are the shibboleths which the New Germany employs as it extirpates from its midst whatever is not identical with itself. But the demonstrably false and absurd synthesis of race and state, in whose name Hitler wars upon the Jew, is no more than a pretext. Beneath it lies the primitive fear of what is alien, the ancient hate of what is strange.

No people has wholly purged itself of that hate and fear. Their trace is still to be found everywhere. But it is in the will to battle, the effort to subdue them, that civilization consists. They, and not the stranger, are the enemy within the household. When a nation abandons

the struggle against them, and capitulates to their insistent clamor, it relapses into barbarous sub-humanity.

The record of mankind's bitterly slow advance may be traced in terms of this conflict within itself. The right to independent thought and disparate action was its earliest victory. It achieved religious liberty only after centuries of striving. And though that cause has been largely won, its sentinels dare not relax their vigilance. So, too, in international affairs. The nations are to-day struggling with the concept that differing languages and customs imply no inherent hostility, that other songs and flags need constitute no challenge to their own.

It is this historic process which Nazi political atavism seeks to reverse. Herein lies its menace to mankind. If it prevail and its contagion spread, old wounds will be reopened and new ones made. For it will institute inquisitions not only into belief and creed, but into blood and race. It will kindle strife, not only between nations, but within them.

Against this menace civilization must contend. "*Fa-cilis descensus . . .*" especially into the hell of primordial fears and hates. Nor is it adequately reassuring that the Swastika and all it connotes cannot ultimately triumph. Hitlerism may be no more than a swirling eddy in the long, sure sweep of social destiny. But it has already taken awful toll.

The Jews of Germany have borne the brunt of its first assault. Their wounds will not be healed, their anguish assuaged, their dead raised by considerations of political philosophy. If the destruction that is upon

them is to be stayed, sterner methods are demanded, more heroic measures required. This task devolves upon men of all lands and faiths. I have said that the fate of German Jewry is not a Jewish but a world issue. That fate is still in doubt. Civilization is at death grips with madness in Nazi Germany. Yet we may renew courage, if not take comfort, knowing that if hysteria is on the side of Hitler, history is on the side of Israel.