

as an "intellectual", who deceives himself and others because he believes it is possible to express everything by words.

She says it is impossible to express ideas about love, life and death by clear conceptions. There always will remain something unexpressable. Here she is absolutely right, but because it is so right it is so confusing.

The inexperienced youngster will enthusiastically agree, simply because he is too lazy to make the effort to check the truth. We educators must fight this indolence and must bring everyone's attention to the point that Mrs. Lindbergh speaks not at all about love, life and death, but about the Nazis; about the British; about what is antiquated with the British and Americans and what is new with the Nazis. One may dream about love, but one can and must speak clearly about the morality of the Nazis in contrast to our own morality.

I would even estimate political dreams relatively harmless if they were real dreams. I don't believe the idea "dream" characterizes something illogical with unclear conclusions. "Dream" has a quite conscious intention to guide the thought of people into a certain direction. I feel obliged to open the eyes of our young people; therefore I am going into detail.

The Wave of the Future asks the very important question: what to tell our children when they hear about the torture of innocent people and the violation of peaceful nations? This is a question of moral education and has to be answered from a moral point of view. Why doesn't the book do it? Why does it go from the moral to the political viewpoint? Why is the answer suddenly left to "ally" or "pro-ally" friends?

The question is asked by men who care about the education of the young people in our world. The Germans, English and French alone cannot answer this question. It is one for the civilized people of the world.

I shall come back later to the real answer. For the moment, I will only demonstrate methods Mrs. Lindbergh uses to confuse the clear moral question by not giving a clear moral but a political answer. There are two answers to the moral question both based on the morality of my own education and tradition.

The youngster who hears about the atrocities and the other mean acts (even those which happened in the war are not the worst) has to be re-educated to the Christian idea of love, respect and understanding of his fellow man. One could perhaps overlook ideals of the past. Today it is a sin for any educator not to act when he sees genuine values fighting for their existence. The book makes quasi fun of people who tell their children not to disturb a breeding concentration camp, where

at the same time the worst atrocities are being committed. I do believe, that if all German parents and all German educators had taught their children to be considerate, even of animals, Hitler would not have found executioners for his concentration camps. The German people might have revolted against the inhuman treatment of the defeated Poles and against all those cruelties we read about daily in the newspapers.

POWER MORALITY VERSUS CHRISTIAN MORALITY

Mrs. Lindbergh's next thesis is: The Christian morality is dead; nobody believes in it any more. A new heroic morality, which is not based on love but power, has come into being. We know millions of men today who follow this credo and will persecute Christianity. We are unable to dissuade anyone from subscribing to this theory, but this concept should come out openly and honestly. This is the ultimate spiritual purity one could ask for.

This book isn't intended to be spiritually pure. It attacks underhandedly in order to win over people who would otherwise be against it the ideology that there are more important values than just Christian morality.

Let's follow her method. Firstly, it doesn't ask the pro-Christian people but the pro-allies for their opinions of education. Secondly, it turns the opinion of the pro-allied people around to a pro-Christian one.

Mrs. Lindbergh tells them what we see in the world today and in Hitler's Germany is just the bad; and we must fight it. We understand now why this answer is not given by the pro-Christians, but the pro-allies. The pro-Christians' answer is on an educational plane, absolutely independent of war. But if the politicians (pro-allies) answer they will understandably say: We have to be on the side of England against Germany.

Mrs. Lindbergh by hinting at this idea gets her readers to the point at which she wishes to have them. The war is unpopular in America. Therefore the pro-allies are unpopular. One is therefore shifted to their answer to education - and without noticing it - to their understanding of Christian morality.

Perhaps people will recognize how I turned the issue around, Mrs. Lindbergh might have thought: Therefore it might be better to give a direct answer to people who recognize the atrocities of Hitlerism. And who wants to fight them? Therefore I tell them: Imagine living in a

country of trees, rocks and mountains. No. But there are no trees, rocks or mountains. They are fake - and the people don't notice it at all.

It is possible to use such illustration without saying one word more. Young people going through their education should build their own idea of the world around them. They have to be taught that a picture is never able to replace an argument.

What is the meaning of the "paper rocks"? Are those atrocities the people see real or only painted? The atrocities are real. Even Mrs. Lindbergh cannot deny that those atrocities are only too real! Therefore the picture cannot apply to them. This picture would only make sense if it would apply to the surroundings of the observer. Therefore the observer was unable to see anything real because of his papier-mache surroundings, i.e. the atrocities - the reality of Hitler - Germany.

THE THEME OF THE BOOK: THE BASIC GOOD IN NAZISM

The book says nothing about the many persecutions, such as people hunted in the streets and captured and treated inhumanly. What about the observer? If he will take the same treatment, the dignity of humanity suffers. What about those people who want to fight against this pestilence? Who wants to make America safe from it? Is it fair to tell them they live in a "theater world"? Mrs. Lindbergh doesn't use this metaphor against people of Christian morality, she uses it as diversion. She certainly cannot deny the horrors visible to the whole world. Horrors the Nazis don't even want to keep secret, evil as they are.

I cite Mrs. Lindbergh verbatim: "There are sins, there is no doubt about it; and I am against them. But there are other sins also." Then she turns around and says: "The real sinners are not the Nazis with their inhuman ideas and methods, but people and nations who do not act like the Nazis. The Nazis had courage enough to make a change. But not the others. Change is the real essence of living matter. To resist change is to sin against life itself."

With this statement she really tries to kill Christian morality. A horrible lack of responsibility! Even the most idealistic fanatic will not take as unimportant all that occurred before in Germany, and dare to call those people blind who see it and want to fight it. By saying: "There are more important things to do, first you have to change, then you have to look for a greater aim than Christian morality. A new aim by which the unhappy people will feel consoled. Look for this glorious aim, which is in front of you. To win it you have to take all evil"

Let's make it clear, Mrs. Lindbergh never says what this aim is. There is no intelligible aim at all. There is neither "a dream aim" nor a faith; there is just nothing. People are supposed to sacrifice all that is really true for this nothing. Their feelings and reactions against atrocities do not count.

I believe it would be incorrect to call Mrs. Lindbergh's book aimless. It is sometimes aimless, it is sometimes pro-Nazi, but it is definitely anti-Christian. Yet it is definitely against the atrocities. Let's check this "sometimes Nazism"! She writes: "What is behind Nazism? Is it nothing but a 'return to barbarism'? Or is it some new and even ultimately good conception of humanity, even if it tries to come alive by evil, horrible and abortive attempts"? I repeat: if she really sees in Nazism something new and also an ultimately good conception of humanity, it is her personal right. But it is also the duty of an honorable author to make clear what this new humanity of Nazism is.

That is not difficult. There are hundreds of books in Germany and Italy which try to prove the positive side of it. I only mention the leading authors like Rosenberg, Darre and Hitler. Everyone knows these people are obsessed by a certain idea; they know what this idea is; they are able to fight against it; and prove that these ideas are not valid for the future.

In Mrs. Lindbergh's book there is not even a hint of what this "new" will be. If there is anything in the Nazis' ultimately good conception, shall we really teach our children - to come back to the original thesis - "Don't oppose the change!"

If they ask: "What shall we change?" the answer will be: "I don't know for certain, or even for uncertain". "Somehow you have to do it like the Nazis, but certainly never do anything nasty." "All right," they will ask, "what are the good sides of Nazism?" "How did you get the idea to see in Nazism the 'wave of the future'?"

The answer would be: "I am sorry I cannot prove it. I only feel it. It is just my belief and my dream."

I didn't cite verbatim. After reading the book no other answer is possible. The author herself later realizes that it is impossible to state just anything if the question is "what is the highest, the most important idea on earth and heaven?" Therefore she tries to make something plausible. But not to prove anything. Again she uses pictures: "Certainly, also see all the ugliness, but that is only foam on the waves of the future." The uncritical reader is satisfied. He feels the author sees the ugly things which are only "foam" and will by nature disappear...forgetting therefore to ask what "the waves of the future" are. Here the author doesn't use a picture to illustrate something to hide the lack of any original idea.

WHY IS MRS. LINDBERGH'S BOOK POPULAR?

You will ask, "Why do you speak so much about such a bad book? Nobody will read it anyway." In fact, it is a book very much read in this country for the last several months.

How is this success to be explained? I believe there are psychological reasons which have nothing to do with the appreciation of Nazism as a future movement. First it is the book's mental attitude against war. War is not popular. No one likes to think about war. Everything written against war is comfortable and easily acceptable. This book confirms it and that is what makes it even more dangerous now. It is possible to be against war even by recognizing Nazism as a movement of the future.

The Nazi movement, in this book, gets a great uplift by mixing pro-Nazi ideas with anti-war ideas. Logically those two ideas never come together. It is certainly comfortable to have arguments for the good of the Nazis because in case of war you would have to fight them. That is even more reason for the success of this book. It shows the easy superficial way by which everyone sees his own near future. I don't speak about the actual political situation here which certainly concerns America also, but of the situation of the whole world.

There is something wrong with the social situation of the world. It is impossible today just to state: "I am master - or I am serf." The self-evidence is gone. One has fear, bad conscience or is just angry. Old ideas die, and new ones are growing. However one feels about it, it is consoling to hear from Mrs. Lindbergh that peace and harmony will reign in America, if there is the courage for a change.

I only hope as many readers as possible will recognize how cheap the bait to catch them. Mrs. Lindbergh knows the insecurity which everyone feels today, but she is clever enough to recognize that people because of insecurity are conservative, that they love the old ways and hate to change. They don't like to change their political or social adversaries.

Mrs. Lindbergh only speaks about "change". She never mentions who should change. Therefore the uncritical and conservative reader assumes the opponent will change. Mrs. Lindbergh never says what the new ideals are, or in which direction they will go. Therefore why not follow her? We have to take this sense of uneasiness and disorder very seriously; this sense of the old is dying before the new is born.

We even have to take it more seriously. Because only this idea gives Mrs. Lindbergh the possibility to gain a point for the Nazis. This idea enables the author to affirm that the future will be with the Nazis

without even giving one single reason. The same symptoms of decline and sickness have occurred in Germany as everywhere else, but in Germany there were courageous men who were willing to try new ways. A not absurd statement, because it could have been.

Everything in Germany asked urgently for a change, for a renewal. Does that by necessity and logic mean progress, or - just in such a situation - retreat to nihilism and barbarism? There is not one serious American publication which tries to prove that Nazism is an "ultimately good conception of humanity trying to come to birth". The author believes Nazism will be the movement of the future because of its success in Germany by awakening the German national spirit. I know success is a very important factor everywhere.

The man without success loses his moral identity. The successful man is the idol, much more than the man who prefers to live without success since he does not want to use indecent means. This thinking is psychologically understandable. But we have to fight any kind of success which is based on destruction of Christian morality, on oppression of all that is lovable in human beings, on the making alive again of all that through centuries we recognized as evil, and fought in hard battles and suppressed.

The success Mrs. Lindbergh thinks of, is the military success. We don't know at all if this success was possible by national spirit and enthusiasm and "superb equipment of the Germans" or by appeasers and traitors among the enemies of Germany. Austria was abandoned; Czechoslovakia betrayed; Poland got no help; a group of unprincipled Frenchmen surrendered their country to the enemy. At the moment England ridded herself of the appeasers, Germany's success stopped. Let's not forget Greece, a small country always against fascism. In a few years Germany grew from a secondary state to a world power. Certainly a great success. Did the national spirit really create this success? I don't believe it. I believe we have to thank this external success to those English and Frenchmen who had the wrong idea. A powerful Germany would protect them against Russia.

THE FALLACY OF MRS. LINDBERGH'S APPRAISAL OF THE GERMAN NATIONAL SPIRIT

Mrs. Lindbergh says: "It is impossible to deny this national spirit." What does she know about spirit? Only what she is made to believe. Was there ever in the world a greater fraud than the German propaganda department? Has she seen anywhere a harder pressure to create national spirit?

She knows about capital confiscation, about concentration camps, about sentences by judges who themselves were under heavy pressure, about the informers everywhere, about the incitement of children against their parents and much more. She knows about all that. Because one doesn't even care to keep it secret.

Can this new national spirit, based on a terror system, really impress Mrs. Lindbergh? I deny the new spirit; fear and resignation are unable to create a new spirit. She will certainly not find the new spirit she speaks about among the workers who have to work today at reduced pay, or among the clerics of any persuasion, or among the decent judges, or among the peasants, or finally among the highly cultured group of Germans.

I agree there is one group with genuine enthusiasm. Those are the young people who went through the "Hitler Youth" and are now soldiers. Here I go along with Mrs. Lindbergh. For years young people grew up without a real ideal. That is a very serious consideration for any educator. To be enthusiastic for an idea is the only possible way for any young man to get free of a basically boring life of self-interest. This enthusiasm enables him to obtain a dedication.

Religious ideas lost power with the 17th century. The creative power of the Renaissance which idealized "man" was lost when it became clear that there are limits for the human intellect. The age of idealism about 1800, especially strong in Germany, had lost its power, the power of the French Revolution - so attractive to the youth, is probably today only alive in Communism.

There really wasn't anything for them to be enthusiastic about. Then Hitler came to power and gave to the young people something to be enthusiastic about. If Mrs. Lindbergh would have pointed at that, she would have made a mark. Communism and Nazism were able to create enthusiasm, while the democracies remained lethargic with the exception of England.

England under Churchill's leadership will fight for her own existence but also for the idea of chivalry, decency and liberty.

IS BARBARISM BETTER THAN LETHARGY

There is still one important question about Mrs. Lindbergh's judgment. The question is: What did Hitler do to arouse the youth before the war, out of this above mentioned lethargy? Hitler was able to win the young people by allowing them not to suppress those passions the Christian education tried to eliminate. Mrs. Lindbergh doesn't even touch this point.

In every human being is a sadistic urge which is restricted, the higher the civilization. Today this urge is suddenly free to torture men, to do everything for its own profit, to reject any decent and chivalrous method. That is a return to barbarism.

If the devotion to Christian humanity is the greatest achievement in the history of human development, the permission of sadism is the worst downfall. Barbarism certainly is worse than lethargy. There is always hope to bring people out of lethargy, to show them a way to the future; but it is impossible to agree with a way back into barbarism.

By analyzing what Hitler gives us we don't find any ideas looking for the future, only ideas looking back to a 1940-year old past, the Dark Ages. It doesn't mean anything else than to replace the free independent humanity - born in the renaissance - with a wholesale humanity which renounces individual acting and thinking and is only too glad to be in uniform.

"The wave of the future is coming and there is no way of fighting it." Certainly it is true; but if the waves of the past are coming, trying to throw us back into times long overcome, we shall have to fight. We shall fight for the future of our culture.

There are two ways to fight. First: England, which naturally fights now for her own existence must be helped by America or we must become an ally of England. Second: We have to fight in our own country against this contagious disease.

I cite here the only sentence in Mrs. Lindbergh's book with which I agree: "I do not believe the things we condemn in Germany are innately German...they are evils which come to every nation under certain conditions." "Nobody should take for granted that the Germans have any kind of moral insanity or are especially given to an awakening of the power of barbarism. I dearly love the Germans, and I am terrified at this devil's whip. They are suffering."

I know for sure - and I am so certain - the terrible sickness which the Germans suffer is a contagious illness, which is very dangerous for other countries too. The fight in our own country has to be prophylactic. We have to do everything to save America from this contagious germ. God may save America from the "waves of the past" and keep her healthy and prepared for the tasks of the future. How can we help?

It is certainly a negative approach to bring attention to such a book as Mrs. Lindbergh wrote. We educators have a greater task. We have to strengthen the old good powers of Christianity developed through many centuries; to strengthen the ideals of devotion and chivalry. They alone are able to make us immune against hate and sadism. That was to become more than ever the main task of education.

Experience shows it is possible. We don't say anything new, we only repeat what was good for centuries. We believe no new enthusiasm can be born in contrast to those good old ideals.

America, once it is immune from the seductive appeal to go backwards will develop a new and true movement for a better future. Then she will not only help herself, but will also show Germany the way to a spiritual and moral future. May God help us.

