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F. T. Marinetti, *The Futurist Manifesto* (1909)

The Futurist movement was founded in 1909-1910 by a group of young Italian artists and writers who sought to break decisively with prevailing artistic canons and with bourgeois liberal civilization. Their goal was to launch a new dynamic and violent art. Among the most prominent of the Futurists was poet F. T. Marinetti, the author of the manifesto reproduced below. Marinetti’s ideas were a curious mix of social Darwinism, evolutionism and an embracing of technology. The Futurists were notable for the positive view of war, which they regarded as the remedy and agent for great changes. The Futurists accordingly supported Italy’s entry into World War I (although this finally occurred only in 1915).

1. We want to sing the love of danger, the habit of energy and rashness.

2. The essential elements of our poetry will be courage, audacity and revolt.

3. Literature has up to now magnified pensive immobility, ecstasy and slumber. We want to exalt movements of aggression, feverish sleeplessness, the double march, the perilous leap, the slap and the blow with the fist.

4. We declare that the splendor of the world has been enriched by a new beauty: the beauty of speed. A racing automobile with its bonnet adorned with great tubes like serpents with explosive breath ... a roaring motor car which seems to run on machine-gun fire, is more beautiful than the Victory of Samothrace.

5. We want to sing the man at the wheel, the ideal axis of which crosses the earth, itself hurled along its orbit.

6. The poet must spend himself with warmth, glamour and prodigality to increase the enthusiastic fervor of the primordial elements.

7. Beauty exists only in struggle. There is no masterpiece that has not an aggressive character. Poetry must be a violent assault on the forces of the unknown, to force them to bow before man.

8. We are on the extreme promontory of the centuries! What is the use of looking behind at the moment when we must open the mysterious shutters of the impossible? Time and Space died yesterday. We are already living in the absolute, since we have already created eternal, omnipresent speed.

9. We want to glorify war - the only cure for the world - militarism, patriotism, the destructive gesture of the anarchists, the beautiful ideas which kill, and contempt for woman.

10. We want to demolish museums and libraries, fight morality, feminism and all opportunist and utilitarian cowardice.
11. We will sing of the great crowds agitated by work, pleasure and revolt; the multi-colored and polyphonic surf of revolutions in modern capitals: the nocturnal vibration of the arsenals and the workshops beneath their violent electric moons: the glutinous railway stations devouring smoking serpents; factories suspended from the clouds by the thread of their smoke; bridges with the leap of gymnasts flung across the diabolic cutlery of sunny rivers: adventurous steamers sniffing the horizon; great-breasted locomotives, puffing on the rails like enormous steel horses with long tubes for bridle, and the gliding flight of aeroplanes whose propeller sounds like the flapping of a flag and the applause of enthusiastic crowds.

It is in Italy that we are issuing this manifesto of ruinous and incendiary violence, by which we today are founding Futurism, because we want to deliver Italy from its gangrene of professors, archaeologists, tourist guides and antiquaries.

Italy has been too long the great second-hand market. We want to get rid of the innumerable museums which cover it with innumerable cemeteries….

What can you find in an old picture except the painful contortions of the artist trying to break uncrossable barriers which obstruct the full expression of his dream?

To admire an old picture is to pour our sensibility into a funeral urn instead of casting it forward with violent spurts of creation and action. Do you want to waste the best part of your strength in a useless admiration of the past, from which you will emerge exhausted, diminished, trampled on?

Indeed daily visits to museums, libraries and academies (those cemeteries of wasted effort, calvaries of crucified dreams, registers of false starts!) is for artists what prolonged supervision by the parents is for intelligent young men, drunk with their own talent and ambition.

For the dying, for invalids and for prisoners it may be all right. It is, perhaps, some sort of balm for their wounds, the admirable past, at a moment when the future is denied them. But we will have none of it, we, the young, strong and living Futurists!

Let the good incendiaries with charred fingers come! Here they are! Heap up the fire to the shelves of the libraries! Divert the canals to flood the cellars of the museums! Let the glorious canvases swim ashore! Take the picks and hammers! Undermine the foundation of venerable towns!

The oldest among us are not yet thirty years old: we have therefore at least ten years to accomplish our task. When we are forty let younger and stronger men than we throw us in the waste paper basket like useless manuscripts! They will come against us from afar, leaping on the light cadence of their first poems, clutching the air with their predatory fingers and sniffing at the gates of the academies the good scent of our decaying spirits, already promised to the catacombs of the libraries….

Full text at: http://www.cscs.umich.edu/~crshalizi/T4PM/futurist-manifesto.html
Manifesto of the International Socialist Congress at Basel (1912)

_Socialism was a prominent political and social force in Europe on the eve of World War I. Indeed, by 1912 the German Social Democrats (SPD) constituted the largest single party in the German parliament (the Reichstag), and socialists were rapidly gaining membership in other countries as well. Pacifism occupied an important place in the socialist program, and the Second Socialist International, created in 1889 on the one-hundredth anniversary of the French Revolution, was designed in part to link the socialist parties of the world. At meetings in Stuttgart (1907) and Copenhagen (1910), socialists tried to clarify their collective position on war. In the context of heightened international tensions connected with the First Balkan War, international socialists convened in Basel, Switzerland in November of 1912 order to prevent the outbreak of a more general European war. They produced the manifesto included below. Their efforts, accompanied by anti-war demonstrations in many cities, put pressure on European governments to seek a peaceful solution to the crisis and thus contributed to the localization of the conflict to the Balkan Peninsula._

At its congresses at Stuttgart and Copenhagen the International formulated for the proletariat of all countries these guiding principles for the struggle against war:

If a war threatens to break out, it is the duty of the working classes and their parliamentary representatives in the countries involved supported by the coordinating activity of the International Socialist Bureau to **exert every effort in order to prevent the outbreak of war by the means they consider most effective**, which naturally vary according to the sharpening of the class struggle and the sharpening of the general political situation.

In case war should break out anyway it is their duty **to intervene in favor of its speedy termination** and with all their powers to utilize **the economic and political crisis created by the war to arouse the people and thereby to hasten the downfall of capitalist class rule**.

More than ever, recent events have imposed upon the proletariat the duty of devoting the utmost force and energy to planned and concerted action. On the one hand, the universal craze for armaments has aggravated the high cost of living, thereby intensifying class antagonisms and creating in the working class an implacable spirit of revolt; the workers want to put a stop to this system of panic and waste. On the other hand, the incessantly recurring menace of war has a more and more inciting effect. The great European peoples are constantly on the point of being driven against one another, although these attempts are against humanity and reason cannot be justified by even the slightest pretext of being in the interest of the people.

If the Balkan crisis, which has already caused such terrible disasters, should spread further, it would become the most frightful danger to civilization and the proletariat. At the same time it would be the greatest outrage in all history because of the crying discrepancy between the immensity of the catastrophe and the insignificance of the interests involved.
It is with satisfaction that the Congress records the complete unanimity of the Socialist parties and of the trade unions of all countries in the war against war.

The proletarians of all countries have risen simultaneously in a struggle against imperialism; each section of the international has opposed the resistance of the proletariat to the government of its own country, and has mobilized the public opinion of its nation against all bellicose desires. Thus there resulted the grandiose cooperation of the workers of all countries, which has already contributed a great deal toward saving the threatened peace of the world. The fear of the ruling class of a proletarian revolution as a result of a world war has proved to be an essential guarantee of peace.

The Congress therefore calls upon the Social-Democratic parties to continue their action by every means that seems appropriate to them. In this concerted action it assigns to each Socialist party its particular task….

The proletariat is conscious of being at this moment the bearer of the entire future of humankind. The proletariat win exert all its energy to prevent the annihilation of the flower of all peoples, threatened by all the horrors of mass murder, starvation, and pestilence.

The Congress therefore appeals to you, proletarians and Socialists of all countries, to make your voices heard in this decisive hour! Proclaim your will in every form and in all places; raise your protest in the parliaments with all your force; unite in great mass demonstrations; use every means that the organization and the strength of the proletariat place at your disposal! See to it that the governments are constantly kept aware of the vigilance and passionate will for peace on the part of the proletariat! To the capitalist world of exploitation and mass murder, oppose in this way the proletarian world of peace and fraternity of peoples!


Full text available at: http://www.workers.org/marcy/cd/sambol/bolwar/bolwar08.htm
Peter Durnovo, Memorandum to the Tsar (February, 1914)

Peter Durnovo (1844-1915) was a conservative bureaucrat in the imperial Russian government. Having served in the ministries of justice and the interior, after the revolution of 1905 he was appointed to the State Council, the upper chamber of the Russian parliament, where he headed that institution’s right wing. His memorandum to the Russian Emperor (Tsar), Nicholas II, was produced in February of 1914. It focused on Russia’s implication in what the author saw as an insoluble conflict Britain and Germany. The memorandum offers and interesting conservative perspective on the dangers of war for Russia and has been considered in many respects prophetic. Interested students might note that an unusually sensitive reading of the text is provided by David McDonald, “The Durnovo Memorandum in Context: the Crisis of Autocracy and Official Conservatism,” Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas 4 (1996): 481-502.

The central factor of the period of world history through which we are now passing is the rivalry between England and Germany. This rivalry must inevitably lead to an armed struggle between them, the issue of which will, in all probability, prove fatal to the vanquished side. The interests of these two powers are far too incompatible, and their simultaneous existence as world powers will sooner or later prove impossible.…. 

The armed conflict impending as a result of this rivalry cannot be confined to a duel between England and Germany alone… [T]he future Anglo-German war will undoubtedly be transformed into an armed conflict between two groups of powers, one with a German, the other with an English orientation.

Under what conditions will this clash occur and what will be its probable consequences? The fundamental groupings in a future war are self-evident: Russia, France, and England, on the one side, with Germany, Austria, and Turkey, on the other. It is more than likely that other powers, too, will participate in that war, depending upon circumstances as they may exist at the war’s outbreak…. 

The main burden of the war will undoubtedly fall on us, since England is hardly capable of taking a considerable part in a continental war, while France, poor in manpower, will probably adhere to strictly defensive tactics, in view of the enormous losses by which war will be attended under present conditions of military technique. The part of a battering ram, making a breach in the very thick of the German defense, will be ours, with many factors against us to which we shall have to devote great effort and attention…. 

Are we prepared for so stubborn a war as the future war of the European nations will undoubtedly become? This question we must answer, without evasion, in the negative. That much has been done for our defense since the Japanese war, I am the last person to deny, but even so, it is quite inadequate considering the unprecedented scale on which a future war will inevitably be fought. The fault lies, in a considerable measure, in our young legislative institutions, which have taken a dilettante interest in our defenses, but are far from grasping the seriousness of the political situation arising from the new orientation, which, with the sympathy of the public, has been followed in recent years by our Ministry of Foreign Affairs…. 
Another circumstance unfavorable to our defense is its far too great dependence, generally speaking, upon foreign industry, a fact which, in connection with the above noted interruption of more or less convenient communications with abroad, will create a series of obstacles difficult to overcome. The quantity of our heavy artillery, the importance of which was demonstrated in the Japanese War, is far too inadequate, and there are few machine guns. The organization of our fortress defenses has scarcely been started, and even the fortress of Reval [now the city of Tallinn, in Estonia], which is to defend the road to the capital, is not yet finished.

The network of strategic railways is inadequate. The railways possess a rolling stock sufficient, perhaps, for normal traffic, but not commensurate with the colossal demands which will be made upon them in the event of a European war. Lastly, it should not be forgotten that the impending war will be fought among the most civilized and technically most advanced nations. Every previous war has invariably been followed by something new in the realm of military technique, but the technical backwardness of our industries does not create favorable conditions for our adoption of the new inventions.

All these factors are hardly given proper thought by our diplomats, whose behavior toward Germany is, in some respects, even aggressive, and may unduly hasten the moment of armed conflict, a moment which, of course, is really inevitable in view of our British orientation.…

Such a war will demand such enormous expenditures that they will many times exceed the more than doubtful advantages to us in the abolition of the German [economic] domination. More than that, the result of such a war will be an economic situation compared with which the yoke of German capital will seem easy.

For there can be no doubt that the war will necessitate expenditures which are beyond Russia's limited financial means. We shall have to obtain credit from allied and neutral countries, but this will not be granted gratuitously. As to what will happen if the war should end disastrously for us, I do not wish to discuss now. The financial and economic consequences of defeat can be neither calculated nor foreseen, and will undoubtedly spell the total ruin of our entire national economy.

But even victory promises us extremely unfavorable financial prospects; a totally ruined Germany will not be in a position to compensate us for the cost involved. Dictated in the interest of England, the peace treaty will not afford Germany opportunity for sufficient economic recuperation to cover our war expenditures, even at a distant time. The little that we may perhaps succeed in extorting from her will have to be shared with our allies, and to our share there will fall but negligible crumbs, compared with the war cost. Meantime, we shall have to pay our war loans, not without pressure by the allies.… And so it is inevitable that, even after a victorious conclusion of the war, we shall fall into the same sort of financial and economic dependence upon our creditors, compared with which our present dependence upon German capital will seem ideal.

However, no matter how sad may be the economic prospects which face us as a result of union with England, and, by that token, of war with Germany, they are still of secondary importance when we think of the political consequences of this fundamentally unnatural alliance.
It should not be forgotten that Russia and Germany are the representatives of the conservative principle in the civilized world, as opposed to the democratic principle, incarnated in England and, to an infinitely lesser degree, in France. Strange as it may seem, England, monarchistic and conservative to the marrow at home, has in her foreign relations always acted as the protector of the most demagogical tendencies, invariably encouraging all popular movements aiming at the weakening of the monarchical principle.

From this point of view, a struggle between Germany and Russia, regardless of its issue, is profoundly undesirable to both sides, as undoubtedly involving the weakening of the conservative principle in the world of which the above-named two great powers are the only reliable bulwarks. More than that, one must realize that under the exceptional conditions that exist, a general European war is mortally dangerous both for Russia and Germany, no matter who wins. It is our firm conviction, based upon a long and careful study of all contemporary subversive tendencies, that there must inevitably break out in the defeated country a social revolution which, by the very nature of things, will spread to the country of the victor.

During the many years of peaceable neighborly existence, the two countries have become united by many ties, and a social upheaval in one is bound to affect the other. That these troubles will be of a social, and not a political, nature cannot be doubted, and this will hold true, not only as regards Russia, but for Germany as well. An especially favorable soil for social upheavals is found in Russia, where the masses undoubtedly profess, unconsciously, the principles of Socialism. In spite of the spirit of antagonism to the Government in Russian society, as unconscious as the Socialism of the broad masses of the people, a political revolution is not possible in Russia, and any revolutionary movement inevitably must degenerate into a Socialist movement….

The peasant dreams of obtaining a gratuitous share of somebody else's land; the workman, of getting hold of the entire capital and profits of the manufacturer. Beyond this, they have no aspirations. If these slogans are scattered far and wide among the populace, and the Government permits agitation along these lines, Russia will be flung into anarchy, such as she suffered in the ever-memorable period of troubles in 1905-1906. War with Germany would create exceptionally favorable conditions for such agitation….

If the war ends in victory, the putting down of the Socialist movement will not offer any insurmountable obstacles. There will be agrarian troubles, as a result of agitation for compensating the soldiers with additional land allotments; there will be labor troubles during the transition from the probably increased wages of war time to normal schedules; and this, it is to be hoped, will be all, so long as the wave of the German social revolution has not reached us. But in the event of defeat, the possibility of which in a struggle with a foe like Germany cannot be overlooked, social revolution in its most extreme form is inevitable.

As has already been said, the trouble will start with the blaming of the Government for all disasters. In the legislative institutions a bitter campaign against the Government will begin, followed by revolutionary agitations throughout the country, with Socialist slogans, capable of arousing and rallying the masses, beginning with the division of the land and succeeded by a division of all valuables and property. The defeated army, having lost its most dependable men,
and carried away by the tide of primitive peasant desire for land, will find itself too demoralized to serve as a bulwark of law and order….

No matter how strange it may appear at first sight, considering the extraordinary poise of the German character, Germany, likewise, is destined to suffer, in case of defeat, no lesser social upheavals. The effect of a disastrous war upon the population will be too severe not to bring to the surface destructive tendencies, now deeply hidden...

Defeated, Germany will lose her world markets and maritime commerce, for the aim of the war—on the part of its real instigator, England—will be the destruction of German competition. After this has been achieved, the laboring masses, deprived not only of higher but of any and all wages, having suffered greatly during the war, and being, naturally, embittered, will offer fertile soil for anti-agrarian and later anti-social propaganda by the Socialist parties.

These parties, in turn, making use of the outraged patriotic sentiment among the people, owing to the loss of the war, their exasperation at the militarists and the feudal burgher regime that betrayed them, will abandon the road of peaceable evolution which they have thus far been following so steadily, and take a purely revolutionary path….

A summary of all that has been stated above must lead to the conclusion that a rapprochement with England does not promise us any benefits, and that the English orientation of our diplomacy is essentially wrong.

February, 1914

P. N. Durnovo

Full text of the memorandum at:
http://www.stetson.edu/~psteen/classes/durnovo.html
Magda Trott, “Woman’s Work, a Substitute for Men’s?” (1915)

Magda Trott was affiliated with Germany’s National Liberal Party and describes here some of the difficulties that women faced when entering into areas of the workplace where men had previously predominated.

With the outbreak of war men were drawn away from the management of numerous organizations and, gradually, the lack of experienced personnel made itself felt.... The demand for educated women has risen phenomenally during the six months since the war began. Women have been employed in banks, in large commercial businesses, in urban offices – everywhere, in fact, where up till now only men had been employed. They are to be tested to see whether they can perform with equal success.

All those who were certain that women would be completely successful substitutes for men were painfully disappointed to discover that many women who had worked for years in a firm were invited to step up to a higher level, now that the men were absent, suddenly handed in their resignations....

Naturally, we enquired of these women why they had given up so quickly, and then the truth of the matter became plain. All women were quite ready, if with some trepidation, to accept the new positions, particularly since the boss made it clear that one of the gentlemen would carefully explain the new assignments to them....

But even on the first day it was noticeable that not everything would proceed according as had been supposed. Male colleagues looked askance at the “intruder” who dared to usurp the position and bread of a colleague now fighting for the Fatherland, and who would, it was fervently hoped, return in good health. Moreover, the lady who came as a substitute received exactly half of the salary of the gentleman colleague who had previously occupied the same position. A dangerous implication, since if the lady made good, the boss might continue to draw on female personnel; the savings on salaries would clearly be substantial. It became essential to use all means to show the boss that female help was no substitute for men’s work, and a united male front was organized.

It was hardly surprising that all the lady’s questions were answered quite vaguely. If she asked again or even a third time, irritated remarks were passed concerning her inadequacy in comprehension, and very soon the male teacher lost patience. Naturally, most of his colleagues supported him and the lady found it difficult, if not impossible, to receive any instruction and was finally forced to resign.


Helena Swanwick studied economics at Girton College in Britain and became a tireless proponent for women’s economic and political rights. Between 1909 and 1912 she served as editor for *Common Cause*, the journal of the National Union of Women's Suffrage Societies. When that organization declared its support for the war, she resigned in protest. Motivated by strong pacifist convictions, she joined several organizations promoting peaceful settlement to the war. After the war she served in the League of Nations Union and was a member of the Empire's delegation to the League in 1929, though she remained always a harsh critic of the Treaty of Versailles. In the selection below, she seeks to account for the effects of the war on women in Britain.

How has the war affected women? How will it affect them? Women, as half the human race, are compelled to take their share of evil and good with men, the other half. The destruction of property, the increase of taxation, the rise of prices, the devastation of beautiful things in nature and art—these are felt by men as well as by women. Some losses doubtless appeal to one or the other sex with peculiar poignancy, but it would be difficult to say whose sufferings are the greater, though there can be no doubt at all that men get an exhilaration out of war which is denied to most women. When they see pictures of soldiers encamped in the ruins of what was once a home, amidst the dead bodies of gentle milch cows, most women would be thinking too insistently of the babies who must die for need of milk to entertain the exhilaration which no doubt may be felt at "the good work of our guns." When they read of miles upon miles of kindly earth made barren, the hearts of men may be wrung to think of wasted toil, but to women the thought suggests a simile full of an even deeper pathos; they will think of the millions of young lives destroyed, each one having cost the travail and care of a mother, and of the millions of young bodies made barren by the premature death of those who should have been their mates. The millions of widowed maidens in the coming generation will have to turn their thoughts away from one particular joy and fulfillment of life. While men in war give what is, at the present stage of the world's development, the peculiar service of men, let them not forget that in rendering that very service they are depriving a corresponding number of women of the opportunity of rendering what must, at all stages of the world's development, be the peculiar service of women. After the war, men will go on doing what has been regarded as men's work; women, deprived of their own, will also have to do much of what has been regarded as men's work. These things are going to affect women profoundly, and one hopes that the reconstruction of society is going to be met by the whole people—men and women—with a sympathetic understanding of each other's circumstances. When what are known as men's questions are discussed, it is generally assumed that the settlement of them depends upon men only; when what are known as women's questions are discussed, there is never any suggestion that they can be settled by women independently of men. Of course they cannot. But, then, neither can "men's questions" be rightly settled so. In fact, life would be far more truly envisaged if we dropped the silly phrases "men's and women's questions;" for, indeed, there are no such matters, and all human questions affect all humanity.

Now, for the right consideration of human questions, it is necessary for humans to understand each other. This catastrophic war will do one good thing if it opens our eyes to real live women as they are, as we know them in workaday life, but as the politician and the journalist seem not to
have known them. When war broke out, a Labour newspaper, in the midst of the news of men's activities, found space to say that women would feel the pinch, because their supply of attar of roses would be curtailed. It struck some women like a blow in the face. When a great naval engagement took place, the front page of a progressive daily was taken up with portraits of the officers and men who had won distinction, and the back page with portraits of simpering mannequins in extravagantly fashionable hats; not frank advertisement, mind you, but exploitation of women under the guise of news supposed to be peculiarly interesting to the feeble-minded creatures. When a snapshot was published of the first women ticket collectors in England, the legend underneath the picture ran "Superwomen"! It took the life and death of Edith Cavell to open the eyes of the Prime Minister to the fact that there were thousands of women giving life and service to their country. "A year ago we did not know it," he said, in the House of Commons. Is that indeed so? Surely in our private capacities as ordinary citizens, we knew not only of the women whose portraits are in the picture papers (mostly pretty ladies of the music hall or of society), but also of the toiling millions upon whose courage and ability and endurance and goodness of heart the great human family rests. Only the politicians did not know, because their thoughts were too much engrossed with faction fights to think humanly; only the journalists would not write of them, because there was more money in writing the columns which are demanded by the advertisers of feminine luxuries. Anyone who has conducted a woman's paper knows the steady commercial pressure for that sort of "copy."

The other kind of women are, through the war, becoming good "copy." But women have not suddenly become patriotic, or capable, or self-sacrificing; the great masses of women have always shown these qualities in their humble daily life. Now that their services are asked for in unfamiliar directions, attention is being attracted to them, and many more people are realising that, with extended training and opportunity, women's capacity for beneficent work would be extended.…

The course and the conduct of the war, throwing upon women greater and greater responsibilities, bringing home to them how intimately their own lives and all they hold dear and sacred are affected by the government of the country, will tend greatly to strengthen and enlarge their claim for a share in the government. The growth of what was known as “militancy,” in the last five years of the British suffrage movement, was the disastrous result of the long denial of justice, the acid fruit of government which had become coercion, because it was no longer by consent. Now that, for two years past, the women of Great Britain have made common cause with their men in this time of stress, the heat of the internal conflict has died down, and one hears on all sides that prominent anti-suffragists have become ardent suffragists, while others have declared their resole at any rate never again to oppose the enfranchisement of women. The battle of arguments was won long ago, but we are not, as a people, much given to theory; custom has a very strong hold over us. The shock of war has loosened that hold, and now almost every one who used to oppose, when asked whether women should be given votes, would reply: “Why not? They have earned them!” I cannot admit that representation is a thing that people should be called upon to “earn,” nor that, if essential contribution to the nation is to count as “earning,” the women have not earned the vote for just as log as the men.…

What the war has put in a fresh light, so that even the dullest can see, is that if the State may claim women’s lives and those of their sons and husbands and lovers, if it may absorb all private
an individual life, as at present, then indeed the condition of those who have no voice in the State is a condition of slavery, and Englishmen don’t feel quite happy at the thought that their women are still slaves, while their Government is saying they are waging a war of liberation. Many women had long ago become acutely aware of their ignominious position, but the jolt of the war has made many more of them aware of it.

Tsar Nicholas II's Abdication Proclamation (2 March 1917)

Since the election of Tsar Michael in 1613, Russia had been ruled by the Romanov dynasty. This dynasty ended with the abdication of Nicholas II in March of 1917, an act that likewise signaled the end of the tsarist regime. By this time hatred of the dynasty had reached its culmination. With political events rapidly narrowing the regime’s options, Nicholas II was finally convinced to abdicate at the city of Pskov, the headquarters of the northern front in the war. Dismissive of the pleas of politicians, Nicholas proved susceptible to the advice of his generals, who appealed to his selfless patriotism and impressed upon him the need to abdicate for the sake of the war. He thus remarked, “If it is necessary for the good of Russia that I should step aside, then I am prepared to do so.” Nicholas abdicated on behalf of himself and his son, which still left open the possibility of the continuation of the monarchy in some form, under Grand Duke Mikhail Aleksandrovich. When the Grand Duke rejected the throne as well, power passed to a Provisional Government in Petrograd, originally formed as committee of the State Duma (the parliament). The Provisional Government would last less than a year, overthrown by the Bolsheviks in November of 1917.

In the days of the great struggle against the foreign enemies, who for nearly three years have tried to enslave our fatherland, the Lord God has been pleased to send down on Russia a new heavy trial.

Internal popular disturbances threaten to have a disastrous effect on the future conduct of this persistent war. The destiny of Russia, the honour of our heroic army, the welfare of the people and the whole future of our dear fatherland demand that the war should be brought to a victorious conclusion whatever the cost.

The cruel enemy is making his last efforts, and already the hour approaches when our glorious army together with our gallant allies will crush him. In these decisive days in the life of Russia, We thought it Our duty of conscience to facilitate for Our people the closest union possible and a consolidation of all national forces for the speedy attainment of victory.

In agreement with the Imperial Duma We have thought it well to renounce the Throne of the Russian Empire and to lay down the supreme power. As We do not wish to part from Our beloved son, We transmit the succession to Our brother, the Grand Duke Michael Alexandrovich, and give Him Our blessing to mount the Throne of the Russian Empire.

We direct Our brother to conduct the affairs of state in full and inviolable union with the representatives of the people in the legislative bodies on those principles which will be established by them, and on which He will take an inviolable oath.

In the name of Our dearly beloved homeland, We call on Our faithful sons of the fatherland to fulfill their sacred duty to the fatherland, to obey the Tsar in the heavy moment of national trials, and to help Him, together with the representatives of the people, to guide the Russian Empire on the road to victory, welfare, and glory.

May the Lord God help Russia!

http://www.firstworldwar.com/source/nicholasiiabdication.htm
Lenin's Decree on Peace (26 October 1917)

Among the first acts of the new Bolshevik government in Russia was the Decree on Peace, which called for immediate negotiations leading to a peace of no annexations or indemnities. The decree was delivered at Second All-Russia Congress of Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, 26 October 1917 and published by Izvestiia on 27 October 1917.

The Workers' and Peasants' Government, created by the revolution of October 24-25, and drawing its strength from the Soviets of Workers', Soldiers', and Peasants' Deputies, proposes to all warring peoples and their governments to begin at once negotiations leading to a just democratic peace.

A just and democratic peace for which the great majority of wearied, tormented and war-exhausted toilers and laboring classes of all belligerent countries are thirsting, a peace which the Russian workers and peasants have so loudly and insistently demanded since the overthrow of the Tsar's monarchy, such a peace the government considers to be an immediate peace without annexations (i.e., without the seizure of foreign territory and the forcible annexation of foreign nationalities) and without indemnities.

The Russian Government proposes to all warring peoples that this kind of peace be concluded at once; it also expresses its readiness to take immediately, without the least delay, all decisive steps pending the final confirmation of all the terms of such a peace by the plenipotentiary assemblies of all countries and all nations.

By annexation or seizure of foreign territory the government, in accordance with the legal concepts of democracy in general and of the working class in particular, understands any incorporation of a small and weak nationality by a large and powerful state without a clear, definite and voluntary expression of agreement and desire by the weak nationality, regardless of the time when such forcible incorporation took place, regardless also of how developed or how backward is the nation forcibly attached or forcibly detained within the frontiers of the [larger] state, and, finally, regardless of whether or not this large nation is located in Europe or in distant lands beyond the seas.

If any nation whatsoever is detained by force within the boundaries of a certain state, and if [that nation], contrary to its expressed desire whether such desire is made manifest in the press, national assemblies, party relations, or in protests and uprisings against national oppression, is not given the right to determine the form of its state life by free voting and completely free from the presence of the troops of the annexing or stronger state and without the least desire, then the dominance of that nation by the stronger state is annexation, i.e., seizure by force and violence.

The government considers that to continue this war simply to decide how to divide the weak nationalities among the powerful and rich nations which had seized them would be the greatest crime against humanity, and it solemnly announces its readiness to sign at once the terms of
peace which will end this war on the indicated conditions, equally just for all nationalities without exception….

The government abolishes secret diplomacy, expressing, for its part, the firm determination to carry on all negotiations absolutely openly and in view of all the people. It will proceed at once to publish all secret treaties ratified or concluded by the government of landlords and capitalists from March to November 7, 1917.

All the provisions of these secret treaties, in so far as they have for their object the securing of benefits and privileges to the Russian landlords and capitalists - which was true in a majority of cases - and retaining or increasing the annexation by the Great Russians, the government declares absolutely and immediately annulled….

In making these peace proposals to the government and peoples of all warring countries, the Provisional Government of Workers and Peasants of Russia appeals particularly to the class-conscious workers of the three most advanced nations of mankind, who are also the largest states participating in the present war - England, France and Germany….

Wars cannot be ended by a refusal [to fight]; they cannot be ended by one side alone. We are proposing an armistice for three months - though we are not rejecting a shorter period - so that this will give the suffering army at least a breathing spell and will make possible the calling of popular meetings in all civilized countries to discuss the conditions [of peace].

Full text of the decree is at: http://www.firstworldwar.com/source/decreeonpeace.htm
Ukraine's Plea for Inclusion in Brest-Litovsk Peace Negotiations (10 January 1918)

After the signing of an armistice in December of 1917, negotiations between the Central Powers and the new Bolshevik government for a final peace treaty began at Brest-Litovsk in early 1918. Among the most contentious issues implicated in the negotiations was the status of Ukraine and the Ukrainian delegation. Over the course of 1917 Ukrainian leaders in Kiev had demanded greater autonomy from Russia, eventually calling for a Ukrainian National Republic in federation with Russia. The Bolsheviks proved hostile to this solution and eventually invaded Ukraine from the east. It was in this context that the head of the Ukrainian government in Kiev (the Rada), Volodymyr Vynnychenko, sought the recognition of the Central Powers and inclusion in the negotiations at Brest-Litovsk, in part in order to gain protection from the Bolsheviks. The Ukrainian delegation was indeed recognized, and the Central Powers signed a separate treaty with Ukraine, even as the Bolsheviks were driving the Ukrainian government out of Kiev. The document below is Vynnychenko's appeal to the Brest-Litovsk Peace Conference (10 January 1918).

1. The entire democracy of the Ukrainian State is striving for the termination of the war, for peace throughout the entire world, and a general peace between all the belligerent powers must be democratic and must assure to every people, even the smallest, full and unlimited national self-determination.

2. The peace which is to be concluded between all the powers must be democratic and must assure to every people, event the smallest, full and unlimited national self-determination.

3. In order to render possible the real expression of the people's will, proper guarantees must be given.

4. Any annexation that means annexation by force or the surrender of any portion of territory without the consent of its population is therefore inadmissible.

5. Any war indemnities, without regard to the form given them, are from the standpoint of the interests of the working classes also inadmissible.

6. In conformity with regulations to be drawn up at the peace congresses, material assistance must be given to small nations and States which in consequence of the war have suffered considerable losses or devastations.

7. The Ukrainian Republic, which at present occupies the Ukrainian front on its own territory and is represented in all international affairs by its Government, whose duty is the protection of the Ukrainian people's interests and which acts independently, must, like other powers, be allowed to participate in all peace negotiations, conferences, and congresses.
8. The power of the (Petrograd) Council of Commissioners does not extend to the whole of Russia, and therefore not to the Ukrainian Republic. Any eventual peace resulting from negotiations with the powers waging war against Russia can therefore be binding for the Ukraine only if the terms of this peace are accepted and signed by the Government of the Ukraine Republic.

9. In the name of all Russia only such a Government (and it must be an exclusively Federal Government) can conclude peace as would be recognized by all the republics and regions of Russia possessing a State organism. If, however, such a Government cannot be formed in the near future, then this peace can only be concluded by the united representatives of those republics and regions.


Available on line at:
http://www.firstworldwar.com/source/1917.htm
Official Russian Announcement of Withdrawal from Brest-Litovsk Peace Talks (10 February 1918)

When the Bolshevik delegation arrived for peace negotiations, they were dismayed by the harsh annexationist demands of the Central Powers. Eventually, on 10 February 1918 (a week after the Central Powers signed a separate peace treaty with Ukraine), the Bolsheviks declared that they were leaving the negotiations in protest. At the same time, the Bolshevik representative, Leon Trotsky, made clear that the Bolsheviks would not continue the war. Thus the Bolsheviks announced their policy of "No War, No Peace."

The peace negotiations are at an end. The German capitalists, bankers, and landlords, supported by the silent cooperation of the English and French bourgeoisie, submitted to our comrades, members of the peace delegations at Brest-Litovsk, conditions such as could not be subscribed to by the Russian revolution.

The Governments of Germany and Austria possess countries and peoples vanquished by force of arms. To this authority the Russian people, workmen and peasants, could not give its acquiescence. We could not sign a peace which would bring with it sadness, oppression, and suffering to millions of workmen and peasants.

But we also cannot, will not, and must not continue a war begun by Tsars and capitalists in alliance with Tsars and capitalists. We will not and we must not continue to be at war with the Germans and Austrians - workmen and peasants like ourselves.

We are not signing a peace of landlords and capitalists. Let the German and Austrian soldiers know who are placing them in the field of battle and let them know for what they are struggling. Let them know also that we refuse to fight against them.

Our delegation, fully conscious of its responsibility before the Russian people and the oppressed workers and peasants of other countries, declared on February 10th, in the name of the Council of the People's Commissaries of the Government of the Federal Russian Republic to the Governments of the peoples involved in the war with us and of the neutral countries, that it refused to sign an annexationist treaty.

Russia, for its part, declares the present war with Germany and Austria-Hungary, Turkey, and Bulgaria at an end.

Simultaneously, the Russian troops have received the following order for complete demobilization on all fronts [the order follows].


Full source available at: http://www.firstworldwar.com/source/brestlitovsk_trotskywithdrawal.htm
Lenin on the Need to Accept Brest-Litovsk Peace Terms (23 February 1918)

Lenin had initially accepted Trotsky's policy of "Nor War, No Peace." But when the Central Powers renewed military hostilities against the young Bolshevik state, Lenin quickly realized that accepting the terms of the Central Powers was unavoidable. He made the case in the document below. Lenin placed his hopes in the proposition that revolution would soon overtake Germany, thus nullifying the Brest-Litovsk treaty. Russia thus signed the treaty on 3 March 1918.

The German reply offers peace terms still more severe than those of Brest-Litovsk. Nevertheless, I am absolutely convinced that to refuse to sign these terms is only possible to those who are intoxicated by revolutionary phrases.

Up till now I have tried to impress on the members of the party the necessity of clearing their minds of revolutionary cant. Now I must do this openly, for unfortunately my worst forebodings have been justified.…

[O]ur retreating army seems demoralized and absolutely refuses to fight. Only unrestrained phrasemaking can impel Russia at this moment and in these conditions to continue the war, and I personally would not remain a minute longer either in the Government or in the Central Committee of our party if the policy of phrasemaking were to prevail.

This new bitter truth has revealed itself with such terrible distinctness that it is impossible not to see it. All the bourgeoisie in Russia is jubilant at the approach of the Germans.

Only a blind man or men infatuated by phrases can fail to see that the policy of a revolutionary war without an army is water in the bourgeois mill. In the bourgeois papers there is already exaltation in view of the impending overthrow of the Soviet Government by the Germans.

We are compelled to submit to a distressing peace. It will not stop revolution in Germany and Europe. We shall now begin to prepare a revolutionary army, not by phrases and exclamations, as did those who after January 10th did nothing even to attempt to stop our fleeing troops, but by organized work, by the creation of a serious national, mighty army.

Their knees are on our chest, and our position is hopeless. This peace must be accepted as a respite enabling us to prepare a decisive resistance to the bourgeoisie and imperialists.

The proletariat of the whole world will come to our aid. Then we shall renew the fight.


Full text at: http://www.firstworldwar.com/source/brestlitovsk_lenin.htm
Paul von Hindenburg's Appeal for Peace Negotiations (3 October 1918)

In the wake of the Allied resurgence in the summer and autumn of 1918 - with the breaking of the Hindenburg Line in Flanders and in the Argonne – and with the sudden collapse of its own allies – the German High Command came to the conclusion that the war could not be won. Consequently it recommended to a stunned Reichstag on 2 October 1918 that a peace with the Entente powers be negotiated, a message that was reiterated by Army Chief of Staff Paul von Hindenburg on the following day. Reproduced below is the text of Hindenburg's call for the urgent opening of peace talks on 3 October.

To The Imperial Chancellor:

The High Command insists on the immediate issue of a peace offer to our enemies in accordance with the decision of Monday, September 29, 1918.

In consequence of the collapse of the Macedonian front, and the inevitable resultant weakening of our reserves in the West, and also the impossibility of making good the heavy losses that have occurred during the battles of the last few days, there is no prospect, humanly speaking, of forcing our enemies to sue for peace. The enemy, on the other hand, is continuing to throw fresh reserves into the battle.

The German army still stands firm and is defending itself against all attacks. The situation, however, is growing more critical daily, and may force the High Command to momentous decisions.

In these circumstances it is imperative to stop the fighting in order to spare the German people and their allies unnecessary sacrifices. Every day of delay costs thousands of brave soldiers their lives.


Text also available at: http://www.firstworldwar.com/source/germancollapse_hindenburg.htm
Allied Armistice Terms with Germany (11 November 1918)

On 6 November 1918, the German government determined to negotiate an armistice with the Allies, having issued preliminary diplomatic feelers two days earlier. Although Germany had insisted that it would only enter into negotiations on the understanding that U.S. President Woodrow Wilson's so-called “Fourteen Points” would form the basis for a settlement, the armistice terms were nevertheless punitive. The Allies' armistice terms were first presented to German negotiators on 8 November 1918; alarmed at the severity of the terms, the Germans lodged formal protests before reluctantly signing revised terms at 5 a.m. on 11 November. The armistice went into effect six hours later, at 11 a.m. Several of the most important terms are reproduced below.

2. Immediate evacuation of invaded countries: Belgium, France, Alsace-Lorraine, Luxemburg, so ordered as to be completed within fourteen days from the signature of the armistice. German troops which have not left the above-mentioned territories within the period fixed will become prisoners of war…

4. Surrender in good condition by the German armies of the following war material: Five thousand guns (2,500 heavy, and 2,500 field), 25,000 machine guns, 3,000 minenwerfer, 1,700 airplanes (fighters, bombers - firstly, all of the D 7'S and all the night bombing machines)….

5. Evacuation by the German armies of the countries [territories] on the left bank of the Rhine. The countries on the left bank of the Rhine shall be administered by the local troops of occupation….

9. The right of requisition shall be exercised by the allied and United States armies in all occupied territories, subject to regulation of accounts with those whom it may concern. The upkeep of the troops of occupation in the Rhineland (excluding Alsace-Lorraine) shall be charged to the German Government.

12. All German troops at present in the territories which before belonged to Austria-Hungary, Rumania, Turkey, shall withdraw immediately within the frontiers of Germany as they existed on August First, Nineteen Fourteen. All German troops at present in the territories which before the war belonged to Russia shall likewise withdraw within the frontiers of Germany, defined as above, as soon as the Allies, taking into account the internal situation of these territories, shall decide that the time for this has come.

14. German troops to cease at once all requisitions and seizures and any other undertaking with a view to obtaining supplies intended for Germany in Rumania and Russia (as defined on August 1, 1914).

15. Renunciation of the treaties of Bucharest [the treaty signed between Romania and the Central Powers in May, 1918] and Brest-Litovsk and of the supplementary treaties.
17. Evacuation by all German forces operating in East Africa within a period to be fixed by the Allies.

19. The following financial conditions are required: Reparation for damage done. While such armistice lasts no public securities shall be removed by the enemy which can serve as a pledge to the Allies for the recovery or reparation for war losses. Immediate restitution of the cash deposit in the national bank of Belgium, and in general immediate return of all documents, specie, stocks, shares, paper money, together with plant for the issue thereof, touching public or private interests in the invaded countries. Restitution of the Russian and Rumanian gold yielded to Germany or taken by that power. This gold to be delivered in trust to the Allies until the signature of peace.

21. All naval and mercantile marine prisoners of the allied and associated powers in German hands to be returned without reciprocity.

22. Surrender to the Allies and United States of all submarines (including submarine cruisers and all mine-laying submarines) now existing, with their complete armament and equipment, in ports which shall be specified by the Allies and United States....

23. German surface warships which shall be designated by the Allies and the United States shall be immediately disarmed and thereafter interned in neutral ports or in default of them in allied ports to be designated by the Allies and the United States....

26. The existing blockade conditions set up by the allied and associated powers are to remain unchanged, and all German merchant ships found at sea are to remain liable to capture. The Allies and the United States should give consideration to the provisioning of Germany during the armistice to the extent recognized as necessary.

35. This armistice to be accepted or refused by Germany within seventy-two hours of notification.

This armistice has been signed the Eleventh of November, Nineteen Eighteen, at 5 o'clock French time.

F. FOCH.
R. E. WEMYSS.
ERZBERGER.
A. OBERNDORFF.
WINTERFELDT.
VON SALOW.

Full text of the terms available at:
http://www.firstworldwar.com/source/armisticeterms.htm
General Ludendorff, On Overcoming the Consequences of the Lost War (1922)

Erich Ludendorff (1865-1937) came from relatively humble circumstances. His mother was of noble birth, but from an impoverished family; his father was a provincial merchant of middling means. Thus, he could not rely on the social credentials that high-ranking military men could still call upon to bolster their careers during the imperial era. With no “von” to his name, Ludendorff owed his rise in the peacetime General Staff to hard work and very real abilities. In the war, he was the “brains” of the Hindenburg-Ludendorff team, the architect of the great victories on the Eastern Front in 1914, the man who by 1916 was making personnel, economic and foreign policy decisions in place of the Kaiser. He determined the strategy on the Western Front that staked all on the massive offensive of the spring of 1918. Upon its disastrous failure, Ludendorff managed to divest himself of both political and military responsibility. As a civilian, he continued to shun accountability for the lost war. The book from which the following excerpt comes is notable for its absolute refusal to admit error. Filled with images of a violated masculinity and riveted upon the need to find those "truly" guilty for the Treaty of Versailles, the military impotence of Germany, and the moral degeneracy he saw all around him, Ludendorff identified a host of villains: the vengeful Allies, democrats, socialists, Jews, and the German masses, who had been betrayed by unnamed prewar leaders and then failed in their duty to the Fatherland.

Internationalist, pacifist, defeatist thinking still predominates in Germany today, even though the world all around us bristles with weapons, sounds the war cry, and fans up hatred against us. It is apparent that the current World Powers are only pausing for breath before renewing struggles amongst themselves and once again oppressing the weaker. [Georges] Clemenceau himself described the Versailles Blackmail as a continuation of the war….

We must learn that we live in a warlike period and that war, for the individual being as well as the state, will remain a natural phenomenon, one also grounded in the divine order of the world….

If we are to put ourselves on this footing in our world of struggle, then once and for all we must reject the phrases that our enemies and our democrats of all stripes have preached to us, phrases such as eternal peace, disarmament, and the reconciliation of humanity – as though on the strength of these God’s world order could be overturned, the two-faced nature of man be mastered, and all worldly goods be set aside in favor of spiritual values alone.

Waging a war of liberation at the present time is not possible for us. No one knows this better than I, who himself has waged war and done everything to prevent the defenselessness of Germany. Our defenselessness before the violent actions of our enemies we owe to the fearsome disaster of Versailles. Horror overrides me when I think of it.

This insight belongs to the political education of the German people just as surely as does the knowledge that war will remain the ultimate, the only decisive, means of policy. This manner of thinking, complemented by a manly enthusiasm for war, cannot be forbidden the German people
by the Entente, even though it wants to take it from us. It is the foundation for comprehending anything political, the foundation of our future, even and especially for the enslaved Nation of the Germans….

The German people may no longer let themselves be fooled by slogans and empty phrases, as they were before, during, and after the war. We ought to examine who it is who tells us these things and who broadcasts them, who the author of this advertising campaign is, instead of lightmindedly taking it to be truthful. Whatever the enemy gives us and whatever he recommends is certainly bad for us. What he takes from us, what he attacks in our thinking and actions or among our institutions – that is good for us….

To this first building block of our political education must be added others. Every German must grasp the contours of real war so that he is never again, as he was in the world war, overwhelmed by its immensity. He must measure its strength according to the demands that engender a war, no matter what shape it assumes.

Once we are clear about our aims and what demands are appropriate to their realization, then we can get down to work. In the foreground there must be put in place a policy of reconstruction, the safeguarding and consolidation of the state, and the renewal of Nation’s strength and spirit. Such measures require the purposeful gathering of all the forces necessary to the self-assertion of the state: that is, the unyielding front of the German Nation in all its regions and callings, unified in deep Christian faith, glowing with love of the Fatherland and readiness for sacrifice to it, and in an optimism borne by consciousness of strength, desire, and duty – a united front like the army created by the Hohenzollern princes – even though bereft of arms!

Just as with the German army of the world war, this united front must be without class conflict, conflicts between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, between city and countryside, or any of the other numerous conflicts and differences that weaken the German Nation, such as mistrust of one another. Within its ranks it must be fully decided who shall do his duty in fighting the enemy, while on the home front profit will be sacrificed. Certainly, the frontline soldiers must be accorded first place in the united front, in memory of what service they rendered [in the war] and what was lost through the Revolution [of 1918].

The un-German in and around us that Ludwig Schemann speaks of lies first and foremost in the lack of race feeling, in the insufficient consideration of the German way in our schools and in law, in the elevation of intellectual training over manual skills, in the self-seeking intellectual tendency spreading among us to value external good living, in internationalist, pacifist, and defeatist thinking, and, finally, in the strong intrusion of the Jewish people inside our borders. * Overcoming this un-German in individuals, in the nation and the state, is the special task of political thinking and of protracted völkisch labor. This must be carried on unwaveringly by the best of our people in closest cooperation with one another and in mutual trust.

---

*Ludendorff note: Until now the concept of race, the German science of race [*Rassenkunde*], has been treated as a stepchild by our scientific research. [With regard to the Jews] They receive new strength from the strong influx of Jews from Eastern Europe [*Ostjuden*].*
For fortification of the personality, strengthening of the will, invigoration of the body, and steeling of health and courage, physical exercises--especially man to man combat--hardening oneself, and abstinence are necessary.

The building up of the German Nation will not by itself suffice to meet the coming challenges. The buildup of the German national economy must also enter into it. It is sheer delusion to believe, as, unfortunately, several of our economic leaders do, that the national economy alone can effect the rebirth. As before the war, they underestimate the value of the national spirit, instead of recognizing and promoting it. Without the German national spirit, the economy only produces goods. Elevated by the national spirit, labor reunites the people, leads to recovery, and in turn provides the national spirit with the necessary backing required to compete effectively in all areas with other peoples. National spirit and the national economy must complement one another and work reciprocally to create ever new powers….

We need a national economy free from compulsion and without limits on property ownership, which sees in employers only employees in the service of the German people and German state, and which accords to all employees their right to work and to profit.

Only reciprocal understanding for the value of intellectual and manual labor can unite all workers….Only the labor of the entire people, not the easy profits of the stock market, answers to the German character and can create the values that will increase the purchasing power of our money, allowing us both to buy back our freedom from our enemies and to overcome the economic injuries of the war with a suitable standard of living.

We need a governmental authority that stands above the outmoded political parties, one borne up by the confidence and strength of the German people, and built upon its self-administration and on an occupational representative body. We need a government that leads the people, not one that merely rules over it, and one that upholds the law for everyone. The strength of government lies, not in widening, but rather in narrowing [of participation]. In the pressure of events, as the great Hohenzollern princes and their great advisors knew, the leadership of a single individual [is necessary] to hold the selfish and refractory part of the people to its duty, and when necessary to do so with force, thereby serving the entire nation.

For the strengthening and lasting preservation of the finished work of reconstruction we require a return to the monarchical form of state, to an imperial federal state, with functionaries, both high and low, adhering to a conception of the state and their duty to it, that Prussianism once imparted….

Nonetheless, we must remain aware that, more than at any time in our history, our development is hindered by inner forces which produce lasting dissension because they insidiously and everywhere intrude themselves, attempting to befog clear and simple thinking with their grandiose ideas. We should not do these enemies any favors by tearing ourselves apart. We should be smarter. We need to win our way, purposefully and confidently, to sober political thinking and willing….

Full text available at:
http://www.h-net.org/~german/gtext/kaiserreich/ludendorff.html