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Facing the Enemy

All Quiet on the Western Front, originally published in German in 1928 as Im Westen Nichts Neues, expresses deep-seeded humanism and fierce opposition to the violence of war. For those reasons, it became an object of Hitler’s hatred: Remarque was forced into exile in 1931, and the novel was burned and banned by the Nazis in 1933.

Widely regarded on a par with War and Peace as the greatest war novel (or anti-war novel), it is written in first-person from the perspective of Paul Bäumer, a student who enlists with his schoolmates in the German Army in World War I. Paul recounts his experiences on the front and on leave (based in part on Remarque’s own experiences as a soldier in the Great War). An epilogue tells us that Paul died on the Western front in October 1918—just before the long-rumored armistice and the signing of the Treaty of Versailles on November 11, 1918.

Remarque’s novel pits the moral prohibition against killing into conflict with the demands of war. He does this by placing Paul in a series of face-to-face encounters with the enemy. In the novel’s culminating scene, Paul huddles in a shell-hole under heavy fire. Suddenly, “something heavy stumbles, and with a crash a body falls over me into the shell-hole, slips down, and lies across me—.” Prior to this, while on a risky patrol Paul had promised himself that if an enemy soldier were to hop into his shell-hole, he [Paul] would be the first to strike. True to his promise, he does: “I do not think at all, I make no decision—I strike madly at home, and feel only how the body suddenly convulses, then collapses.” Paul sees only a body, not a face.

The soldier does not die but falls back gurgling and gasping. With his “eyes glued on him,” Paul finds that “I cannot any more lift my hand against him.” Why not? An answer might be found in the works of Jewish philosopher Emmanuel Levinas (1906-1995), who wrote that we are ordered not to kill by the face of the Other, particularly the eyes. Levinas explained that the face of the Other summons us toward human relationships and toward the ethical. It speaks and orders us—or rather, it issues a “commandment,” with all the awful Biblical weight of that word: “The first word of the face is ‘Thou shalt not kill.’ It is an order.”

The traditional military order “Don’t shoot until you see the whites of their eyes” stands in stark contrast, taking the eyes of the Other as the very things which grant permission to kill and in fact signal that killing should commence immediately.

Continued on next page
In battle, the soldier faces a conflicting set of commands: the face’s command not to kill, and the military command to kill the enemy. How might these conflicting orders and obligations be resolved?

This is the conflict that Paul faces in the foxhole. He tries to avoid the ethical command by avoiding seeing the wounded soldier’s face: “I dare not look again at the dark figure in the shell-hole. With an effort I look past it and wait, wait.” The words “figure” and “it” substitute for “face,” allowing Paul to deafen himself to the command the soldier’s face would speak to him. When Paul awakes the next morning, he maintains this detached refusal to see the face of his enemy: “The figure opposite me moves. I shrink together and involuntarily look at it.”

As the wounded man gurgles and groans, “dying, but… not dead,” a remarkable shift takes place. Paul moves closer to the wounded man and begins referring to him as “he” rather than “it.” No wonder present-day soldiers are trained to aim for the belt; the soldier who looks into the enemy’s eyes risks perceiving the enemy as a human being rather than an object.

At this point, the threat is not so much the threat the wounded soldier poses to Paul’s life as the threat his vulnerability poses to Paul’s morality. Indeed, Paul has an open invitation to finish off his enemy, but he does not do so. Rather, he moves beside the wounded man. “Then he opens his eyes. He must have heard me, for he gazes at me with a look of utter terror…. The body is perfectly still, without a sound, the gurgle has ceased, but the eyes cry out.” Paul remarks, “The eyes follow me. I am powerless to move so long as they are there.” They arrest Paul’s ability to raise his hand against his enemy every bit as much as the angel of the Lord arrested Abraham’s hand when he raised it to slay Isaac.

Called to respond to the face of the Other, Paul reassures the dying soldier that he will not kill him: “I bend forward, shake my head and whisper: ‘No, no, no.’” Paul opens the man’s collar, positions his head more comfortably, scoops water out of a puddle and helps the man drink it, and bandages him while gently whispering, “I want to help you, Comrade, camerade, camerade [sic]—.”

Paul attends to the soldier’s material needs; he assuages his pain, anxiety, and fear; he respects his dignity; he slakes his thirst before his own; and he ignores their social identities as enemy combatants. In short, Paul does answer the command to respond ethically when face-to-face with the Other.

Paul stabbed his enemy physically, but as the man lays dying, no longer merely a cultural abstraction, Paul comments, “he has an invisible dagger with which he stabs me: Time and my thoughts.” Late that afternoon, the wounded man dies. In the aftermath of the man’s death, addressing the dead man he now calls “Comrade,” Paul reflects, “you were only an idea to me before, an abstraction that lived in my mind and called forth its appropriate response. It was that abstraction I stabbed. But now, for the first time, I see you are a man like me.”

Spurred by his pierced conscience to ethical action, Paul resolves to write to the dead man’s wife, to help her, to help his parents and his child. He opens the man’s tunic and takes out the pocket-book that has his name inscribed. He takes out the man’s wallet and finds pictures and letters; the pictures are of a woman and a little girl. Paul resolves, “I must do everything, promise everything in order to save myself; I swear… I see you are a man like me.”

Continued on next page
Literature of War

More Face-to-Face Encounters

Richard Middleton-Kaplan

Face-to-face encounters have always been present in the literature of war. Here are just a few from among the many works in which writers explore the ethical dimensions of those battlefield encounters:

The first great narrative of world literature, *The Epic of Gilgamesh*, may have been composed as far back as 1600 BCE. The potential rivals Enkidu and Gilgamesh become close comrades instead of fierce foes. Although they do battle before consecrating their friendship, they approach one another as respectful equals because the harlot tells Enkidu to go to Gilgamesh so “he may see your face” and to “gaze at his face.”

Walt Whitman’s collection of Civil War poems titled *Drum-Taps* (1865) contains “Vigil Strange I Kept on the Field One Night.” In that poem, the speaker, commanded by “One look I but gave which your dear eyes return’d with a look I shall never forget,” stays beside a fallen comrade through death and through the night.

In Stephen Crane’s *The Red Badge of Courage* (1894), the protagonist Union soldier Henry Fleming callously separates himself from the cheery-voiced man who selflessly leads Henry back to his regiment: “As he who had so befriended him was thus passing out of his life, it suddenly occurred to the youth that he had not once seen his face”; the failure to register the face of the other man represents Henry’s ethical failure to reciprocate a human relationship.

In Bob Dylan’s anti-war song “John Brown” (1962), the disfigured soldier recalls that of all the terrors of battle, “the thing that scared me most was when my enemy came close / And I saw that his face looked just like mine.”

Continued on next page
overall din of destruction. Useless too was the suffering of the millions of young men like Paul.

Remarque’s novel leaves us with an overwhelming sense of useless suffering, wasted lives, pointless war, senseless slaughter. That is his theme, and that propels his novel as a vehicle of anti-war thought and sentiment. The novel rages against useless suffering by portraying it without compromise and without comfort. Remarque leaves us with death in the foxhole, leaving us to contemplate how to achieve in every moment what Paul Bäumer achieved for a few hours face-to-face with Gérard Duval, and leaving us galvanized and inspired to discover an ethical path that might lead out of the trenches of war toward life, bringing us at last face-to-face with peace.

Literature of War

Richard Middleton-Kaplan

Remarque’s novel leaves us to contemplate how to forge a path out of the trenches toward life.

World War 1 in the Movies

Richard Middleton-Kaplan

Erich Maria Remarque’s 1928 novel All Quiet on the Western Front inspired the 1930 Hollywood film of the same name. Earning four Oscars including a Best Director award for Lewis Milestone, the film starred Lew Ayres as Paul Bäumer. Like Remarque’s novel, the film was banned in Nazi Germany. The experience of making the movie resulted in Ayres becoming a conscientious objector in World War II.

A 1979 remake directed by Derrick Mann starred Richard Thomas and Ernest Borgnine. Thomas had previously starred in a 1974 TV movie adaptation of Stephen Crane’s Civil War story The Red Badge of Courage, so viewers were accustomed to seeing him not only as John-Boy in The Waltons but also as a sympathetic front-line soldier wrestling with the demands of war.

In the same year as the 1930 U.S. film, Germany’s Weimar Republic produced its own version of war in the trenches: Westfront 1918, directed by the legendary G. W. Pabst.

With the recent centennial of the Armistice, World War I films are once again in vogue. Scheduled to come out in late 2019 is 1917, directed by Sam Mendes and starring Colin Firth and Benedict Cumberbatch. Whether it glorifies war, condemns war, or tries to have it both ways, remains to be seen.

Most astonishing among recent films is Peter Jackson’s repurposing of original footage in his 2018 documentary They Shall Not Grow Old. Best known as the director of The Lord of the Rings and Hobbit film trilogies, Jackson is also an amateur WWI historian and collector of war memorabilia. Moreover, Jackson’s grandfather fought on the British side in the war. Britain’s Imperial War Museum selected him to work creatively with more than 100 hours of WWI footage, including footage from the Western front. Jackson also was granted access to more than 600 hours of interviews conducted by the BBC with British WWI veterans in the 1960s. Ultimately, he chose to focus on the experience of a common British soldier from recruitment through the war and the trenches and then homecoming. In making the documentary, which is a work of profound respect and creativity, Jackson did the following:

Continued on next page
Adjusted the speed of old film footage so that soldiers appear to move as we do, not in herky-jerky sped-up fashion.

Colorized as much of the footage as he could afford to. This involved meticulous research. For instance, he researched and acquired uniforms to determine exact colors of threads, medals, and insignia. As another example, he traveled to a battle site gulley in order to capture the exact shades of the grass in that area.

Employed forensic lip readers to determine what words soldiers were mouthing as they walked past the cameras that captured their images but not sound. Jackson then determined from those soldiers’ uniforms what regiments they were in, then what region of the country those regiments were from, and then hired actors with those same regional accents to speak the soldiers’ words in sync with the images on the screen.

These techniques bring the soldiers to life with unprecedented immediacy and humanity.

Other notable WWI films worth seeking out include the following:
- Wings (directed by William A. Wellman, U.S.A., 1927), starring Clara Bow, Gary Cooper, and Buddy Rogers.
- Hell’s Angels (directed by Howard Hughes with uncredited James Whale, U.S.A., 1930), starring Jean Harlow.
- A Farewell to Arms (directed by Frank Borzage, U.S.A., 1932), starring Gary Cooper, Helen Hayes, and Adolphe Menjou. Based on the novel by Ernest Hemingway.
- La Grande Illusion (Grand Illusion) (directed by Jean Renoir, France, 1937), starring Jean Gabin and Erich von Stroheim.
- The Good Soldier Schweik (directed by Karel Steklý, Czechoslovakia, 1956). Based on the novel by Jaroslav Hašek. There are other Czech films by this title from 1931, 1955, and 1960.
- Lawrence of Arabia (directed by David Lean, UK, 1962), starring José Ferrer, Alec Guinness, Anthony Quinn, Claude Rains, Omar Sharif, and Peter O’Toole. Based on Seven Pillars of Wisdom by T. E. Lawrence.
- Gallipoli (directed by Peter Weir, Australia, 1981), starring Mel Gibson.
- Legends of the Fall (directed by Edward Zwick, U.S.A., 1994), starring Anthony Hopkins, Julia Ormond, Brad Pitt, and Aidan Quinn.
- Un long dimanche de fiançailles (A Very Long Engagement) (directed by Jean-Pierre Jeunet, France, 2004), starring Marion Cotillard, Jodie Foster, and Audrey Tautou.
- Passchendaele (directed by Paul Gross, Canada, 2008), starring Caroline Dhavernas and Paul Gross.
- Der rote Baron (The Red Baron) (directed by Nikolai Müllerschön, Germany, 2008), starring Joseph Fiennes.
- Das Weiße Band (The White Ribbon) (directed by Michael Haneke, Germany, 2009).
In recent years, internationalism cooperation among nations for promotion of the common good has acquired a bad reputation. Of course, internationalism has long been anathema to the political Right, where a primitive tribalism and its successor, nationalism, have flourished for many years. Focusing on their nation’s supposed superiority to others, a long line of rightwing demagogues, including Adolf Hitler (“Deutschland Über Alles”) and Donald Trump (“America First”), have stirred up xenophobia, racism, and militarism, often with some success in public opinion and at the polls. Numerous nationalist imitators have either secured public office or are hungering for it in many parts of the world.

But what is new in recent years is the critique of internationalism on the political Left. For centuries, internationalism was a staple of the progressive, avant garde outlook. Enlightenment thinkers promoted ideas of cosmopolitanism and the unity of humanity, critics of war and imperialism championed the development of international law, and socialists campaigned for replacing chauvinism with international working class solidarity. In the aftermath of two devastating world wars, liberal reformers roundly condemned the narrow nationalist policies of the past and placed their hopes for a peaceful and humane future in two world organizations: the League of Nations and the United Nations.

A key reason for the decline of support for this internationalist vision on the political Left is the belief that internationalism has served as a cloak for great power militarism and imperialism. In fact, there is some justification for this belief, as the U.S. government, while professing support for “democracy” and other noble aims, has all too often used its immense military, economic, and political power in world affairs with less laudatory motives,
especially economic gain and control of foreign lands.

And much the same can be said about other powerful nations. In their global operations during much of the twentieth century, were the British and French really concerned about advancing human rights and “civilization,” the Germans about spreading “kultur,” and the Russians about liberating the working class? Or were they merely continuing the pattern though not the rhetoric of their nationalist predecessors?

To continue this subterfuge, starting in 1945 they all publicly pledged to follow the guidelines of a different kind of global approach, cooperative internationalism, as championed by the United Nations. But, when it came to the crunch, they proved more interested in advancing their economies and political holdings than in developing international law and a cooperative world order. As a result, while pretending to honor the lofty aims of the United Nations, they provided it with very limited power and resources. In this fashion, they not only used the United Nations as a fig leaf behind which their overseas military intervention and imperialism continued, but ended up convincing many people, all across the political spectrum, that the United Nations was ineffectual and, more broadly, that cooperative internationalism didn’t work.

But, of course, cooperative internationalism could work if the governments of the major powers and, at the grassroots level, their populations demanded it. A fully empowered United Nations could prevent international aggression, as well as enforce disarmament agreements and sharp cutbacks in the outrageous level of world military spending. It could also address the climate catastrophe, the refugee crisis, the destructive policies of multinational corporations, and worldwide violations of human rights. Does anyone, aside from the most zealous nationalist, really believe that these problems can be solved by any individual nation or even by a small group of nations?

Fortunately, there are organizations that recognize that, in dealing with these and other global problems, the world need not be limited to a choice between overheated nationalism and hypocritical internationalism. In the United States, these include the United Nations Association (which works to strengthen that global organization so that it can do the job for which it was created) and Citizens for Global Solutions (which champions the transformation of the United Nations into a democratic federation of nations). Numerous small countries, religions, and humanitarian organizations also promote the development of a more cooperative international order.

If the people of the world are to stave off the global catastrophes that now loom before them, they are going to have to break loose from the limitations of their nations’ traditional policies in world affairs. Above all, they need to cast off their lingering tribalism, recognize their common humanity, and begin working for the good of all.

DR. LAWRENCE WITTNER is Professor of History Emeritus at SUNY/Albany and the author of Confronting the Bomb: A Short History of the World Nuclear Disarmament Movement (Stanford University Press, 2009). Dr. Wittner’s Web site can be found at https://www.lawrenceswittner.com/
Righteousness & Resistance

Patrick Henry

OSE (Oeuvre de secours aux enfants):
Jewish Rescuers of Jews in France During the Holocaust

By presenting Madeleine Dreyfus in his brilliant award-winning documentary, Weapons of the Spirit, Pierre Sauvage points to the fact that Jewish people themselves were rescuers of Jews on the plateau Vivarais-Lignon during the Holocaust. There was no mention of Madeleine Dreyfus or the Jewish Children’s Welfare Organization that she worked for in Philip Hallie's earlier ground-breaking 1979 ethical study, Lest Innocent Blood Be Shed. The Story of Le Chambon and How Goodness Happened There. Nor, parenthetically, did Hallie mention that other Jews, such as Pierre Fayol, were leaders in the local armed resistance.

The organization Madeleine Dreyfus worked for, Oeuvre de secours aux enfants (hereafter referred to as OSE), was founded in Russia in 1912 by a group of young doctors committed to offering poor Jews sanitary protection and health benefits. It moved in 1917 to Berlin where a certain Albert Einstein was its honorary president. In 1933, it moved to Paris and in 1940 to Montpellier in the south of France where, with its 280 official employees, it became the principal Jewish organization concerned with the welfare of foreign Jews in the internment camps in the region and, ultimately, as of August 1942, the evacuation of Jewish children from those camps, and the placing of the children in non-Jewish homes and institutions.

These camps, where 3,000 Jews died during the Occupation, were entirely run by French personnel. After the Allied invasion of North Africa in November 1942 and the German occupation of all of France, it was no longer safe to keep large numbers of Jewish children in places like Chabannes (one of eight OSE homes in Unoccupied France) where 400 Jewish children had been housed together. Jewish children now had to be placed individually in homes, on farms, and in non-Jewish institutions or smuggled out of the country.

Madeleine Dreyfus was one of the OSE Jewish fieldworkers. She and her family settled in Lyon after her husband, Raymond, lost his job in Paris due to antisemitic legislation. She began working for OSE in August 1941 as a psychologist, helping adolescents adjust to their new lives after having been uprooted from their homes and schools in northern Occupied France. As of October 1942, without false papers and with the most readily identifiable Jewish name in the country, she began doing illegal work, finding homes for Jewish children and accompanying them to those homes throughout southern France.

During a thirteen-month period, nine of which when she was pregnant and four of which when she was breastfeeding her daughter, Annette, who was born in August 1943, Madeleine Dreyfus managed to place over 100 Jewish children in non-Jewish homes and institutions, mostly in this predominantly Protestant countryside.

“Jewish people played an important role in the rescue of Jews...in every area I have examined in France”
Righteousness &
Resistance

“Given the preponderance of evidence of Jewish resistance, it is simply unconscionable to continue to speak in general terms of ‘Jewish passivity.’”

Given the preponderance of evidence of Jewish resistance, it is simply unconscionable to continue to speak in general terms of “Jewish passivity.” But we must also expand the notion of resistance to include not only violent resistance but nonviolent resistance as well. In France, for example, Jews were less than 1% of the population but were 6% of the formal violent Resistance. They were also part of every nonviolent rescue mission I examined throughout the country. We must consider Jewish resistance to be resistance by Jewish persons in Jewish organizations and by Jewish persons working within non-Jewish organizations.

Outside the camps and ghettos, nonviolent resistance focused largely, although not exclusively, on rescue. Throughout all of German-occupied Europe, Jews, particularly Jewish children, were sheltered in non-Jewish institutions, homes, and farms, and smuggled into neutral countries such as Switzerland, Spain, and Sweden. It has been estimated that somewhere between five and ten percent of the 3,000,000 Jews who survived the Shoah in Europe were rescued. So we are talking about between 150,000 and 300,000 people.

As regards hidden children throughout occupied Europe, we can never overemphasize the fact that the first rescuers of Jewish children were Jewish parents. Separating oneself from one’s children on the mere hope of their being rescued (and, for reasons of safety, almost always without knowing where one’s children would be hidden) was at once the most courageous and anguished choice Jewish parents had to make and the ultimate act of resistance against the annihilation of European Jewry.

Here in the realm of rescue, particu-
larly when compared to the acclaim granted non-Jewish rescuers, the tremendous role played by Jews in the rescue of other Jewish persons, often working in Jewish organizations and in conjunction with non-Jews, has not received sufficient academic study and appropriate public recognition. Until recently, there have been few attempts to recognize them. Yet, rescue was another form of resistance; like collaboration, it had many faces: hiding in one’s home country, in adjacent forests or crossing borders to safety. In each of these areas, Jewish people played an active and significant role throughout occupied Europe in the rescue of other Jews.

Even armed resisters recognized the importance of rescue and the fact that rescue saved many more Jews than armed resistance. Take, for example, the case of Tuvia Bielski who, with his brothers Asael and Zus, saved 1,200 Jews of all ages in the forests of Belorussia in what became known as “Bielski’s Shtetl.” When asked about his activities, he clearly expressed his preference for rescue over combat against the Nazis: “So few of us are left, we have to save lives. To save a Jew is much more important than to kill Germans.”

It is my hope that, in addition to the depiction of the Ghetto Fighters and the Forest Warriors, future iconography of Jewish resistance against the Nazis will include images of Jewish couples entrusting their children to Jewish humanitarian workers in the internment camps and ghettos throughout Europe, workers who risked their lives to find shelter for those children, as well as images of Jewish men and women, crossing borders and leading other Jewish people to safety in places such as Switzerland, Spain, Sweden, and Turkey.

FINALLY, if you know a Jewish person who rescued other Jews during the Shoah and who has not yet been formally recognized in Jerusalem as a Jewish Rescuer of Jews, please send me his or her name and the names of persons to contact to verify such rescue. I will be most happy to forward that information to my friend, Alan Schneider, at the B’nai B’rith World Center in Jerusalem which is collecting names and issuing Jewish Rescuer of Jews citations. Right now, I am working with him on behalf of Madeleine Dreyfus. Thank you.

PATRICK HENRY is the author of We Only Know Men. The Rescue of Jews in France during the Holocaust and the editor of Jewish Resistance Against the Nazis. He can be reached at henrypg@whitman.edu