

End of an Age.

Mr. Chairman,

In the course of this series on the perils of Europe I will do my best to offer you a presentation of the ~~current issues~~ <sup>recent</sup> of the Anglo-Italian, the Anglo-French, agreements, <sup>as well as</sup> and of the current issues in Spain, in Russia, in Czechoslovakia and elsewhere.

This, however, is obviously not enough. The more closely a person is following to-day current events, the more the conviction must grow upon him that these swiftly changing issues are but the more or less accidental outcrops of a great crisis in human affairs - a transition from one age to another age in the history of mankind.

Such a recognition is of great practical importance.

(a) take the field of foreign affairs. Some of you may have heard Mr. Anthony Eden say in a recent broadcast:

"It is utterly futile to imagine that we are involved in a crisis which may pass as it has come. We are involved in a crisis of humanity over the world. We are living in one of those great periods of history which are awe-inspiring in their responsibilities and their consequences. Stupendous forces are let loose, hurricane forces."

What can be called the official weather forecast in Downing Street strikes an altogether different note, as you know. Nobody in the City who has a business reputation to lose would care to admit that he believed in anything as unbusinesslike as the crisis of humanity or, incidentally, would worry about it if it existed. Instead, he confidently assumes that the present external difficulties of this country are in no way different from those of the pre-war

days; and that the one and only way of coping with the recognised dangers is the traditional method of armaments, <sup>every thing</sup> ~~else~~ <sup>being needed</sup> ~~superfluous ideology~~.

Now, if Mr. Eden's view is correct, then such an approach to foreign affairs necessarily implies great practical dangers. For, if our period of history is essentially different from the age before, then the usual diplomatic methods upon which this country <sup>used</sup> ~~could~~ formerly <sup>to</sup> rely may have become ineffective <sup>and</sup> ~~indeed~~, reliance upon them may prove a grievous mistake.

(b) But quite apart from the requirements of a successful foreign policy, the effectiveness of ~~the~~ active and passive defence measures may also depend upon a right appreciation of the nature of ~~our~~ our time. Let me quote again from Mr. Edens speech:

"I am a convinced believer in democracy, and yet it would be foolish, perhaps fatal, to the survival of democracy, to ignore the stupendous achievements realised under other forms of government....Their methods can not be ours but we should not fail to note the passionate fervour with which they pursue their purposes...The lesson is there to read. If we uphold our ideals, our conception of life, both national and international, if we are to see them prevail, then a comparable effort must be made by us and an equal spirit roused."

Obviously, one of the immediate results of such a passionate fervour and such a spirit of disciplined sacrifice might be to equip ~~this~~ this country with means of defence comparable to those of the totalitarian state. Especially in the field of protection against air-attack. <sup>and the</sup> The spirit ~~and~~/discipline in the masses is everything.

Not only the political and diplomatic, but the very military safety of democratic countries may depend upon the degree, in which public opinion can be made to realise the true nature of ~~the~~ ~~the~~ the.



*Great* crisis through which mankind is passing at present.

(c) A most important consequence follows. It may become vitally important to develop a new understanding of politics in the masses of the people, and, in order to achieve ~~such an understanding~~, to introduce new and effective methods of political training and political education in democratic countries.

It is especially at this point that a clear recognition of the critical nature of our times must be of vital importance. In times such as these no other but realist and objective methods can lead to an adequate understanding of events. By a realist method we mean an analysis of events which recognises the objective nature of the process of human history, and therefore, necessarily <sup>implies</sup> ~~assumes~~ that the great turning-points of history are not simply the outcome of the wishes or whims of individuals or multitudes, but the more or less adequate ~~response~~ <sup>however painful the fulfilment of these needs may be</sup> response to the objective needs of a civilization. The reasons of ~~the~~ crisis of mankind ~~over the world~~ must lie deeper than either ~~the~~ the passions or ambitions of individuals however influential they ~~may~~ be or ~~the~~ the predilections of groups or classes for one ideology ~~or~~ <sup>as against an</sup> other, or any other subjective factor ~~of a similar kind~~; - they <sup>be inherent</sup> must ~~lie~~ in the objective nature of the problems <sup>for which</sup> mankind must work out a solution ~~for~~ or else, perish.

We will point out later on <sup>in this series</sup> that in our view that crucial problem is nothing more or less than the working out of a new international organisation of economic life on this planet to replace ~~that~~ <sup>under which we have grown up</sup> international economic organisation, which has passed away for ever.

the  
But whatever/precise~~manner~~ manner of defining the ultimate crisis may be, the realist ~~man~~ method will take us a long way towards the ascertaining of the ~~objective~~ features of the present great crisis.

Firstly we will deal with the general pattern of international politics in our time;

Secondly, with the position ~~that~~ the Great Powers <sup>are</sup> occupying in that pattern;

Thirdly, with the more exact definition of <sup>that position</sup> ~~the relationship~~ of the Great Powers to one another in terms of the Versailles Treaty and its revision <sup>late</sup> system.

## I.

### The Pattern of international Politics

A) The most obvious fact concerning our period of history is that we <sup>are</sup> ~~have~~ passed <sup>long</sup> out of ~~the~~ <sup>an</sup> age of purely national conflict ~~are passing~~ into a period in which social conflict is being added to the national.

National conflict continues to dominate the external ~~relations~~ relations of states, but <sup>invariably</sup> social conflict is tending to complicate the issues.

1. National states are making use of their common <sup>attitude</sup> ~~sentiment~~ in the social conflict to cement their national alignments as in the case of the German, Italian, Japanese Anti-Comintern Pact. #

2. Social slogans are ~~used~~ <sup>used</sup> in the service of national

purposes of the charge of Bolshevism levelled against Czechoslovakia in order to force her out of ~~her~~<sup>her</sup> alliance with France.  
 strife is

3. Civil ~~war~~ being fomented ~~in~~ in order to further national interests.

B. This leads us to the ~~second~~<sup>an other</sup> feature of our period of history: the overlapping of ~~war between nations~~<sup>war between nations</sup> and civil war. This intersection of war between nations and civil war in our time bears a close resemblance to the age of the religious wars. National governments were then relying on the support of their co-religionists within the enemy country and made common cause with them against the enemy government. On the other hand national states ~~made~~ sometimes made use of religious factions of an other than their own religion in order to further their own national policy.

The Japanese in China, the Italians and Germans in Spain, the Germans in Czechoslovakia are lending support to internal factions. No doubt Soviet Russia, ~~or even perhaps~~<sup>or even</sup> the democratic countries, ~~in~~ in case of war, would ~~be~~ attempt to raise internal opposition within the totalitarian countries.

Thus ~~national war~~<sup>war between nations</sup> and civil war ~~are~~<sup>are</sup> ~~interlinked~~<sup>interlinked</sup> in our period. The two patterns are overlapping, and it is often impossible to disentangle the thread of events unless we account for the intersection of these ~~two~~<sup>two</sup> patterns.

Social wars ~~are~~<sup>bear</sup>, by their nature, a close similarity to religious wars, with which they often go hand in hand.



The transformation of the social system may present itself as a requirement of a prophetic religion. At other times ~~obvious~~ social problems as the abolition of slavery in the U.S.A. ~~in the middle of last century~~ may be linked by the contending parties with their religious outlook as was the case <sup>to some degree</sup> with the northern abolitionists and their New England puritan tradition <sup>on the one hand</sup> ~~as against~~ the latitudinarianism of the <sup>descendants of the</sup> Cavaliers ~~of the South~~. <sup>on the other</sup> ~~comparative~~ <sup>episcopalian</sup>

## II.

The position of the Great Powers in the new pattern.

Germany takes a leading part in both the national and the social conflict. She is <sup>the predominant</sup> ~~the leading~~ power in the so-called revisionist group which is directed against France, while she <sup>is also</sup> ~~acting~~ <sup>as a driving force</sup> ~~as the initiator~~ in the Fascist front ~~against~~ Russia. It is this twofold ~~aspect~~ of Third Reich policy which brings France and Soviet Russia together. The one feels endangered <sup>for the</sup> national ~~aspects~~, the other <sup>for social reasons</sup> ~~the social aspects~~.

It is, <sup>especially</sup> ~~in~~ <sup>her</sup> ~~capacity~~ <sup>of</sup> leadership in the social, anti-Communist alignment, that <sup>Germany</sup> ~~she~~ is in the position to link <sup>her</sup> foreign policy with the <sup>home affairs</sup> ~~internal~~ policy of various other countries. <sup>as e.g. in Spain</sup>

*But not in this capacity alone.*

In fact, we must distinguish between two types of interventionism:

<sup>racial</sup> ~~national~~ and social. Germany is practicing <sup>both</sup> at present, <sup>is claiming</sup> ~~she is~~

to be <sup>both</sup> the protector of <sup>211</sup> ~~the~~ Germans outside her frontiers and of the

<sup>anti-social</sup> ~~Fascist~~ forces in the world. It is this ~~double~~ twofold aspect of

interventionism, which, makes ~~it~~ so great an asset to Germany's

*this policy*

foreign policy at present. *It is one of the points on which the new compromise is*

Germany occupies a pivotal position in world politics to-day. She is the leader in *alignments* ~~both fronts~~ *and moreover* combines the principle of national foreign policy with the principle of interventionism, *and this again* both on *national* and on social grounds. *Social interventionism* ~~The latter~~ *is* part of the ~~present~~ *Communist* outlook too, though at present *Spain* ~~Russia~~ is not stressing this aspect of her foreign policy. Still her help for the ~~Spanish~~ *Spanish* government must be mainly ascribed to her concern about the growing influence of the Fascist powers in the international field. *Incidentally, the* democratic powers are *as Soviet Russia* just as anxious to-day to disclaim any intention ~~of a~~ *of a* policy of interventionism. in favour of the democratic forces in other countries. In view of the objective nature of the connection between national ~~and~~ *conflict* and social policy in our time, it is doubtful whether the self-denying attitude of the democratic powers ~~can~~ should be regarded as an asset to their ~~foreign~~ *foreign* policy or rather as a proof of the remarkable success of Fascist methods in foreign ~~policy~~ *affairs*; indeed it may be doubted, whether the democratic countries will be able to ~~continue on~~ *continue* this self-denying ~~policy~~ *policy* indefinitely. If not, then ~~their present attitude~~ *might* their present attitude *might* appear in the retrospect as an attempt to try to do ~~that which is~~ *that which is* impossible, with the consequent draw-back of ~~doing~~ *having to do* the inevitable, when it is ~~too~~ *too* late.

### III.

#### The Versailles Treaty and its revision.

This is the main pattern of history in our time. This is the ~~media~~ *media* in which ~~Germany~~ *Germany*, the pivotal state in this pattern, ~~fits into this pattern.~~ *fits into this pattern.* Our third question ~~in connection with~~ *regards* the historical background of this develop



ment. What exactly was the ~~moment~~ <sup>defunct</sup> role of the Versailles Treaty <sup>system</sup> in bringing about this ~~result~~?  
~~What present situation?~~

More often than not the Versailles Treaty is made directly responsible for the rise of National Socialism in Germany and <sup>thus,</sup> implicitly for the aims and methods of the Third Reich. How much truth is there in this view?

A) German National Socialism is a form of Fascism. It is the purest embodiment of the anti-socialist dictatorship principle in the world.

As a form of Fascist dictatorship Nazism can not be put down to the Versailles Treaty, for as ~~often~~ often happens, to the mentality of the German people.

To quote a letter-writer in The New Statesman:

"The Versailles Treaty is hardly more responsible for the Nazis in Germany than it is for the Younger Officers and other Fascist movements in Japan, for Signor Mussolini, for the Belgian Rexists, the Dutch Nazis, the Rumanian Iron Guards, the Dictatorship of the Colonels in Poland, Colonel De La Roque and the "Francistes" across the Channel..." *The list could be indefinitely continued,*

Obviously there is not the slightest connection between the Peace Treaties and <sup>rise of</sup> ~~the great majority of the Fascist~~ <sup>in the world.</sup>

*The position is quite similar concerning*  
~~The same,~~ incidentally, ~~is true of~~ the popular notion of the alleged connection between ~~Nazism~~ <sup>German Fascism in Germany</sup> and the militarist mentality of the German people, their Prussian traditions. Italian Fascism is, of course, ~~on the same account~~ <sup>coloured by</sup> put down to the Italian temperament and Southern romanticism; Japanese Army Fascism to the <sup>whole hearted</sup> well-known Samurai traditions of the Feudal nobility. Some two dozen various Fascisms are thus accounted for by the entirely different, and, in fact unique mentalities



of the peoples concerned. *It is a method equally applicable to all countries - before the present*  
 Fascism, like Feudalism, Capitalism, or the modern working-  
 class movement, *is* a world-wide phenomenon mainly determined by general  
 reasons of a general order.

*Pure* Feudalism ~~in France~~ was very different from the material  
 system in England under the Normans, Chinese Feudalism  
 was very different from Prussian, Japanese or ~~Persian~~  
 from Spanish or Polish feudalism. And yet who would

doubt that they were ~~different~~ *different* forms of the same system  
~~of land tenure linked with military and administrative~~  
 similar in essence but different ~~in the~~ *in the* circumstances  
 of their development, the ~~forms~~ *forms* of their institutions, then  
 the methods ~~used in them~~ *used?*

Or take Capitalism. Who would doubt that for all the  
 differences between ~~English~~ *English* and Japanese, Indian and  
 French capitalism they are ~~all~~ *all* essentially the same -  
~~machine production under the private ownership of the means of produc-~~  
 tion under the private ~~ownership~~ *ownership* of the means of produc-  
 tion - while the circumstances of their rise, the forms  
 which they may assume and the methods used may be ~~very~~ *very*  
 different ~~indeed~~.

The same applies to Fascism. Fascism is a tendency  
 inherent in ~~our present economic system~~ *our present economic system*  
 . It is a phenomenon of a general order, arising from  
 general ~~causes~~ *causes*. But the ~~way~~ *way* it arises in a  
 definite country, ~~more~~ *more* precise institutional forms, the  
 methods which it may adopt in order to secure its victory,  
 will be dependent upon ~~chiefly two factors~~ *chiefly two factors* the  
 historical situation and the mentality of the people.  
~~Thus with available we don't today~~  
 Still we do not wish today that the spectacular ~~rise~~  
 of rise of Fascism in Germany, ~~the~~ *the* politics of its  
 first three years ~~was~~ *was* largely influenced by the  
 historical antecedents i.e. mainly the Versailles Treaty  
 System and the post war policy of the Allies, just as  
 its institutional forms and ~~methods~~ *methods* may have  
 been ~~influenced~~ *influenced* by the ~~entire~~ *entire* situation.

But does this also imply that the aims of the Third Reich in the international field and the ~~the kinds of methods~~ we have described are also an outcome of the provisions of the Versailles Treaty and of the post War policy of the Allies towards Germany?

*The answer:*

The post-War period of 20 years falls into two <sup>distinct</sup> periods.

1. The Versailles Treaty system, 1918-1932, and
2. The <sup>rise of Nazi Germany</sup> ~~Third Reich~~ (1933 and after)

It is ~~of the greatest importance~~ to realise ~~precisely~~ where the weakness of the so-called Versailles system lay. *In the retrospect this is much easier than it appeared to be at the time.*

The Germans defeated and deprived of money (Reparations), <sup>including colonies</sup> territory (territorial revision) and weapons (disarmament).

Such a state of affairs could have been maintained <sup>if it had been</sup> only with the help of superior forces (occupation, dismemberment or other extreme and, in the circumstances, <sup>obviously</sup> ~~utterly~~ nonsensical <sup>self-preserving</sup> measures). This, anyway, impossible in view of American and British withdrawal from the promised ~~all~~ alliance with France.

Instead, an entirely new kind of safeguard for the Treaty status quo was established in the League of Nations based on the principles of the Covenant, i.e., the rule of law upheld by sanctions, applied to the aggressor. This is the principle of collective security.

*created itself*  
~~proved~~ fatefully. ~~In reality~~ It had been established by the victorious generals as a purely military measure, in order to keep the vanquished in a state of impotence.

But, incidentally, <sup>it also</sup> ~~the unilateral disarmament of the defeated countries~~ made



the Covenant unworkable. *Why?*

The League <sup>was</sup> based on the principle of a voluntary association of nations.

Equality of status and condition of such an association.

Whatever we may think of the moral standing of a disarmed country, its political and legal standing is necessarily lower than that of countries which have a right to be armed.

Thus disarmament which was on the one hand made to appear as the first step towards a new world was in reality a fateful ~~reactionary~~ <sup>of power politics</sup> measure which prevented the establishment of the League of Nations on a sound foundation.

In the retrospect there can be no doubt ~~about this~~, that neither reparations, not the territorial provisions <sup>with colonies</sup> of the Treaty, but unilateral permanent disarmament was the <sup>fatal</sup> weakness of the so-called Treaty system. Reparations have disappeared; as to the territorial provisions, only those concerning the Eastern frontier were <sup>ever</sup> ~~seriously~~ <sup>sailed</sup> in question. And it is precisely in this region that Germany has found it not impossible to make a long-term arrangement with her Eastern neighbour.

The gap between the <sup>system</sup> ~~gap~~ of force and violence and that of the rule of law bridged by the promise of the victorious countries to disarm voluntarily. When this proved a vain promise, the so-called system passed away as if it had never existed. For, in fact, it had not. The Emperor's new clothes.



Whatever the régime in Germany, it would have to deal with this problem. So far it is entirely true to say that the Versailles Treaty system and the unimaginative and ~~narrow-minded~~ <sup>narrow</sup> treatment dealt out <sup>to Germany</sup> by successive Allied governments, especially by France ~~and England~~, was a cause of the German upheaval.

But ~~under~~ <sup>on the</sup> same showing it is ~~more~~ also clear that the task of such a movement was essentially fulfilled with the achievement of equality of status, i.e., the liquidation of the military clauses of the Treaty including the Rheinland provisions.

It is mere self-delusion to imagine that the aims and, especially the methods of the Third Reich can be deduced from the Versailles Treaty and the <sup>infernal</sup> ~~Post War~~ Treatment of Germany. If this were true matters would be very much simpler than they are.

The aims of the Third Reich are in fact very much more nearly a continuation of Germany's pre-War as well as wartime aims than anything else. The opposite <sup>assumption</sup> ~~assumption~~, so wide spread in foreign countries, was one of the greatest assets of German foreign policy in recent years.

German foreign policy <sup>is not explained</sup> ~~can not be understood~~ by the past. It must be understood in the light of the future. Germany's great strength lies in this fact. <sup>This we must refuse above all before we can</sup> ~~the recognition of the fact~~ <sup>face</sup> up to the tasks of our time in a realist spirit.

-----

# Expansion of France within New pattern

Mr. Chairman,

## 1. Introductory:

<sup>official</sup> In ~~methodical~~ scrutinizing the ~~comments~~ ~~of the press~~ ~~on the Rome speeches~~ I gathered the following conviction: The official press <sup>is</sup> trying to discover important hidden points of differences between the two speeches which I, personally, failed to perceive. The government is trying to <sup>convince</sup> ~~prove to~~ itself and ~~the~~ the country that the Anglo-Italian agreement made a world of ~~a~~ difference to Italy's attitude in the Rome talks.

This is a typical instance of the kind of realism by which the official policy is inspired. ~~Indistinguishable from a consistent method of self-delusion of the Court type.~~

<sup>have an</sup> Here is ~~an~~ example of the truth of our assertion concerning the practical relevance of ~~the right kind of~~ realism in foreign affairs. In reality it was sheer illusionism to expect the attitude of the dictators to be other than it was. The politics and diplomacy of a past age must prove not only futile but positively dangerous under such conditions. They are <sup>in reality</sup> an elaborate method of self-delusion ~~of~~ which ~~that~~ the patient ~~unfortunates~~ <sup>small</sup> ~~unfortunates~~ is the victim.

## 2. Historical realism

I submit that <sup>main reason</sup> ~~the~~ ~~of~~ such self-delusion is the persistent refusal to accept <sup>a realistic outlook in history.</sup> ~~the fact~~ ~~that~~ ~~of a crisis of humanity as the root cause~~ of the present world situation.

~~This crisis opens up a new age in the history of mankind.~~

~~A realistic understanding of~~ <sup>the process of history.</sup> ~~the process of history~~ implies an analysis of events which recognises the objective nature of ~~the process of history.~~ <sup>the process of history.</sup>







*Let us sum up the main*

~~3) The objective features of the present period:~~

3) ~~The pattern of international politics~~ characterised in our time *by the following:*

aa. <sup>*we are*</sup> ~~passing out of an age of purely national conflicts into~~ a period in which social conflict is being added to the national. National conflict continues to dominate the external relations of state, but, inevitably, social conflict is tending to complicate the issues. *in more than one way*

bb. Accordingly, there is ~~an~~ overlapping of war between nations and civil war, the great parallel to this being, of course, the age of religious wars. To the historical realist a parallel between social wars based on the problem of industrial and economic organization and religious wars, often, as they are, based on the demand ~~for~~ <sup>*for*</sup> a change in the whole of society, ~~is does not appear far-fetched.~~ <sup>*it does not appear far-fetched.*</sup> (Only the realism of ~~the City~~ <sup>*the City*</sup> contrasts philosophy <sup>*and*</sup> ~~and business and~~ <sup>*business*</sup> ~~and~~ <sup>*reveals*</sup> ~~inward~~ <sup>*inward*</sup> their/conviction that the material aspect of human existence presupposes the unreality of ~~religion~~ <sup>*philosophy*</sup>. This, again, may be ~~very~~ <sup>*correct*</sup> true under the economic conditions under which thinking goes on in the ~~City~~ <sup>*the City*</sup>, conditions, however, which ~~the City~~ <sup>*the City*</sup> incorrectly assume to be eternal).

However this may be it is a fact that wars between nations are to-day caused both by national and by social reasons and that, at the same time, wars between nations and civil wars tend to intersect in the pattern of ~~the~~ world politics.

*Our best test was also to see*

~~The position of the Great Powers in the pattern, is charac-~~

#### 4. Germany's position.

aa. Germany taking a leading part in both the national and the social conflict. ~~and~~ She stands for interventionism, both racial and social-protector of ~~the~~ Germans and anti-socialists. The great asset of her foreign policy is this connection/ between foreign policy proper and interventionism.

bb. The democratic powers <sup>are</sup> disclaiming interventionism. This may prove a fatal weakness in view of the realities underlying this connection. *was seen way, national & social in this time*

The role of the Great Powers and the late Versailles Treaty system.

aa. Neither Fascism (National Socialism) nor the aims and methods of the Third Reich accounted for by 1. the provisions of the Versailles Treaty or 2. the post War treatment of Germany by the ~~the~~ Allies. On the other hand

1. ~~the manner~~ *the manner*  
bb. ~~at which~~ *at which* Fascism arose in Germany; 2. ~~the~~ *the forms of its* peculiar institutions; 3. its method and ideology accounted for by 1. the above mentioned historic antecedents and 2. national mentality.

The aims and methods of the Third Reich connected not so much with the defunct Versailles Treaty as with Germany's pre-War and War time aims combined with new methods appropriate to the nature of the present crisis. *the Third Reich is* Germany in fact trying to exploit the crisis of humanity to her own national ends by attempting to force a false solution of this crisis in *in fascism*.

*Do this in with return late on. Let in our order today the position of the other great powers in relation to the U.S.*



4. The responsibilities for the break-down of the post War equilibrium.

It will take us right into the heart of the realities of the present situation if we try to answer the question Could this break-down have been averted and how?

Once the attempts at persuading the victorious countries to disarm voluntarily had failed, the collapse of the so-called Treaty system was inevitable. Or, rather, such a failure was ~~identical with~~ the collapse of the system. The permanent unilateral disarmament of one part of the world while the other continued to consist of armed sovereign powers was a ~~complete impossibility~~ <sup>in itself as effecting a 2nd world war</sup>. But was a peaceful and constructive liquidation of this ~~impossible~~ <sup>possible</sup> situation not ~~possible~~ and if so, in what manner could it have been achieved?

The answer is, simply, this. Two things were needed to achieve this end: Some measure of revision and some measure of collective security. The ~~great~~ difficulty was that neither ~~the one without the other~~ was of much use without the other and that it was moreover politically ~~impossible~~ <sup>unpracticable</sup> to go ahead with the one without the other.

The English stood for revision, the French for Security. The English refused to offer guarantees for a status quo ~~which~~ <sup>to be permanent.</sup> ~~which~~ they did not believe (e.g. Germany's Eastern frontiers. )

The French were reluctant to allow any increase in Germany's strength unless her (France's) security was safeguarded.

*tendency found everywhere*  
England's revisionist ~~line was expressed~~ in various ways.

- a. diplomatic support to the defeated countries, *Germany*, Bulgaria, Hungary, Austria. (all except Turkey)
- b. Reparations. of. 1. Balfour-declaration.  
 2. opposing sanctions (Curzon v. Poincare)  
 3. Russia (Lloyd George v. Millerand after the dismal end of Churchills inter-ventions. )
- c. Minority issues in Poland and the Succession States.
- d. the various special issues under the Treaties as
  - 1. Saar
  - 2. Danzig, etc.
- e. The Anschluss
- f. Danubian plans.

~~g. refusing to accept any plan of European security on a basis of discussion in which security was safeguarded~~  
 of ~~the~~ the unrevised status quo *← the →*

The French government opposed revision and pressed for security. *vj*

- a. for regional pacts of mutual assistance ( to close the gaps of the Covenant concerning military sanctions)
- b. Arbitration schemes in order to designate the international law-breaker as the aggressor
- c. putting forward plans for an international League force for an international air-force, an international police and other instruments of an effective international executive.

The French argument  
 to fulfil

- a. failure ~~and~~ *Anglo-American* promises of military alliance.
- b. the League of nations inadequate, ineffective and incomplete.
- c. ~~international organization~~ *efforts at* ~~the~~ *Anglo-American* peace consistently sabotaged  
*Anglo-American powers.*



The English argument

- a. Increasing impatience with French security craze.<sup>4</sup>
- b. objections to sanction commitments
  - aa. Great Britains world wide interests in trade .
  - bb. consequent preeminence as a naval power predestined to become the gendarme of the League under the Covenant.
  - cc. Danger of a conflict with the U.S.A. in view of their doctrine concerning the Freedom of the Sea.
  - dd. Formal commitments contrary to ~~national~~ <sup>national</sup> traditional policy *(except for)*

5. Disarmament and reform of the League.

The revision versus security issue was brought to a head on the crucial problem of disarmament.

The British Government was prepared to revise the disarmament clauses of the Treaty . i.e., to agree to German rearmament but the French were not prepared to agree unless England <sup>consented</sup> ~~offered~~ additional security.

The present position as you know, is, that France had to bear with a very much greater degree of German ~~armament~~ rearmament and England had to agree to a very much greater measure of military commitments to French security than France had suggested at the time.

A simultaneous ~~uninterrupted~~ re-armament of Germany and establishment of collective security (both, of course, gradually achieved) might have resulted in a peaceful and constructive liquidation of the so-called Treaty system.

But in France the nationalists and conservatives did not want to hear of revision at the price of national egotism; in Great Britain the nationalists, i.e. the Tories and Die-hards would not hear of League of Nations commitments at the price of sacrificing isolationism.

But was the Left very much more helpful? True, the Labour Party strove, with all its might, to strengthen the League and, thereby, to increase collective security. But as to the crucial problem of disarmament it can hardly be said to have ever realised its implications. ~~Agreed~~ <sup>Agreed</sup>, by standing whole-heartedly for disarmament it tried to strengthen the link between the League of Nations Covenant and the Treaty proper; if it had succeeded, the non-existent system of Versailles would have been ~~actually~~ transformed into a coherent whole, - the basis of a new world order.

But, frankly, did the Labour Party seriously envisage an alternative policy? What ~~is~~ <sup>was</sup> ~~the purpose~~, in the ~~certainly not~~ <sup>far from</sup> improbable case that the voluntary disarmament of the victorious powers should not prove possible?

It did not. Both revision and collective security would entail armaments. 1) Collective security would need an armed League executive,



in fact national armaments under League control and supervision. The Labour Party never faced up to this implication. It professed to be a Pacifist party and ~~eventually~~ <sup>violently</sup> ultimately succeeded in <sup>so closely</sup> linking socialism with pacifism ~~in the minds~~ in the minds of the people, that when Soviet - Russia, a new state surrounded with heavily armed enemies, started to build a powerful army, many Labour people doubted on this account whether ~~the economic system of~~ Russia was genuinely socialist!

b) But not only collective security, revision also entailed approval of armaments. We have tried to show, how essentially Germany's claims were linked with her desire to be allowed to be armed <sup>in an armed</sup> world. <sup>She never left in England</sup> The Labour Party rigidly refused to face up to the necessity of German rearmament, ~~thus~~ <sup>her</sup> insistence on disarmament ~~really implied that~~ <sup>her</sup> readiness to agree to revision was <sup>almost</sup> ~~really~~ <sup>irrelevant</sup>.

Let us consider for a moment the <sup>important</sup> ~~far-reaching~~ consequences of this lack of realism in the outlook of Labour. Its pacifist idealism was detached from reality; it was <sup>more</sup> ~~pseudo~~ - idealism. <sup>terms of fact</sup> In reality it meant that the Labour Party ~~refused to accept~~ <sup>more</sup> the material and <sup>more</sup> ~~real~~ <sup>price</sup> of a new world order. That it would continue to <sup>imagine</sup> ~~insist~~ that it could/ban force and violence from <sup>an anarchic</sup> ~~the~~ world ~~without~~ <sup>simply</sup> first setting up ~~an~~ <sup>of things</sup> order in which ~~the~~ <sup>a world</sup> force and violence used by the powerful to subject the weak would be replaced by ~~an international order based on~~ <sup>social</sup> justice, in which ~~the~~ <sup>a</sup> force and violence would be reduced to the role of safeguarding a just order.

-22-

Apart from the justified and realist attempt ~~to~~ to force disarmament upon the victorious countries, the Labour Party's contribution was not such that ~~it would~~ in the retrospect, be possible to saddle the Tories and Die hards with the sole responsibility ~~on the failure~~ for the failure of this country to achieve a constructive solution. Both revision and collective security implied the acceptance of some measure of armaments. Pacifism has a heavy responsibility to carry in this ~~respect~~ respect.

#### 6. Reform of the League.

The same failure to substantiate a constructive solution is evident in the problem of the League itself.

France was forcing the League to the fore as a lever of collective security. §16

England under the slogan of no ~~new~~ new commitments and revision was consistently sabotaging the strengthening of the League. §19.

Article 16:1 (Should any member of the League resort to war in disregard of its covenants under §§12, 13 or 15, it shall ipso facto be deemed to have committed an act of war against all other members of the League, which hereby undertake immediately to subject it to the severance of all trade or financial relations the prohibition of all intercourse between their nationals and the national of the covenant breaking state and the prevention of all financial commercial or personal intercourse between the nationals of the covenant breaking state and the nationals of any other state whether a member of the League or not.

2, It shall be the duty of the council in such case to recommend to the several governments concerned what effective military naval or air force the members of the League shall severally contribute to the armed forces to be used to protect the Covenants of the League."

Article 19 : "The Assembly may from time to time advise the reconsideration by members of the League of Treaties which have become inapplicable and the consideration of international conditions whose continuance might endanger the peace of the world."



England asked for the implementation of Artl. 19; France for the instrumentation of Article 16. England was as slow to do the one as France was to do the other.

The same question is put also in another way. This also has not lost its topical interest. Whether universality or effective sanctions were more essential? Obviously universality would make sanctions almost unnecessary. ~~MINIMUM~~ On the other hand, experience has shown how little the presence of the aggressors has prevented them from aggressing. The truth is that League of the Nations who believe in the principles of the League because their interests ~~MINIMUM~~ run parallel to it, would be a much more likely starting point of a new order than a League universally containing all the nations, both the friends and the enemies of the League.

This same problem is ~~MINIMUM~~ was raised ~~MINIMUM~~ in a still other form by the Four ~~MINIMUM~~ Power Pact. of Mussolini.

#### 7. The Four Power Pact.

[The English and French controversy was <sup>a</sup> argument of partners who wished to establish a new peace order but where not agreed ~~MINIMUM~~ upon the priority of the essentials move; revision and collective security.

Ever since the ~~MINIMUM~~ emergence of the Third Reich an other and opposite tendency became noticeable viz towards the scrapping of the League and a frank return ~~MINIMUM~~ to the balance of power with all its dangers.

-24-

On 18th March 1933 Mussolini proposed a Four Power Pact:

- a Mediatization of the small powers
- b A Council of Four states.
- c Exclusion of Russia.
- d Some measure of revision to be forced upon France's smaller allies.



2 TACTICSAIMS AND METHODS OF THE THIRD REICH.Topical Introduction.

"Restraint in Rome" was followed by less restraint in Moscow.

Quote

- 1/ "The Times" on Italy and the Axis.-Ch. in the House.
- 2/ The Mussolini speech on ideological wars.  
and on value of the confirmation of the gentleman agreement.

A) AIMS.

We submit that the aims and methods of the Third Reich are not the outcome of the provisions of the Treaty or of the post-war treatment of Germany by the victorious powers, but are ~~merely~~ <sup>essentially</sup> the continuation of the pre-war tendencies and war aims of the ~~1914-18~~ Second Reich. <sup>only this time on a vastly larger scale.</sup> The ~~methods~~ <sup>aims</sup> are ~~entirely~~ <sup>new</sup> and up to date. <sup>The leaders of G.</sup> They are trying to use ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> underlying social conflict <sup>for the furtherance of</sup> Germany's ~~aims~~. This is a most realist approach on the part of the leaders of the Third Reich and should be met by <sup>on the part of other states</sup> an equally realist understanding of the nature of the present crisis. (1932)

Not revision.

Quotations from 15th Edition of Mein Kampf written almost 15 years ago.

Hitler on Revision.

"The demand for the restoration of our frontiers of 1914 is a political mistake of so ~~serious~~ <sup>deep</sup> consequences that it ~~is~~ <sup>is</sup> a crime." Denounced as lunacy.

<sup>should leaders take brand</sup> For these frontiers were not the frontiers Germany needed. They were ~~the~~ <sup>accidental</sup> frontiers <sup>due to</sup> the fortunes of war and ~~ought~~ <sup>ought</sup> in no way to be regarded as final...

The East.

Germany may accept them in some places, not in others.

Dietrich Klagges, is the ~~main~~ <sup>main</sup> authority on the teaching of history in the NAZI party. His book on this subject has not only the official party impressum, but is

recommended especially for purchase by all party organisations. Right handman of Alfred Rosenberg in his capacity of Education in Chief of the Nazi Party.

Klagges describes the outcome of the Great War as ultimately favorable to Germany. Why?

Quotation:

"In the Great War the wall that separated Germany from the East crumbled away with the dissolution of the Hapsburg Monarchy and of the Russian Empire". The latter phrase refers to two things:

- a) The splitting off of the Baltic ~~fringe~~ main body of the Russian State;
- b) The destruction of Tsarism which ~~was thought to~~ impaired the strength of Russia.

The ~~Wars~~ -Litovsk treaty showed clearly what was implied.

On the 3rd March 1918 Lenin and Trotsky ~~with~~ negotiated a Peace for ~~USSR~~ Russia with General Hoffmann.

In this Treaty Russia was made to renounce the territory of Poland, Lithuania, the Ukraine, Latvia, Estonia and Finland. As at that time the frontiers of Russia and the Ukraine were not established, Russia was in danger of losing further territory in the south.

In actual fact the organized anti-revolutionary movement of General Krasnov, supported by Germany, in the regions of the Don, Kuban and ~~Don~~ Don, and the rise of a federation of Caucasian states, likewise organised under German auspices, deprived Russia of the whole of her Southern territories and the Caucasus.

Hence this Peace Treaty denoted the complete dismemberment of European Russia, her complete detachment of the Black Sea and her almost complete detachment from the Baltic.

It brought into existence a number of states, which, though theoretically independent, were, in actual fact, subject to German domination.

This is clearly proved by the manner in which, with German help, the respective governments were set up; the manner in which, these States were economically to be closely fettered to Germany; and lastly, by the projected internal



administration of these states, in which a German police force was to remain, until conditions in them had been stabilised".

On the numbers of this "police".

(Historians History of the 1st World War Germany never defeated by Erich Ludendorff.

Ludendorff recounts how

Not only Russia but also Austria-Hungary, Bulgaria, Turkey, were made dependent upon Germany even before the end of the War. Finland - to keep the Bolsheviks from joining the Entente. The Caucasus - on account of oil. Rumania and the Ukraine - on account of oil and wheat. <sup>147</sup> had to be kept under military occupation.

Ludendorff says that this accounted for Germany's decisive weakness in the great attack in the West. He puts the number of divisions retained in the East at 20. But the Americans were already on their way. Germany could not wait. There were ~~only~~ hardly three weeks between March and the 21st of March 1918.

Unwittingly, Germany paid in 1918 a terrible price for her Eastern ambitions. Unwittingly, - because she remained unconscious of the true nature of this treaty.

In "Mein Kampf" Hitler tells how he <sup>abrogated</sup> prouided himself on the great propagandist effects of the parallels which he drew betw. the Vers. Treaty and the Tr. of Br.-Litovsk. : "I placed the two treaties side by side, compared them point by point, showed the positively boundless humanity of the ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> inhuman cruelty of the ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> pp 523-25. The difference between Nationalism and Hitlerian Reich. Old contrasted with Hitler's unwavering Eastern orientation.

"We, National Socialists, definitely renounce the foreign policy of pre-War Germany. We wish to continue where matters were left 600 years ago. We do not want to follow the Germanic invasions of the West and South but turn our eyes towards the East. We want to break, for ever, with the pre-War German policy which was directed towards colonial and trade interests and turn to the soil and settlement policy of the future. This means that we must turn our eyes towards Russia, and its small subjected neighbours, for nowhere else is there soil available in Europe. Let us follow up the hint which fate itself ~~is~~ <sup>has</sup> provided us with when Russia lapsed into Bolshevism."

This implies a renewal of the dismemberment of Russia and, consequently, a new order of things, not only in the Danubian Basin, but also in the Black Sea region - under German leadership. The dominant power in Europe would ~~unavoidably~~ <sup>necessarily</sup> become the dominant power in the Near East and Central Asia. Germany's destiny is the future of the world.

### Hitler's Political Testament.

ernal ivites

"The pol. Testament of the German nation defining its ext. act. ~~Hitler's Political Testament~~ for all times must run as foll.:"

"Do not suffer the existence of two Continental Powers in Europe. Any attempt to organize ~~another~~ other military power on Germany's frontiers is equalivalent ~~with~~ an attack on Germany herself. The same holds good even though military power should not be organized, but only a state set up which is capable of developing ~~into~~ into a military power. As long as this danger is present Germany is not only entitled, but ~~actually~~ in duty bound to prevent the coming into existence of such a state, and if such a state should have already been established, to break it up and destroy it. Remember that the strength of our people should never be allowed to reside in ~~colonial~~ possessions but ~~only~~ in the mother country itself on European soil. ~~Remember~~ regard our Germany as safe unless she has sufficient soil available for every one of her sons for centuries to come. Remember that the right to the soil ~~is the only right which is truly holy~~ to be cultivated by man is the only right which is truly holy, and that the most holy sacrifice in the world is that of the blood shed in the conquest of such soil."

oversea  
/ Refuse to

~~Hitler's Political Testament~~

"Mein Kampf" p 754.



-29-

B. THE Methods.

The methods of the third Reich are ~~of utmost radicalism and~~ *extremely effective because*  
~~at the same time intent on being~~ *they are carefully* adapted to the nature of our times.

- a. It is one of the tenets of Hitlerism, that the clue to Germany's destiny does not lie ~~in the field of foreign~~ *in the field of foreign* politics but in that of home politics. How a people reacts to the impact of history depends upon the substance and structure of its society. This ~~leading~~ *guiding* principle of Hitlerism makes the social aspect of German Fascism ~~an~~ an intrinsic feature of its policy. In other words, ~~far-reaching~~ social reform, even though only in the framework of capitalism is the condition of success in foreign affairs. *It is hopeless to expect to beat Russia unless at least some measure of reform has been carried through.*
- b. The external policy of the racial and fascist state is to be based on racial and social interventionism, not on the anachronistic methods of territorial conquest. In both respects uncompromising attitude. All Germans in the world should look to Germany. All opponents of the socialist working-class movement should look to Germany. However embarrassing these tenets may be in a given situation they are upheld at all costs. "Wherever our destiny may yet lead us ~~to our friend and foe~~ *our friend and foe* shall know us by our ~~beliefs~~ *conduct*." Whatever we may think of the human value of the

ideals embodied in the Nazi doctrine we should not overlook the great measure of reality <sup>behind implied in</sup> in the war of ideologies <sup>by</sup> which it is ~~being~~ engaged.

c. The Nazis present themselves as the protagonists of anti-socialism, because they ~~have~~ discovered the inherent tendency of <sup>capitalist</sup> democracy towards socialism. In offering themselves as the rallying point ~~to~~ the anti-socialist forces, classes and interests in modern society they can rely upon powerful allies <sup>within</sup> ~~inside~~ <sup>across the</sup> the countries with which they are in conflict.

*Counterrevolutionary subversion; economic pressure & political threats.*

C. Tactics.

National socialist tactics consist primarily in misleading other countries about <sup>these</sup> ~~the~~ aims and methods.

*ever before → All three on a higher potential more effective than Totalitarian economic*

(1) Tactics.

*Misleading about aims*

*{ Catholics  
Protestants  
Jews*

*{ Gold reserves  
foreign trade active favorable balance of trade  
credit*

*Faulhaber -*

*Niemöller -*

*Shacht*



-1-

SOVIET Russia - its Five Year 'plans, its foreign policy, its trials.

The lack of understanding of the Third Reich due to ignorance of Nazi philosophy. Lack of understanding of USSR due to ignorance of the political philosophy of the leading Russian statesmen.

I have some times heard asserted that Mussolini and Hitler could not be taken seriously as they had never had the benefit of a proper education. Well, this proved a mistake. is the case in respect to Russia. The Bolsheviks are known to be Marxists and therefore their ideas and notions are being ignored.

No greater mistake could be made. I submit that the problems of the Five Year Plans especially, the second and the foreign policy as well as the much discussed trials can be most easily understood if we concentrate upon the political philosophy of the various Bolshevik groups.

Who are the Bolsheviks? The majority SPR. London-Bruxelles Conference. Split on. What does this mean? The professional revolutionary.

The importance lies in the methods used and the degree of personal commitment involved.

E.g. Lenin in 1917 did not shrink from accepting the German government help and actually travelled to Russia under the protection of the troops of Imperialist Germany of Wilhelm II. When the Bolsheviks were denounced as German agents and documentary proof of these facts was produced, the Bolsheviks did not deny it, but simply pointed out that they had not come to become the tools of Germany militarism but German militarism as their instrument. And in Brest-Litovsk they showed that Lenin was right. 3rd Mar. 1918.

A conspirative party of this kind knows only one loyalty only, viz the loyalty to the revolution. Lenin never regarded himself as a Russian but as an internationalist revolutionary. If he defended Russian interests in the wars of intervention, it was on account of the revolutionary importance of Russia. In principle Lenin was prepared to sacrifice Russian national interests anytime to the interests of the world revolution. E.g. the Ural-Western Siberian Republic idea. Territory meant nothing; the idea was everything.

From this point of view the idea of treason simply does not arise. (Very similar to the English civil war period when both parties recognised an allegiance to their religion but not to their country. Cf. Catholics but also Protestants in relation to Foreign Powers).

It is not surprising to find that Lenin was holding out promises to Germany that their support will be rewarded by territorial concessions.

Lenin changes and is hiding. Trotsky was arrested 2 in prison. Lenin was not a conspirator.

Cafes = Elkan IV. p. 29. (Constantin)

The right wing strictly adhered to this idea: not to attempt to ~~establish~~ Socialism in Russia. <sup>Russia must first</sup> The Left wing adhered to the position not to ~~establish~~ Socialism in Russia <sup>alone</sup>; ~~the w.o. party~~ (attempt) <sup>to</sup> ~~wait for the beginning~~ there was no ~~clear~~ cleavage for the whole party adhered to the line that no attempt should be made to ~~establish~~ Socialism in Russia; <sup>the task of the party was to make use of the</sup> ~~position~~ in Russia to ~~prepare~~ <sup>prepare</sup> ~~the way~~ <sup>the way</sup> ~~for the~~ <sup>for the</sup> ~~revolution~~ <sup>revolution</sup> When by the middle of 1917 the Bolsheviks moved to the ~~position~~ that a middle class revolution was not enough, but they must ~~move~~ <sup>move</sup> towards the ~~achievement of~~ <sup>achievement of</sup> revolutionary democracy under the leadership of the revolutionary proletariat; the aim of this revolution was not the ~~complete~~ <sup>complete</sup> ~~out of the question~~ <sup>out of the question</sup>, but the carrying through of a socialist revolution <sup>in which the leadership of the working class is expressed in</sup> ~~in which the leadership of the working class is expressed in~~ fulfilling the demands of the socialist workers viz control of the works, interfering with speculation, putting order into production; preventing the big factory owners from sabotaging the revolution; ~~waiting for~~ to let loose world revolution in the wake of which Russia herself might proceed to a real socialist revolution.

Febr-March 17 In the first period the workers were allied with the <sup>whole peasantry</sup> ~~peasantry~~ against autocracy; <sup>for the bourgeois-democratic republic</sup> ~~for the bourgeois-democratic republic~~ In the second they were allied with the poorest peasants against the ~~bourgeois-democratic middle class~~ <sup>middle class</sup> and for a proletarian dictatorship. August 1917 The first was the democratic dictatorship; The second was called the "socialist" dictatorship. ... (in order to begin to make the most urgent steps towards socialism.)

G. Stalin (Russia)

In the beginning the strongest support was given to Lenin by Trotsky, who now joined the Bolshevik party. He had been the only Russian Socialist who had stood for a socialist revolution ever since 1905. His theory of the permanent revolution <sup>in Russia</sup> ~~theory~~ made two main assertions: 1) that in our epoch of history ~~the overthrowing of autocracy in Russia could not lead to a democratic republic, but would necessarily lead to a socialist revolution; 2) such a revolution however could not lead to the establishment of socialism in Russia alone~~ but would be the beginning of a world revolution in the course of which ~~Russia herself might also establish socialism.~~ So Trotsky's <sup>firm</sup> ~~firm~~ foresight as to the socialist character of the Russian revolution was ~~from the very beginning~~ <sup>from the very beginning</sup> linked with his firm conviction of the impossibility of establishing Socialism in one country, especially in a backward country like Russia.

Permanent Revolution



At the time, this discrepancy was without <sup>from</sup> consequences. Trotsky did not drop his theory of the permanent revolution. nor did he expressly ~~accept~~ <sup>accept</sup> Lenin's thesis of the necessity of an alliance of the socialist workers with the peasantry in an ~~agrarian~~ <sup>agrarian</sup> country.

For at that time ~~all~~ the Party was agreed that ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> socialist revolution in Russia meant a great effort at ~~launching~~ <sup>launching</sup> world revolution, for the survival of ~~Soviet~~ <sup>Soviet</sup> Russia against the advanced capitalist states was deemed out of the question <sup>arranged</sup>

Trotsky, as you know, had a very great part in organising the defence of Russia and overcoming the numerous armies of the interventionists.

In the next period of so-called War Communism Trotsky had his way, ~~also in other things~~: The actual economic system consisted in a Bread War, in the requisitioning of grain from the peasants. That this was incompatible with Lenin's idea of the alliance, is obvious. Lenin is known not to have favoured ~~War Communism~~ <sup>War Communism</sup>. But after all, practical needs were of more account than the ~~theoretical~~ <sup>theoretical</sup> theory of abolishing money and the like. <sup>(in War Communism)</sup>

The disastrous consequences of the interventions, the civil wars and ~~War Communism~~ <sup>War Communism</sup> lead to the ~~Nep~~ <sup>Nep</sup> i.e. the return to a free grain market and the end of requisitioning. This was entirely on the lines of the right, for it meant the ~~reintroduction~~ <sup>reintroduction</sup> of capitalism, even though only as a respite. Socialism was now out of the question.

<sup>to gain a breathing space.</sup> The Left under Trotsky fought this line, ~~but~~ <sup>but</sup> Lenin's authority carried weight even with them. Incidentally, most important economic concessions were offered to the capitalist powers in exchange for loans & other assistance. ~~Lenin was prepared to sacrifice an important part of sovereignty in order to obtain only by these means~~ <sup>Lenin was prepared to sacrifice an important part of sovereignty in order to obtain only by these means</sup> Soviet Russia's existence could be safeguarded, and the cause of the world revolution could be thus advanced. ~~Nonetheless, in view of Russia's primitive economic conditions, capitalism was regarded by Lenin as a progress compared with the actual economic condition of the country.~~

Nevertheless it was ~~clear~~ <sup>clear</sup> understood that the NEP could be nothing more than a breathing space. Unless the world revolution came to the rescue the ~~complete~~ <sup>complete</sup> return to capitalism with the consequent <sup>political</sup> counter-revolution was accepted as inevitable. As Lenin said, the small peasant farm <sup>only</sup> capitalism <sup>from</sup> ~~every pore~~ <sup>every pore</sup>.

<sup>It proved a short breathing space</sup> After Lenin's death the Party had lost its authoritative leader. There was the right wing under Bucharin, Rykov and Tomsky.

<sup>1921</sup> The Left wing under Karev, Sinoviev on the one hand, Trotsky and Pravskov, on the other. Stalin followed a middle line course.

<sup>tried to keep a non-alignment</sup>

It very soon became obvious that the NEP position could not be held indefinitely. Its advantages could be reaped only if no interference with peasant farming was allowed. Then, perhaps, the profit interest of the farmers might bring production back to pre-War level. But in that case ~~the socialist sector of industry~~ had to ~~disappear altogether~~. It would then be impossible to ~~recreate~~ the number of the industrial workers and the basis of the dictatorship could not ~~be~~ permanently maintained. The failure was most apparent in the light industries where the so called agricultural raw materials as flax hemp, wax, horn, began to ~~become~~ scarce. The NEP had either to be consistently applied, or discontinued. ~~As well as in the recent of~~

The right wing advised a further retreat and a more complete NEP. Bukharin's famous *Enrichissez vous* - to the peasants. There were tendencies towards a closer connection with Western capitalist powers.

The Left wing advised the opposite: a return to the pre-NEP, i.e. to the exploitation of the peasants through the workers of the towns and the use of so called administrative methods. At the same time, the policy of world revolution should be intensified at all costs.

Stalin and a small group of the centre took an entirely different line which until then ~~had been~~ regarded as impossible: the line of socialist construction in Russia irrespective of the course of events outside. This was the policy of the Five Year Plans and collectivisation.

The Five Year Plans should solve the industrial, the collectivisation the peasant problem.

This was a complete break with the traditional line of the Party.

Marx and Lenin. The latter convinced that he had been doing what Marx had advised. In truth he was doing what Marx ~~had~~ advised. Take the peasant question (Marx's strong prejudices on this question). Lenin's original contribution. The ~~Smy~~ ~~idea~~. Also the ~~the~~ concept of classes. Not two

Same with Stalin. Convinced that he followed in the footsteps of Lenin. In truth an original contribution to political ~~theory~~. The Socialism in one country idea ~~was~~ practically amounted to the attempt at making Russia into an industrial country, by her own means, without foreign loans and without dependence on foreign capitalist countries.

In theory this was impossible. Marxism meant the adjustment of politics to economic reality. This meant the complete reversal. No wonder that practically the whole of the old party refused to follow this line. Both the Right and the Left went into opposition and were convinced that the ruin of the revolution was inevitable. The Right wing saw in Stalin a traitor to the Russian people who would have to suffer for this. The Left traitor to the world revolution, because, obviously, this meant that Russia was for the time being not interested in it, and would have even to slow down in order to achieve success at home.



## Perilous Europe IV

MM Soviet - Russia.

*35-*  
 The predictions of the pessimists were fulfilled and overfulfilled. The strain on the resources of the country proved such that ~~the~~ widespread suffering became unavoidable. *Lowering of standards*

But the predictions of the pessimists were also falsified to an amazing ~~an almost~~ almost miraculous degree. In short the Five Year Plans were a success. Russia which ten years ago was of no account as an industrial country, ranks now ~~second in the world~~ *amongst the first.*

*very 120 mill t 950 Haul trucks 1935*  
 The 1937 harvest was the highest the country ever had. Grain for 240 million roubles was exported. *Overtake!*

Tractors in 1938. Stalingrad plus Charkov 25 000 caterpillars 50 HP

Chelyabinsk 16 000 heavy cater 65 HP

*Tanks* Kirov plant (late Putilov) 15 000 special cater potato cotton suagar beet

## Elektrik power

1913 1935 1936 1937

1,900 5,000 32,800 40,500  
 million KWH

These unique developments accompanied by two other *similar* almost unique changes *15 May 1936 - Stalin*

The one in the ~~field~~ of foreign policy, the other of home affairs.

The first was the complete change over from the world revolution line in foreign policy to at peace at almost all costs line since 1934. *1934 to 1937*

The second was the emergence of a unique conspiracy ~~in~~ the party itself which almost without any support in the Russian masses developed its organisation within the party to an amazing degree. *inside*

When by the *beginning* of 1936 the first trials began, the world stood puzzled and ~~against~~ at the spectacle.

In reality only that had happened *which* could ~~naturally~~ have been

36-

been expected to happen amongst people of this sort under circumstances such as these.

The men who had engineered the Russian revolution were not exactly ~~everyday~~ a common place generation. ~~They were~~ They were what the term implies - Russian revolutionaries. If a person who does not live for his personal comfort, nor for his personal success, not for even for power, but ~~entirely~~ ~~for the sake~~ for the sake of a cause in which he believes, may in some sense be called a saint, ~~when~~ ~~he~~ ~~quite~~ ~~and~~ ~~naturally~~ ~~lays~~ ~~down~~ ~~his~~ ~~life~~ for that cause, then I think it is only fair to say that the accused in the Moscow trials, more than once ~~men~~ ~~dedicated~~ ~~to~~ ~~the~~ ~~cause~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~Revolution~~ ~~one~~ ~~more~~ ~~of~~ ~~saints~~ ~~than~~ ~~of~~ ~~any~~ ~~other~~ ~~figure~~ ~~in~~ ~~public~~ ~~life~~. Of course they would not be Russians if at the same time ~~are~~ criminals of the most ~~revolting~~ type had not wormed their way into ranks of the revolutionaries. ~~think~~ think of Yagoda and perhaps some other figures of the second trial.

But after having said that, I think it is only fair to say that the responsibilities of the authorities towards the millions and millions of people whose lives were endangered and whose work was frustrated by the activities of the accused, was appalling. It is impossible to read the Verbatim Report of the Third trial without being convinced of the almost literal truth of ~~the~~ the accusations and at the same time not to feel that perhaps the most ~~monstrous~~ ~~gigantic~~ ~~criminal~~ ~~co~~ ~~conspiracy~~ ~~in~~ ~~the~~ ~~history~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~world~~ ~~has~~ ~~been~~ ~~brought~~ ~~to~~ ~~justice~~. But after all, what else could you have expected ~~when~~ ~~the~~ ~~proportions~~ ~~of~~ ~~this~~ ~~revolution~~ ~~are~~ ~~contrasted~~ with the English and French Revolutions (which after all also demanded their ~~price~~ toll of human life).

But now let me sum up the political result of these trials, as they have struck me especially after the Third Trial in which Bucharin and Rykov, Smirnov and Krestynki were involved.

1/ ~~No~~ ~~mysteries~~ ~~remained~~. The connection of Yagoda and of Tuchachewski to the Right wing conspirators is entirely clear. ~~Moreover~~ Ever since 1934 regular communications were held; ~~they~~ ~~carried~~ ~~on~~ ~~almost~~ ~~off~~ ~~the~~ ~~way~~;

2/ ~~Neither~~ ~~Trotsky~~ ~~nor~~ ~~Tuchachewski~~ ~~had~~ ~~any~~ ~~connection~~ ~~with~~ ~~the~~ ~~masses~~;

*as known got:*

Of the three conspiratorial groups only the Right held any connection with the masses: students, workers, peasants.

Neither Trotsky nor Tuchachewski had any (including the army)

The Right wing had White Russian, Uzbekistan and Turk connections. But no others.

The harm done was immense. And yet it was impossible to stop the volume of progress because nothing really spectacular could be achieved.

A colossal increase in the strength of the Union.  
Confer, the present situation.

*Socialism + is being built in Russia*



Notes on the socialist working-class movement.

The Bolsheviki.

Art. 1.

of the Statute of the London-Bruxelles Congress of 1903.

Whether

" a person supporting the Party and working under the control of the Party "

should be considered as a member, -

or whether ~~more~~ ~~was~~ was wanted :

" participation in the illegal organisation of the Party " and consequently throwing one's whole personality and existence into Party Work, which implies ~~complete~~ <sup>blind</sup> obedience to party discipline which is to be thought of as very strict. Centralisation called : democratic Centralisation was the corollary of this ~~attitude~~ <sup>attitude</sup>.

The organisation of the Communist Party thus constitutes a group of keen, self-sacrificing revolutionaries from the mass of the proletariat. ~~It is the Professional revolutionary.~~ But not Banguism (i.e. preparing (in secret) for a Putsch of a few who are making a present of power to the masses, as it were). No making of revolutions. The existence of a revolutionary process, is on the contrary, being assumed.

To prepare the revolution accelerate and speed it up, (NOT MAKE IT!) preparing the masses insofar as their ideas, their organisation and the tactics of the leadership are concerned

All this on the basis of the character of the period, because a revolutionary situation may turn up any time.

Such a party is neither a mere condition, nor a result of the revolutionary mass movement, but both condition and result.

38-  
Notes on the socialist working-class movement.

Stalin's Report at the Sixth Congress of the Bolshevik Party, in August 1917:.

"There was no power, there was no possibility of stopping the revolution half-way....

Several comrades have said that since capitalism is only feebly developed here, it is Utopian to raise the question of a socialist revolution. They would be right if it were not for the war, if it were not for the devastation, if the foundations of national economy had not been shaken. But these questions of interfering in the economic sphere are being raised in all countries as vital questions. In Germany this question has been raised and settled without the direct and active participation of the masses. It is quite otherwise here in Russia. Here economic collapse has assumed more ominous dimensions. On the other hand, in no other country has there ever been such freedom in time of war as here in Russia. Then, there is the high degree of organization of the workers: for example, in Petrograd, 66% of the workers are organized. Finally, in no other country has the proletariat such an extensive organisation as the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies. Under these circumstances it was impossible for the workers to refrain from interfering in economic life. This is the real reason why the question of the socialist revolution could arise here in Russia."

Lenin, (Marxism and Uprising), Written 26-27th Sept. 1917. (9-10 . Oct.)

"... the necessity of all power immediately passing into the hands of revolutionary democracy, headed by the revolutionary proletariat.

"Our declaration must be the briefest and sharpest formulation of this conclusion; it must connect up with the points in the programme of

- (1) peace to the people,
- (2) land to the peasants,
- (3) confiscation of scandalous profits,
- (4) and a halt to the scandalous damage to production done by the capitalists."

Lenin ((The crisis has matured), Written 12th Oct. 1917. (25th Oct)

"I am compelled to tender my resignation from the Central Committee which I hereby do leaving myself the freedom of propaganda in the lower ranks of the party and at the Party Congress."



## THE CIVIL WAR IN SPAIN.

In my two last lectures I intend to deal with the position in Czechoslovakia and in Spain. They are important by themselves and ~~moreover~~ <sup>moreover</sup> afford an outstanding instance of the modern pattern of ~~modern~~ international affairs: -the interweaving of national and civil wars; Interventionism becomes the rule. The Third Reich practices it both on racial grounds i.e. in reference to the Germans outside its borders, and on social grounds i.e. in reference to anti-Communism outside its borders. The first is ~~present~~ <sup>happening</sup> in Czechoslovakia; the second in Spain.

I wish to discuss the Danubian issues in relation to Great Britain's foreign policy next week. This discussion will necessarily ~~concentrate~~ centre on the Czech situation.

To-night I wish to discuss the Spanish problem mainly from point of view of social interventionism.

I submit that in view of the <sup>active international</sup> ~~solidarity~~ of the Fascist ~~movements~~ forces, democracy cannot maintain itself <sup>in any one country, unless it can</sup> in our time ~~except with~~

<sup>only count on the international</sup> ~~the~~ support of the democratic powers.

<sup>This implies</sup> ~~to-day~~ 1) that in Spain the issue is that of democracy versus autocracy; 2) that the Fascist powers are actively engaged in deciding this issue in favour of autocracy; 3) that democracy in Spain is in danger of succumbing to the combined internal and external forces of autocracy, <sup>mainly</sup> because the democracies are backward

appreciation  
in their ~~misappreciation~~ of the needs of the situation. Some people talk  
of ~~the~~ "war of ideologies" as if <sup>it was a</sup> ~~modern~~ political ideal. It is not. It  
is a political reality, and one of the most important ones of our time.  
The Fascist powers have a more advanced view of these realities than  
the leaders of the democratic powers. That is the main reason ~~for their~~  
signal  
of their successes in the sphere of foreign policy.

### I. A resumé of Spanish history of the XIX century.

The 1931 Republic was one of the many attempts to ~~make~~  
make Spain into a modern country. The struggle was <sup>between</sup> the liberal middle class + the  
working class + ~~and the Cortes~~ on the one hand, the ~~other~~ <sup>feudal and clerical</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>other</sup>.

When in 1814, after the downfall of the French revolution,  
the Holy Alliance brought <sup>Bourbons</sup> ~~the monarchy~~ and reaction back to Spain, it was  
the person of Ferdinand VII, that they ~~reappeared~~ made their reappearance  
in that country. "Death to liberty and the Constitution!" was the cry of  
the mob. "Hurrah for our chains!" was also heard.

The <sup>liberals</sup> ~~Liberals~~ who had fought <sup>against the French</sup> for the King and established the  
Cortes were arrested. The monks were leading the counter-revolution.  
The reintroduction of the Inquisition was foreshadowed. The secret society  
of the Exterminating Angels was hunting down the Liberals.

The Spain of 1814 became the Spain of 1808 i.e.

the Jesuits were recalled  
the clergy was reinstated <sup>in its</sup> ~~its~~ landed property  
Inquisition was reinstated,  
Camarilla was ruled by the Russian Ambassador.

Ship to fight the colonies were provided for by Russia.

1820 the insurrection of <sup>General</sup> ~~General~~ Rafael del Riego succeeds.  
The Constitution of 1812 reinstated. The King <sup>forgets</sup> ~~takes~~ the oath on it.



In Catalonia and Valencia troops had to guard the entrances to the monasteries day and night to prevent pillage and massacre. But Russia did not recognise the new régime. Only Great Britain did. Prussia and Austria the two other Fascist states sided with Russia of course.

*He started as ruler, Napoléon III in Spain, as Gorbachev did not.*  
The King and the Cortez continue to struggle for power. The Madrid Militia dealt a staggering blow to the royalist ~~reactionary~~ <sup>rebels</sup> in June 1822. 114 years later.

Whereupon in October 1822 the Holy Alliance <sup>now</sup> intervenes: France, Russia, Prussia, Austria, on the Congress of Verona. In spite of British protest. The Great Powers, <sup>who saw that taken a Gorbachev line under Lenin.</sup> except Britain, advise the government to release the King. The Cortez refuse. They leave for Seville.

The French reactionary monarchy, on the behest of the Holy Alliance marches into Spain with 95,000 infantry and 21,000 horse and occupy Madrid. There was talk of a "whitewash".

The historian <sup>sup</sup> writes: "The Prince of Angoulême made the white flag of France responsible for the organisation of the most odious system of persecution ever introduced <sup>in any country</sup>." Cadiz fell on September 23rd 1823. Ferdinand VII was back on the throne again. ~~King~~ <sup>King</sup>, the President of the free Cortez of Spain was dragged through the streets of Madrid in a basket at the tail of a ass; then he was hanged and quartered as if he were a felon. By the <sup>by the Commission for purification</sup> ~~thousand~~ <sup>imprisoned</sup> were the Liberals ~~and~~ <sup>and</sup> ~~some~~ <sup>some</sup> ~~other~~ <sup>other</sup> ~~calico~~ <sup>calico</sup>.

*middle class*  
*beginning start it as a civil war. According to the Encycl. Brit*  
*The last capital punishment was inflicted on a*  
*Quaker school master. He was hanged in 1826.*

-4-

- The struggle between the CORTEZ on the one hand, and reaction mainly clerical on the other runs right through the history of the XIXth century.
- 1/ The Cortez had been reintroduced in 1808 and the 1812 Constitution established representative government. In 1808 Napoleon entered Madrid, abolished feudalism and the Inquisition.
- 1812 . DESTROYED ON THE 13 MAY 1814 by Ferdinand VII.
- 2/ According to the Encyclop. Brit. the last capital a Quaker changed in 1826. The unfortunate Rafael de Riego succeeds and the 1812 constitution is re-stated.

1820 DESTROYED BY THE INTERVENTION of the Holy Alliance . 23rd September 1823.

Continuation

- 3/ Ferdinand dissolved ~~himself~~ his wife Christina, and here even more dissolute daughter Isabella I rule Spain. From 1833 to 1868. the legitimacy of all her children was doubted.
- 4/ ~~Spain~~ Christina ~~was~~ kept in with the Liberals because the Carlist pretender (her brother in law) was out and out clerical. The Cortez is divided into two hostile fractions, the moderados and the progressistas. Like the French moderates it means immoderately & reactionary, while the progressistas stood for the abolishment of the Inquisition.
- 1837 The Constitution of 1837 comes into being, which ~~is a~~ representative system, maintaining the army.

- 5/ ~~Isabella~~ Absolutism reintroduced by Isabella. Only the liberal factions of the ~~army~~ mitigate the reaction under the surface. She leaves the country in 1868.
- 1845 Revolution breaks out: Cortez re-established. James O'Connell, Protestant, comes to Madrid. Cortez, however, unimpaired, parliament.
- 6/ The Interregnum of General Prim and Serrano, the mild anarchy period

1868-70

- 7/ King Amadeo - liberal Monarchy. 1870-73.

- 8/ Republic under Castellar
- 1873

"Federalative republic for Spain with self-government for the single states as in Switzerland and the United States; separation of Church and State; proclamation of the rights of the citizen on the basis of a democratic Constitution and under the authority of the law."

The so-called Intransigents rose in Murcia; Cartagena held out for four months - exactly as the Anarchists now maintain under the FAI and POUM leadership.

- 1874 All the powers, except Russia, decided to recognise the Republican regime of General Serrano. 1874 But Serrano was not very successful against the Carlists.

1874

Alfonso XII proclaimed, January 14th, took over the government.

- 1876 THE NEW CONSTITUTION 3 - in force until 1923, the Dictatorship of Primo de Rivera.
- in force ~~under~~ 1933



-5-

- 1886-1902 The Regency of Maria Christina (widow of Alfonso XII)  
 Ardent Catholic. The Jesuits reach unsurpassed power  
 over education.  
 But universal suffrage introduced, trial by jury.
- 1902- 1931 Alfonso XIII the ~~MBM~~ intriguer, the man who ~~egg~~  
 egged on Primo de Rivera to the dictatorship experiment.  
 It was quite natural that the Republic was again introduced.

To sum up :

The history of XIXth century Spain is the history of autocracy supported by the Church against the liberal middle class represented by the Cortez. Everytime the Cortez regains power, the separation of Church and State is attempted. A counter-revolution follows, in which the Church plays three cards:

- a/ The ~~lack of~~ *lack of* ~~the~~ *liberals and republicans* ~~of the~~ *of the* ~~the~~ *the* consequent difficulty of establishing a modern administration under parliamentary control in Spain; *Calles*
- b/ the bigotted and fanatic attitude of part of the ~~the~~ *the*
- c/ the extreme anti-authoritarianism of part of the at least and free thinker's opposition ~~which~~ *for* ~~the~~ *the* ~~reactionaries~~ *reactionaries* ( regional alists, Intransigents, anarchists, to-day the Syndicalists and POUM members manouvred by the Trotzkyists).

## 2. The Third Republic. 1931 onwards.

In 1931 Alfonso XIII secretly encouraged Primo de Rivera's coup. The Constitution was abolished by a pronunciamiento. (The Juntas were to be abolished, and the Generals to rule in their own name.)

After seven years this regime collapsed. It had not achieved not much of account. The main tasks were still unsolved d) *The new constitution (1876)*

- a/ the reform of the land system;
- b/ the separation of Church and State (including the Schools)
- c/ the regulation of the regional autonomy demands of Catalonia, the Basques, Galicia, +

*administrative reform of local government  
 army reform*

1. Who were the new government? 2. What were the most urgent tasks? What did they achieve? Why did they not achieve more?

### 1. Who were the government?

A big radical middle class party, not much different from the French radical socialists; with two wings: a determined republican wing, who would side with the socialists to establish the Republic firmly under Azana, and a more conservative wing which would go back to the monarchy rather than allow the working class any real influence in the Republic.

#### Lerroux

The government on the whole a moderate republican government supported by the Socialists, but without their participation in the government. The Communists were practically non-existent;

the clericals and monarchists on the one hand, the syndicalists and anarchists on the other in the opposition (but the latter did not take part in elections).

### 2. Tasks *achievements, obstacles to future success.*

#### A Land

aa Some 75% of the population living on the soil. *an agricultural*  
Some 60% of the land not under cultivation. *excessive*  
67% of the land owned by 2% of the owners. *landless*  
of 24 million inhabitants some 3 million *wages*  
from 7 pence to 2/6 a day. *45-15% small*

bb About 1/2 of the land available for expropriation i.e. some 1,7 million acres were actually taken over by September 1932. when the compensation law was passed. Distribution began one year later, i.e. in the autumn of 1933.

cc The peasants use violence in order to hasten the expropriation goaded on by the clergy and the anarchists and syndicalists.

The landowners refuse to pay taxes, leave the land untilled thus increasing the economic difficulties of the government.  
(Sabotage)

aa Church 1931 half of the children educated by the Church.  
When March 1933 Bill closing Church schools is carried 500,000 children attending Church schools.

bb The greatest effort was made to meet the new demand for state schools;

cc the utmost opposition was offered by the clericals, the reactionaries and ~~the~~ the Lerroux radicals.  
Six republican chiefs, including the Radicals, the Conserv. Reps.

*April - May 33.*  
*Lerroux reluctant to sign the bill.*



-45-

-7-

C. The Army The 1812 constitution called for national army.

aa A general for every 18 soldiers.

Even when a liberal influence, essentially an irresponsible one.

1900 some 60% of budget went to the army; of this the officer received about 3/5 and the rest of the army 1/3, leaving less than 1/10 for material and manoeuvres".

(Marvaud, L'Espagne au XXieme siecle. Paris 1915. pp.195-6).

Law of Jurisdictions COMPROMISE.

All attacks and insults against army officers were to be judged by military courts, while offences against the country or the flag were left to civilian tribunals.

1907 committees of lesser officers of the infantry set up Juntas demanding army and other reforms.

bb The hypertrophic cavalry regiments reduced

later e.g. two cavalry regiments refuse to follow orders May 18 1936 27 officers arrested.

cc determined resistance of army chiefs and reactionaries.

Summing up : Why did they not achieve more?

~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ "Current Affairs" December 1933. Spain's Venture in Democracy ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ quoted ~~XXXXXX~~ appreciatively by one of the most reactionary sources on the Spanish question (at that time i.e. the News Bulletin of the Institute of International Affairs).

The revolutionary intent of the Constitutional Assembly was wrecked on the two rocks of Church and Land. The process was this :

First, Parliament determined to effect reforms ;

Secondly, opposition within parliament prologued discussion and postponed action, while the press, almost entirely hostile, cried that the national economy was being ruined and that Azana & the Socialists were to blame ;

Thirdly, the struggle with the Cortez was translated into a feeling of insecurity among the land ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ lords, who thereupon hoarded, refrained from undertaking any but urgent labour, and often even allowed the land to remain fallow ; which ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ in turn increased unemployment, aggravated the crisis, caused revolt, strikes, destruction ;

Next the government

Next, the government, in defence, used the police and the civil guard  
jail & repression.  
Ultimately, popular feeling turned against Azana & the Socialists".

The first biennium							
28.VII.	1931 -1932 -	Left	292	Centre	136	Right	42.
19 XI .	1933		98		162		212.
16 II.	1936		265		64		144

The second elections brought up the Left against the very  
real dilemma either to disregard the swing to the right,  
or to hand over power to the deadly enemies of the Republic  
though they may have called themselves republicans

The second elections brought the  
aa increase of antagonism (centre weakened)  
bb the right entirely surprised; they had refrained  
from a coup d'etat against the Republic only because  
they were firmly convinced that the Republic was  
doomed and that they were the masters of the present  
situation anyway. The influence of Seipal strongly  
induced them to take the democratic course. The  
reactionary nature of this kind of democracy shown up

Quote Gil Robles: Jose Maria Gil Robles:

2nd June 2 1936

"For us democracy is a transitory means for influencing the  
politics of the country... What I do is to find a supporting  
base on what ever offers itself to me, in order to transform  
it, and, if necessary destroy it. I do not refer to such  
an insignificant and transitory thing as the form of the  
government, but to the problem of the fundamental change of  
the country".



3. The Fascist -Communist legend.

Calvo Sotelo starts a Fascist movement which commits a number of murders after the February victory of the Left in 1936.  
Hardly more than 50,000 followers, at the time.

Fascists 40 in 1936.

"F. in Spain is of importance." Azana 19 February, '36.

Communists: In the Revolutionary Constituent Assembly, when the right was almost wiped out, the Communists had no representatives at all.

Communists 14 in 1936 (Socialists 120).

The UGT and the CNT counted their membership by the million.  
The Communist had no separate Trade Union organisation and their membership was less than the 14 representatives show.

4. The real line of cleavage.

It runs between Daladier and Caillaux in the radical party.

Between Lloyd George and Lord Grey on the Constitutional issue in England.

Between Baldwin and Londonderry or Lord Lloyd

Between a Liberal who can be still counted as liberal like Mander and Lord Lothian.

The issue was whether democracy should be maintained even though this might imply Socialism, or dropped in order to exclude such a development.

5. Italian and German foreign policy based on this line of division.

In my introduction, I said that the Fascists rightly believe that Liberal democracy has the tendency of developing towards Socialism, and that there are vested interests in every country which would give support to an anti-Socialist foreign country before supporting the Socialist cause even though it were in their own interest.

Strikingly confirmed by the Spanish development.

In fact, made into a Fascist Communist war, in spite of the Communists.

Democracy cannot maintain itself except with the support of the other democratic countries.

-1-

## Germany and Czechoslovakia.

Let us recapitulate ~~what~~ what appeared to be the main ~~outlines~~ outlines of German foreign policy.

## I. OUTLINES OF GERMAN FOREIGN POLICY ON THE DANUBE.

1/ The main aim of German foreign policy is the acquisition of contiguous territory in the East. In the words of ~~Hitler~~ The political Testament of the German nation as formulated by Hitler in Mein Kampf: be

a/ "Remember that the strength of our people should never ~~be~~ allowed to reside in overseas possessions, but only in the mother country itself, on European soil. Refuse to regard our Germany as safe as long as ~~there is~~ not sufficient soil ~~at her disposal~~ for every one of ~~these~~ persons for centuries to come". Remember that the right to the soil is the only right which is ~~holy~~ holy, and that the most holy sacrifice in the world is that of the blood shed in the conquest of ~~such~~ soil".

b/ "We want to break for ever with the pre-War German policy which was directed towards colonial and trade advantages and wish to turn to the soil and settlement policy of the future. This means that we must look towards Russia and its small subjected neighbours, for nowhere else is there any soil available in Europe to-day..."

2/ To unite all ~~the~~ Germans, in one way or another; the achievement of the German Peoples Community, the famous Volksgemeinschaft.

Behind the 67 m in Germany herself, together with Austria 73 Million Czechoslovakia 3,5 m, Poland 1,2 ~~million~~ million; Hungary 550,000 Rumania 800,000 Yugoslavia 700,000 Danzig 420,000; Denmark 60,000 60,000 Memel and Lithuania 190,000; 75473 = ~~about~~ 80 000 000

altogether 87 million, including

Switzerland	3.000.000
USSR	1.100.000
France	1.700.000
Italy	270.000
Rest	x x x
	7.500.000



-2-

3/ Not to extend the frontiers of Germany proper, so as to include foreign races as far as possible

4/ It is from this idea that the supra-territorial Empire idea arose, the conglomerate of vassal states under German leadership. Prince Rohan in "Europe's Fate in the Balance".

This book is banned in Czechoslovakia

Three characteristics of the Reich idea:

- a. a definite racial ~~idea~~ ideal; the Teuton ideal.
- b. necessarily unlimited in extent, since it is essentially not territorial, but supra-territorial;
- c. its enemy is evil; i.e. it does not confront a definite enemy. Wherever and whenever Evil is converted to Good, the Reich changes the former enemy into a vehicle of the Reich idea (e.g. USSR).

The two problems underlying the Reich solution are:

- a. how to overcome class war; the answer is with the help of the corporative organisation of ~~industry~~ industry;
- b. How to overcome the racial conflict i.e. the problem of racial ~~minorities~~ minorities.

The new ~~Order~~ of Labour and the new ~~Order~~ of the Nations are the two pillars of ~~the~~ an up to date ~~Reich~~ Empire. In other words the Reich is to be built on Fascism and on a system of racial autonomies under German hegemony and protectorate. This means the end of the sovereign states involved, only not in the form of a League of Nations of an internationalist type but of a Germanic Empire of an intensely nationalist type.

\*) NB. The social & national question combined. British Empire meant Pax Britannica and at the same time the introduction of Capitalism.

5/ Racial and social interventionism as the method of Reich building are entirely in accordance with this aim.

- a. German protectorate over all Germans, first the 10, million on the frontiers, then the rest living in Czechoslovakia (3,5), in Poland (1,2) in Rumania (0,8), Jugoslavia (0,7), Lithuania (0,2). Summa 6,4 million

-3-

- b. anti-Communism can be <sup>at</sup> any time made to <sup>work</sup> ~~play~~ against any State in this area in order to reinforce racial ~~claims~~ <sup>self</sup>.  
Czechoslovakia.

Göbbels Speech about the Pope. <sup>1936</sup> Not reliably anti-Communist. The Pope refused to recall the Nuncio or rather to break off diplomatic relations with the Spanish Government. Göbbels described this as "providing him with food for thoughts. ..."

*Seriously*

- 6/ On the other hand, racial considerations are not allowed to determine policy ~~in a one-sided fashion~~. E.G. Southern Tyrol or in Rumania or Hungary where the racial minority would have to be made to conform to the exigencies of the German Reich
- a. very moderate tone of outland German publications
  - b. Henlein's camouflage for years at end;
  - c. preventing separatist tendencies from developing, especially in case German subversion makes life in the consequently weakened states almost intolerable. Nationals enjoined to remain "loyal citizens" which means ~~consistently~~ disloyal citizens, but after all citizens of the other state.

Quote Klagges (Dietrich): On "Race and Foreign Policy" ~~German~~ <sup>German</sup> Geschichts- und nationalpolitische Erziehung: *(interest)*

"Race by itself does neither warrant the political unity of a nation nor does it offer a sound basis for its foreign policy. Racial purity remains of paramount importance for the ~~permanent~~ permanent existence of a people; still politics as such are carried on by nations not by races. Foreign policy therefore deals with nations and their interests; accordingly, international relations must definitely be based on interests, not on racial kinship. History speaks in no uncertain voice on this point."

*Next aim:*

- 7/ Extension of the self-sufficiency area on the Danube so as to gain time for the consolidation of the new Reich and its military force. A vast increase in raw material supplies, food, extended markets ~~allow the lowering of costs.~~



-4-

allow the lowering of the cost of ~~1923~~ production etc. Germany will not become self sufficient but she will have put off considerably the time when she would have to return to international cooperation or to go to war. In fact a nationalist German Empire of Eastern Europe will be more vulnerable both nationally and socially than present-day Germany. War will be more ~~costly~~ than it is to-day. But time will have been gained.

8/ The ~~new~~ methods of penetration

A/ in foreign policy: the bilateral non-aggression treaty combined with a harmonizing of foreign policy.

The bilateral treaty means that the L of N Covenant becomes inapplicable and therefore Germany is certain to have regained the natural right of the aggressor ~~state~~ even though Germany should be prima facie aggressor in the conflict in question.

a parallel foreign policy of Austria since 11 June 1936

Poland Febr 1934  
Czechoslovakian demands.

B/ in economic way ~~economic way~~ SCALE 2

The bilateral agreements

clearing, quota, trade, exchange, capital export and still arrangements etc. Regional Preference i.e. the restriction of the most favored nation clause to the region concerned. Including the order for munitions & arms.

C/ in the racial issues.

The development and acceptance of new international law on racial minorities including  
a) their corporate ~~internal~~ internal status;  
b) international status under the protectorate of their constitutional Great Power.  
A statute of international validity a new kind of Monroe doctrine.

It is with these racial issues that we are here concerned.

## II. THE RACIAL ISSUES IN EASTERN EUROPE.

- 1/ The Danubian region a region of mixed settlement.

Quote Kossuth to Teleki on the Danubian position.

- 2/ The new States continue to be mixed states.

3,8      6,8      6,0  
Hungary, Austria, Bulgaria the new "pure" national states  
not without some qualification: Hungary 550,000 Germans

32  
Poland non Polish majority 3,5  
Czechoslovakia non Czech majority (German, Magyar, Poles, Slova  
15 Rumania bare Rumanian majority (German Magyar, Rus) Macedonians  
18 Yugoslavia non-Serbian majority. Croatian, Slovenian, Bosniak,  
14 Even Estonia 1,1 (20,000 Germans)  
Latvia (1,9) (70,000)  
Lithuania (2,5) (190,000)  
Finland (3,7) big Swedish minority

check up  
Poland: 3-8  
Jug 2-1  
W-Rus 1-05  
Germans 103

- 3/ The balance ~~of~~ of the Treaties on the right side by some 4:1.

21-8 --13 9 1/2 mill non-Magyars  
3 1/2 Magyars lost their homes.

34-7 --27 20,5 non-Germans found a home  
3 1/2 Germans lost their home.

52

36 million found it; 7 million lost it.

- 4/ The social balance // even more favourable :

big landed estates broken up in (the new parts of)  
Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Austria, the Baltic states.

- 5/ The rights of racial minorities are about schools, then use of their language  
in the judicial, local government, courts, share in the  
social and economic benefits of government. Rumanian and  
Yugoslavians. Czech record very good.

- 6/ Revision problem closely connected with it.



-6-

## III. Revisionism chain of minorities

Unexpected ~~reaction~~ reactions:

- 7/ But while only one country is interested in revision (HUNGARY) the question of racial minorities is a very general one:
- a/ Poland, Yugoslavia, Rumania stand ~~more~~ to lose by its ~~fulfillment~~ <sup>fulfillment</sup> than any else;
  - b/ but the ~~fulfillment~~ <sup>solution</sup> of the question means also that Hungary may lose its revision claim for ever!

8/ German policy <sup>aiming at</sup> the disintegration of all these states. <sup>Potter's role</sup> The issue ~~is~~ most a tiabie to this end. Not revision but racial minority statue. If that was the only question, then this might be quite useful. But as a matter of fact it is only an instrument of German Empire policy, and a most dangerous one that.

aa Encouraging ~~the~~ unjustified separatism or autonomy of Slovaks

bb disintegrating the national states and bringing them under the influence of Germany. The

~~non-national~~ state is the true solution, but

Germany working towards the Balkanisation of this region in order to make all subservient to herself.

## IV. Grand Britain foreign policy

E. D. Shaw

1. No rigid maintenance of the status quo for its own sake

2. Big game change, no struggling  
evolutionary security: 2 of 11

3. Important making of small states  
to be prepared to turn the head of a  
League

End of an Age.

Mr. Chairman,

In the course of this series on the perils of Europe I will do my best to offer you a presentation of the ~~current issues~~ of the Anglo-Italian, the Anglo-French, agreements, <sup>as well as</sup> ~~and~~ of the current issues in Spain, in Russia, in Czechoslovakia and elsewhere.

This, however, is obviously not enough. The more closely a person is following ~~to-day~~ <sup>today</sup> current events, the more the conviction must grow upon him that these swiftly changing issues are but the more or less accidental outcrops of a great crisis in human affairs - a transition from one age to another age in the history of mankind.

Such a recognition is of great practical importance.

(a) take the field of foreign affairs. Some of you may have heard Mr. Anthony Eden say in a recent broadcast :

"It is utterly futile to imagine that we are involved in a crisis which may pass as it has come. We are involved in a crisis of humanity over the world. We are living in one of those great periods of history which are awe-inspiring in their responsibilities and their consequences. Stupendous forces are let loose, hurricane forces."

What can be called the official weather forecast in Downing Street strikes an altogether different note, as you know. Nobody in the City who has a business reputation to lose would care to admit that he believed in anything as unbusinesslike as the crisis of humanity or, incidentally, would worry about it, if it existed. Instead, he confidently assumes that the present external difficulties of this country are in no way different from those of the pre-war



days; and that the one and only way of coping with the recognised dangers is the traditional method of armament, nothing else being needed.

Now, if Mr. Eden's view is correct, then such an approach to foreign affairs necessarily implies great practical dangers. For, if our period of history is essentially different from the age before, then the usual diplomatic methods upon which this country could formerly rely may have become ineffective, indeed, reliance upon them may prove a <sup>gross</sup> ~~gross~~ mistake.

(b) But quite apart from the requirements of a successful foreign policy, the effectiveness of ~~the~~ active and passive defence measures may also depend upon a right appreciation of the nature of ~~our~~ our time. Let me quote again from Mr. Eden's speech:

"I am a convinced believer in democracy, and yet it would be foolish, perhaps fatal, to the survival of democracy, to ignore the stupendous achievements realised under other forms of government.... Their methods can not be ours but we should not fail to note the passionate fervour with which they pursue their purposes... The lesson is there to read. If we uphold our ideals, our conception of life, both national and international, if we are to see them prevail, then a comparable effort must be made by us and an equal spirit roused."

Obviously, one of the immediate results of such a passionate fervour and such a spirit of disciplined sacrifice might be to equip this country with means of defence comparable to those of the totalitarian state. Especially in the field of protection against air-attack <sup>and the</sup> The spirit ~~and~~ discipline in the masses is everything.

Not only the political and diplomatic but the very military safety of democratic countries may depend upon the degree in which public opinion can be made to realise the true nature of ~~the~~ time

crisis through which mankind is passing at present.

(c) A most important consequence follows. It may become vitally important to develop a new understanding of politics in the masses of the people. And, in order to achieve such an understanding, to introduce new and effective methods of political training and political education in democratic countries.

It is especially at this point that a clear recognition of the critical nature of our times must be of vital importance. In times such as these no other but realist and objective methods can lead to an adequate understanding of events. By a realist method we mean an analysis of events which recognises the objective nature of the process of human history, and therefore, necessarily <sup>implies</sup> ~~assumes~~ that the great turning-points of history are not simply the outcome of the wished or whim of individuals or multitudes, but <sup>are</sup> ~~the~~ more or less adequate ~~manys~~ response to the objective needs of a civilization. The reasons of the crisis of mankind ~~under the present~~ must lie deeper than either in the passions or ambitions of individuals, however influential they may be, or in the predilections of groups or classes for one ideology or the other, or any other subjective factor of a similar kind; -- they must lie in the objective nature of the problems <sup>themselves, what for which</sup> mankind must work out a solution ~~and~~ or else, perish.

We will point out later on, that in our view that crucial problem is nothing more or less than the working out of a new international organisation of economic life on this planet to replace the <sup>our old one</sup> ~~international economic organisation~~, which has passed away for ever.



the  
But whatever/precised manner of defining the ultimate crisis may be, the realist ~~and~~ method will take us a long way towards the ascertaining of the objective features of the present great crisis.

Firstly we will deal with the general pattern of international politics in our time;

Secondly, with the position that the Great Powers occupy in that pattern;

Thirdly, with the more exact definition of the relationship of the Great Powers to one another in terms of the Versailles Treaty and its revision.

## 1.

### The Pattern of international Politics

The most obvious facts concerning our period of history is that we have passed out of the age of purely national conflict and are passing into a period in which social conflict is being added ~~on~~ to the national.

National conflict continues to dominate the external ~~relations~~ relations of states, but social conflict is tending to complicate the issues.

1. National states are making use of their common front in the social conflict to cement their national alignments as in the case of the German, Italian, Japanese Anti-Comintern Pact.

2. Social slogans are ~~made use of in the service of national~~ <sup>adapted to serve</sup> purposes

purposes of the charge of Bolshevism levelled against Czechoslovakia in order to force her out of her alliance with France.

3. Civil ~~war~~ <sup>strife is</sup> being fomented in order to further national interests.

B. This leads us to the second feature of our period of history: the overlapping of <sup>war between nations</sup> ~~internationalism~~ and civil war. This intersection of war between nations and civil war in our time bears a close resemblance to the age of the religious wars. National governments were then relying on the support of their co-religionists within the enemy country and made common cause with them against the enemy government. On the other hand national states ~~often~~ sometimes made use of religious factions of an other than their own religion in order to further their own national policy.

The Japanese in China, the Italians and Germans in Spain the Germans in Czechoslovakia are lending support to internal factions. No doubt Soviet Russia or even perhaps the democratic countries, in case of war, would ~~also~~ attempt to raise internal opposition within the totalitarian countries.

Thus national war and civil war <sup>are</sup> ~~are~~ closely interlinked in our period. The two patterns are overlapping, and it is often impossible to disentangle the thread of events unless we account for the intersection of these patterns.

Social wars <sup>bear</sup> ~~have~~, by their nature, a close similarity to religious wars, with which they often go hand in hand.



The transformation of the social system may present itself as a requirement of a prophetic religion. At other times obvious social problems as the abolition of slavery in the U.S.A. in the middle of last century may be linked by the contending parties with their religious outlook as was the case with the northern abolitionists and their New England puritan tradition, as against the latitudinarianism of the Cavaliers of the South.

## II.

### The position of the Great Powers in the new pattern.

Germany takes a leading part in both the national and the social conflict. She is the leading power in the so-called revisionist group which is directed against France, while she acts also as the initiator in the Fascist front ~~front~~ against Russia. It is this twofold antagonism of Third Reich policy which brings France and Soviet Russia together. The one feels endangered on the national front, the other on the social.

It is in Germany's latter capacity viz. her leadership in the anti-Communist alignment, that she is in the position to link her foreign policy with the internal policy of various other countries. In fact, we must distinguish between two types of interventionism: national and social. Germany is practicing at present both. She is to be both the protector of the German outside her frontiers and of the Fascist forces in the world. It is this ~~new~~ twofold aspect of interventionism, which, makes it so great an asset to Germany's

foreign policy at present.

Germany occupies a pivotal position in world politics to-day. She is the leader in both fronts and also combines the principle of national foreign policy with the principle of internationalism, both on national and on social grounds. The latter is part of the Russian outlook too, though at present Russia is not stressing this aspect of her foreign policy. Still her help for the Spanish Government must be mainly ascribed to her concern about the growing influence of the Fascist powers in the international field. The democratic powers are just as anxious to-day of disclaiming any intention <sup>of a</sup> ~~nationalist~~ policy of interventionism, in favour of the democratic forces in other countries. In view of the objective nature of the connection between national and social policy in our time, it is doubtful whether the self-denying attitude of the democratic powers ~~can~~ should be regarded as an asset to their foreign policy or rather as a proof of the remarkable success of Fascist methods in foreign policy; indeed it may be doubted, whether the democratic countries will be able to continue on this self-denying line indefinitely. If not, then ~~their~~ their present attitude may well appear in the retrospect as an attempt to try to do the impossible, with the consequent drawback of doing the inevitable when it is already too late.

### III.

#### The Versailles Treaty and its revision.

This is the main pattern of history in our time. This is the way in which ~~Germany~~ Germany, the pivotal state in this pattern, fits into this pattern. Our third question ~~is~~, concerns the historical background of this develop



ment . What exactly was the ~~important~~ role of the Versailles Treaty in bringing about the ~~present~~ present situation?

More often than not the Versailles Treaty is made directly responsible for the rise of National Socialism in Germany and <sup>thus,</sup> implicitly for the aims and methods of the Third Reich. How much truth is there in this view?

German National Socialism is a form of Fascism . It is the purest embodiment of the anti-socialist dictatorship principle in the world.

As a form of Fascist dictatorship Nazism can not be put down to the Versailles Treaty, nor as also often happens, to the mentality of the German people.

To quote a letter-writer in The New Statesman:

"The Versailles Treaty is hardly more responsible for the Nazis in Germany than it is for the Younger Officers and other Fascist movements in Japan, for Signor Mussolini, for the Belgian Rexists, the Dutch Nazis, the Rumanian Iron Guards, the Dictatorship of the Colonels in Poland, Colonel De La Roque and the "Francistes" across the Channel..."

Obviously there is not the slightest connection between the Peace Treaties and the great majority of the Fascist movements.

The same, incidentally, is true of the popular notion of the alleged connection between Nazism and the militarist mentality of the German people, their prussian traditions. Italian Fascism is, of course, on the same account put down to the Italian temperament and southern romanticism; Japanese Army Fascism to the well-known Samurai traditions of the Feudal nobility . Some two dozen various Fascisms are thus accounted for by the entirely different, and, in fact unique mentali-

of the peoples concerned.

Fascism , like Feudalism, Capitalism, or the modern working-class movement, as a world-wide phenomenon mainly determined by ~~general~~ reasons of a general order.



But does this also imply that the aims of the Third Reich in the international field and the new kinds of methods we have described are also an outcome of the provisions of the Versailles Treaty and of the post War policy of the Allies towards Germany?

The post War period of 20 years falls into two periods.

1. The Versailles Treaty system 1918-1932, and
2. The Third Reich (1933 and after)

It is of the greatest importance to realise exactly where the weakness of the so-called Versailles system lay.

The Germans defeated and deprived of money (Reparations), territory (territorial revision) and weapons (disarmament).

Such a state of affairs could have been maintained only with the help of superior force. (occupation, dismemberment or other extreme and in the circumstances, utterly nonsensical measures). This, anyway, impossible in view of American and British withdrawal from the promised alliance with France.

Instead, an entirely new kind of safeguard for the Treaty status quo was established in the League of Nations based on the principles of the Covenant, i.e., the rule of law upheld by sanctions, applied to the aggressor. This is the principle of collective security.

It is here that the ambiguous character of German disarmament proved fateful. In reality it had been established by the victorious generals as a purely military measure, in order to keep the vanquished in a state of impotence.

But, incidentally, the unilateral disarmament of the defeated countries made

the Covenant unworkable.

The League based on the principle of a voluntary association of nations.

Equality of status condition of such an association.

Whatever we may think of the moral standing of a disarmed country, its political and legal standing is necessarily lower than that of countries which have a right to be armed.

Thus disarmament which was on the one hand made to appear as the first step towards a new world was in reality a fateful reactionary measure which prevented the establishment of the League of Nations on a sound foundation.

In the retrospect there can be no doubt about this, that neither reparations, not the territorial provisions of the Treaty but unilateral permanent disarmament was the weakness of the so-called Treaty system. Reparations have disappeared; as to the territorial provisions, only those concerning the Eastern frontier were seriously in question. And it is precisely in this region that Germany has found it not impossible to make a long-term arrangement with her Eastern neighbour.

The gap between the system of force and violence and that of the rule of law bridged by the promise of the victorious countries to disarm voluntarily. When this proved a vain promise the so-called system passed away as if it had never existed. For, in fact, it had not. The Emperor's new clothes.

Whatever the regime in Germany, it would have to deal with this problem. So far it is entirely true to say that the Versailles Treaty system and the unimaginative and narrow-minded treatment dealt out by successive Allied governments, especially in France to Germany, was a cause of the German upheaval.

But under same showing it is ~~when~~ also clear that the task of such a movement was essentially fulfilled with the achievement of equality of status, i.e., the liquidation of the military clauses of the Treaty including the Rheinland provisions.

It is mere self-delusion to imagine that the aims and, especially the methods of the Third Reich can be deduced from the Versailles Treaty and the Post War Treatment of Germany. If this were true matters would be very much simpler than they are.

The aims of the Third Reich are in fact very much more a continuation of Germany's pre-War as well as wartime aims than anything else. The opposite assumption, so wide spread in foreign countries, was one of the greatest assets of German foreign policy in recent years.

German foreign policy can not be understood by the past. It must be understood in the light of the future, Germany's great strength lies in this fact. Its recognition the first step towards a facing-up to the tasks of our time in a realist spirit.

---



End of an Age.

Mr. Chairman,

In the course of this series on the perils of Europe I will try best to offer you a presentation of the current issues of the Anglo-Italian, the Anglo-French, agreements, and of the current issues in Spain, in Russia, in Czechoslovakia and elsewhere.

This, however, is obviously not enough. The more closely a person is following to-day current events, the more the conviction must grow upon him that these swiftly changing issues are but the more or less accidental outcrops of a great crisis in human affairs - a transition from one age to another age in the history of mankind.

Such a recognition is of great practical importance.

(a) take the field of foreign affairs. Some of you may have heard Mr. Anthony Eden say in a recent broadcast :

"It is utterly futile to imagine that we are involved in a crisis which may pass as it has come. We are involved in a crisis of humanity over the world. We are living in one of those great periods of history which are awe-inspiring in their responsibilities and their consequences. Stupendous forces are let loose, hurricane forces."

What can be called the official weather forecast in Downing Street strikes an altogether different note, as you know. Nobody in the City who has a business reputation to lose would care to admit that he believed in anything as unbusinesslike as the crisis of humanity or, incidentally, would worry about it if it existed. Instead he confidently assumes that the present external difficulties of this country are in no way different from those of the pre-war

days; and that the one and only way of coping with the recognised dangers is the traditional method of armament, nothing else being needed.

Now, if Mr. Eden's view is correct, then such an approach to foreign affairs necessarily implies great practical dangers. For, if our period of history is essentially different from the age before, then the usual diplomatic methods upon which this country could formerly rely may have become ineffective, indeed, reliance upon them may be a grievous mistake.

(b) But quite apart from the requirements of a successful foreign policy, the effectiveness of the active and passive defence measures may also depend upon a right appreciation of the nature of our time. Let me quote again from Mr. Eden's speech:

"I am a convinced believer in democracy, and yet it would be foolish, perhaps fatal, to the survival of democracy, to ignore the stupendous achievements realised under other forms of government.... Their methods can not be ours but we should not fail to note the passionate fervour with which they pursue their purposes... The lesson is these to read. If we uphold our ideals, our conception of life, both national and international, if we are to see them prevail, then a comparable effort must be made by us and an equal spirit roused."

Obviously, one of the immediate results of such a passionate fervour and such a spirit of disciplined sacrifice might be to equip this country with means of defence comparable to those of the totalitarian state. Especially in the field of protection against air-attack. and the The spirit and discipline in the masses is everything.

Not only the political and diplomatic but the very military safety of democratic countries may depend upon the degree in which public opinion can be made to realise the true nature of time



crisis through which mankind is passing at present.

(e) A most important consequence follows. It may become vitally important to develop a new understanding of politics in the masses of the people. And in order to achieve such an understanding to introduce new and effective methods of political training and political education in democratic countries.

It is especially at this point that a clear recognition of the political nature of our times must be of vital importance. In times such as these no other but realist and objective methods can lead to an adequate understanding of events. By a realist method we mean an analysis of events which recognises the objective nature of the process of human history, and therefore, necessarily assumes that the great turning-points of history are not simply the outcome of the wishes or whims of individuals or multitudes but the more or less adequate response to the objective needs of a civilization. The reasons of the crisis of mankind over the world must lie deeper than either in the passions or ambitions of individuals however influential they may be or in the predilections of groups or classes for one ideology or the other, or any other subjective factor of a similar kind; - they must lie in the objective nature of the problems mankind must work out a solution for or else, perish.

We will point out later on that in our view that crucial problem is nothing more or less than the working out of a new international organisation of economic life on this planet to replace the international economic organisation which has passed away for ever.



the  
But whatever/precisely manner of defining the ultimate crisis may be, the realist ~~man~~ method will take us a long way towards the ascertaining of the objective features of the present great crisis.

Firstly we will deal with the general pattern of international politics in our time;

Secondly, with the position that the Great Powers occupy in that pattern;

Thirdly, with the more exact definition of the relationship of the Great Powers to one another in terms of the Versailles Treaty and its revision.

# 1.

## The Pattern of international Politics

The most obvious facts concerning our period of history is that we have passed out of the age of purely national conflict and are passing into a period in which social conflict is being added on to the national.

National conflict continues to dominate the external ~~relations~~ relations of states, but social conflict is tending to complicate the issues.

1. National states are making use of their common front in the social conflict to cement their national alignments as in the case of the German & Italian, -Japanese Anti-Comintern Pact.

2. Social slogans are made use of in the service of nat

purposes of. the charge of Bolshevism levelled against Czechoslovakia in order to force her out of ~~her~~ alliance with France.  
strife is

3. Civil ~~war~~ being fomented ~~in~~ in order to further national interests.

B. This leads us to the second feature of our period of history: the overlapping of <sup>war between nations</sup> ~~international~~ and civil war. This intersection of war between nations and civil war in our time bears a close resemblance to the age of the religious wars. National governments were then relying on the support of their co-religionists within the enemy country and made common cause with them against the enemy government. On the other hand national states ~~made~~ sometimes made use of religious factions of an other than their own religion in order to further their own national policy.

The Japanese in China, the Italians and Germans in Spain the Germans in Czechoslovakia are lending support to internal factions. No doubt Soviet Russia or even perhaps the democratic countries, in case of war, would ~~also~~ attempt to raise internal opposition within the totalitarian countries.

Thus national war and civil war <sup>are</sup> ~~are~~ closely interlinked in our period. The two patterns are overlapping, and it is often impossible to disentangle the thread of events unless we account for the intersection of these patterns.

Social wars <sup>bear</sup> ~~have~~, by their nature, a close similarity to religious wars, with which they often go hand in hand.

The transformation of the social system may present itself as a requirement of a prophetic religion. At other times obvious social problems as the abolition of slavery in the U.S.A. in the middle of last century may be linked by the contending parties with their religious outlook as was the case with the northern abolitionists and their New England puritan tradition, as against the latitudinarianism of the Cavaliers of the South.

## II.

### The position of the Great Powers in the new pattern.

Germany takes a leading part in both the national and the social conflict. She is the leading power in the so-called revisionist group which is directed against France, while she acts also as the initiator in the Fascist front against Russia. It is this twofold antagonism of Third Reich policy which brings France and Soviet Russia together. The one feels endangered on the national front, the other on the social.

It is especially in Germany's latter capacity viz. her leadership in the anti-Communist alignment, that she is in the position to link her foreign policy with the internal policy of various other countries. In fact, we must distinguish between two types of interventionism: national and social. Germany is practicing at present both. She is to be both the protector of the German outside her frontiers and of the Fascist forces in the world. It is this twofold aspect of interventionism, which, makes it so great an asset to Germany's



foreign policy at present.

Germany occupies a pivotal position in world politics to-day. She is the leader in both fronts and also combines the principle of national foreign policy with the principle of internationalism, both on national and on social grounds. The latter is part of the Russian outlook too, though at present Russia is not stressing this aspect of her foreign policy. Still her help for the Spanish Government must be mainly ascribed to her concern about the growing influence of the Fascist powers in the international field. The democratic powers are just as anxious to-day of disavowing any intention ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ of a policy of interventionism in favour of the democratic forces in other countries. In view of the objective nature of the connection between national and social policy in our time, it is doubtful whether the self-denying attitude of the democratic powers ~~mm~~ should be regarded as an asset to their foreign policy or rather as a proof of the remarkable success of Fascist methods in foreign policy; indeed it may be doubted, whether the democratic countries will be able to continue on this self-denying line indefinitely. If not, then ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ their present attitude may well appear in the retrospect as an attempt to try to do ~~XXXXXX~~ the impossible, with the consequent drawback of doing the inevitable when it is already too late.

### III.

#### The Versailles Treaty and its revision.

This is the main pattern of history in our time. This is the way in which ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ Germany, the pivotal state in the pattern, fits into this pattern. Our third question ~~is~~, concerns the historical background of this de-

ment . What exactly was the ~~important~~ role of the Versailles Treaty in bringing about the ~~from~~ present situation?

More often than not the Versailles Treaty is made directly responsible for the rise of National Socialism in Germany and <sup>thus,</sup> implicitly for the aims and methods of the Third Reich. How much truth is there in this view?

German National Socialism is a form of Fascism . It is the purest embodiment of the anti-socialist dictatorship principle in the world.

As a form of Fascist dictatorship Nazism can not be put down to the Versailles Treaty, nor as also often happens, to the mentality of the German people.

To quote a letter-writer in The "New Statesman":

"The Versailles Treaty is hardly more responsible for the Nazis in Germany than it is for the Younger Officers and other Fascist movements in Japan, for Signor Mussolini, for the Belgian Rexists, the Dutch Nazis, the Rumanian Iron Guards the Dictatorship of the Colonels in Poland, Colonel De La Roque and the "Francistes" across the Channel..."

Obviously there is not the slightest connection between the Peace Treaties and the great majority of the Fascist movements.

The same, incidentally, is true of the popular notion of the alleged connection between Nazism and the militarist mentality of the German people , their prussian traditions. Italian Fascism is, of course, on the same account put down to the Italian temperament and southern romanticism; Japanese Army Fascism to the well-known Samurai traditions of the Feudal nobility . Some two dozen various Fascisms are thus accounted for by the entirely different , and, in fact unique mentalities

of the peoples concerned.

Fascism , like Feudalism, Capitalism, or the modern working-class movement, is a world-wide phenomenon mainly determined by general reasons of a general order.



But does this also imply that the aims of the Third Reich in the international field and the new kinds of methods we have described are also an outcome of the provisions of the Versailles Treaty and of the post War policy of the Allies towards Germany?

The post War period of 20 years falls into two periods.

1. The Versailles Treaty system 1918-1932, and
2. The Third Reich (1933 and after)

It is of the greatest importance to realise exactly where the weakness of the so-called Versailles system lay.

The Germans defeated and deprived of money (Reparations), territory (territorial revision) and weapons (disarmament).

Such a state of affairs could have been maintained only with the help of superior force. (occupation, dismemberment or other extreme and in the circumstances, utterly nonsensical measures). This, anyway, impossible in view of American and British withdrawal from the promised alliance with France.

Instead, an entirely new kind of safeguard for the Treaty status quo was established in the League of Nations based on the principles of the Covenant, i.e., the rule of law upheld by sanctions, applied to the aggressor. This is the principle of collective security.

It is here that the ambiguous character of German disarmament proved fateful. In reality it had been established by the victorious generals as a purely military measure, in order to keep the vanquished in a state of impotence.

But, incidentally, the unilateral disarmament of the defeated countries made

the Covenant unworkable.

The League based on the principle of a voluntary association of nations.

Equality of status condition of such an association.

Whatever we may think of the moral standing of a disarmed country, its political and legal standing is necessarily lower than that of countries which have a right to be armed.

Thus disarmament which was on the one hand made to appear as the first step towards a new world was in reality a fateful reactionary measure which prevented the establishment of the League of Nations on a sound foundation.

In the retrospect there can be no doubt about this, that neither reparations, not the territorial provisions of the Treaty but unilateral permanent disarmament was the weakness of the so-called Treaty system. Reparations have disappeared; as to the territorial provisions, only those concerning the Eastern frontier were seriously in question. And it is precisely in this region that Germany has found it not impossible to make a long-term arrangement with her Eastern neighbour.

The gap between the system of force and violence and that of the rule of law bridged by the promise of the victorious countries to disarm voluntarily. When this proved a vain promise the so-called system passed away as if it had never existed. For, in fact, it had not. The Emperor's new clothes.

Whatever the regime in Germany, it would had to have to deal with this problem. So far it is entirely true to say that the Versailles Treaty system and the unimaginative and narrow-minded treatment dealt out by successive Allied governments, especially in France to Germany, was a cause of the German upheaval.

But under same showing it is ~~mmmm~~ also clear that the task of such a movement was essentially fulfilled with the achievement of equality of status, i.e., the liquidation of the military clauses of the Treaty including the Rheinland provisions.

It is mere self-delusion to imagine that the aims and, especially the methods of the Third Reich can be deduced from the Versailles Treaty and the Post War Treatment of Germany. If this were true matters would be very much simpler than they are.

The aims of the Third Reich are in fact very much more a continuation of Germany's pre-War as well as wartime aims than anything else. The opposite assumption, so wide spread in foreign countries, was one of the greatest assets of German foreign policy in recent years.

German foreign policy can not be understood by the past. It must be understood in the light of the future, Germany's great strength lies in this fact. Its recognition the first step towards a facing-up to the tasks of our time in a realist spirit.

---



Mr. Chairman,

In ~~unwittingly~~ scrutinizing the comments of the official press on the Rome speeches I gathered the following conviction: The official press, trying to discover important hidden points of differences between the two speeches which I, personally, failed to perceive. The government is trying to prove to itself and to the country that the anglo-italian agreement made a world of a difference to Italy's attitude in the Rome talks.

A typical instance of the kind of realism by which the official policy is inspired. Indistinguishable from a consistent method of self-delusion of the Coué type.

An example of the truth of our assertion concerning the practical relevance of the right kind of realism in foreign affairs. In reality it was sheer illusionism to expect the attitude of the dictators to be other than it was. The politics and diplomacy of a past age must prove not only futile but positively dangerous under such conditions. They are an elaborate method of self-delusion in which state the patient ~~unwittingly~~ is the victim.

I submit that at the root of such self-delusion is the persistent refusal to accept the fact ~~revelation~~ of a crisis of humanity as the root cause of the present world situation.

This crisis opens up a new age in the history of mankind.

A realistic understanding of history implies an analysis of events which recognises the objective nature of the process of history

Ultimately, the turning points of history are not simply the result of the wishes or whims of individuals or multitudes but they are the more or less adequate response to the objective needs of a civilisation, however painful the fulfilment of these needs may be.

The reasons of a crisis of mankind must lie deeper than either the passions or ambitions of individuals, however influential they be or the predilections of groups or classes of people for one ideology as against another, ~~but~~ they must be inherent in the objective nature of the problems mankind must work out a solution for or else relapse into barbarianism.

I submitted that the crucial problem is nothing more or less than the creating of a new international frame-work of life on this planet to replace that under which we have grown up and which has passed away for ever. The objective nature of this task is clearly given by the fact that at the back of that organization of life there, necessarily stood an organization of economic life on an international scale and that it is the passing away of this international economic organization of life which makes it imperative that a new economic organization should take its place. A new international framework of life on this planet is impossible unless this objective aspect finds an objective solution. The ~~the~~ issues of fascism and democracy, of capitalist and socialist economic organization, far from being irrelevant ideologies, bear a close reference to any real understanding of the present crisis.

First of all we tried to point out the objective features



3. The objective features of the present period.

a. The pattern of international politics <sup>is</sup> characterised in our time :

aa. Passing out of an age of purely national conflicts into a period in which social conflict is being added to the national. National conflict continues to dominate the external relations of state, but, inevitably, social conflict is tending to complicate the issues.

bb. Accordingly, there is an overlapping of war between nations and civil war. The great parallel to this being, of course, the age of religious wars. To the historical realist a parallel between social wars based on the problem of industrial and economic organization and religious wars, often, as they are, based on the demand of a change in the whole of society, <sup>is</sup> by no means paradoxical. (Only the realism of the City contrasts philosophy <sup>is</sup> and business <sup>reveals</sup> ~~modernism~~ which ~~presupposes~~ inward their/conviction that the material aspect of human existence presupposes the unreality of ~~religion~~ <sup>philosophic truth</sup>). This, again, may be <sup>correct</sup> ~~very~~ true under the economic conditions under which thinking goes on in the City, conditions, however, which they incorrectly assume to be eternal).

However this may be, it is a fact that wars between nations are to-day caused both by national and by social reasons and that, at the same time, wars between nations and civil wars tend to intersect in the pattern of ~~the~~ world politics.



b. The position of the Great Powers in the pattern, is characterized

aa. Germany taking a leading part in both the national and the social conflict. Also she stands for interventionism both racial and social. Protector of all Germans and anti-socialists. The great asset of her foreign policy is this connection, between foreign policy proper and interventionism.

bb. The democratic powers disclaiming interventionism. This may prove a fatal weakness in view of the realities underlying this connection.

c. The role of the Great Powers and the late Versailles Treaty system.

aa. Neither Fascism (National Socialism) nor the aims and methods of the Third Reich accounted for by 1. the provisions of the Versailles Treaty or 2. the post War treatment of Germany by the warring Allies. On the other hand

1.  
bb. The rate at which Fascism arose in Germany; 2. its peculiar institutions; 3. its method and ideology accounted for by 1. the above mentioned historic antecedents and 2. national mentality.

The aims and methods of the Third Reich connected not so much with the defunct Versailles Treaty as with Germany's pre-War and War time aims combined with new methods appropriate to the nature of the present crisis. Germany in fact trying to exploit the crisis of humanity to her own national ends by attempting to force a false solution of this crisis.

4. The responsibilities for the break-down of the post  
War equilibrium.

It will take us right into the heart of the realities of the present situation if we try to answer the question Could this break-down have been averted and how?

Once the attempts at persuading the victorious countries to disarm voluntarily had failed , the collapse of the so-called Treaty system was inevitable. Or, rather, such a failure was identical with the collapse of the system. The permanent unilateral disarmament of one part of the world while the other continued to consist of armed sovereign powers was a complete impossibility. But was a peaceful and constructive liquidation of this impossible situation not practicable and if so, in what manner could it have been achieved?

The answer is, simply, this. Two things were needed to achieve this end: Some measure of revision and some measure of collective security. The great difficulty was that neither ~~was~~ was of much use without the other and that it was moreover politically impossible to go ahead with the one without the other.

The English stood for revision , the French for Security. The English refused to offer guarantees for a status quo in the permanence of which they did not believe. (e.g. Germany's Eastern frontiers. )

The French were reluctant to allow any increase in Germany's strength unless her (France's) security was safeguarded.



England's revisionist line was expressed in various ways.

- a. diplomatic support to the defeated countries , Germany, Bulgaria, Hungary, Austria. (all except Turkey)
- b. Reparations. of.
  1. Balfour-declaration.
  2. opposing sanctions (Curzon v. Poincare)
  3. Russia (Lloyd George v. Millerand after the dismal end of Churchills inter-ventions. )
- c. Minority issues in Poland and the Succession States.
- d. the various special issues under the Treaties as
  1. Saar
  2. Danzig, etc.
- e. The Anschluss
- f. Danubian plans.

~~g. refusing to accept any plan of European security as a basis of discussion in which security was safeguarded for the unhevised status quo .~~

The French government opposed revision and pressed for security.

- a. for regional pacts of mutual assistance ( to close the gaps of the Covenant concerning military sanctions)
- b. Arbitration schemes in order to designate the international law-breaker as the aggressor
- c. putting forward plans for an international League force for an international air-force , an international police and other instruments of an effective international executive.

The French argument  
to fulfil

- a. failure to fulfil anglo-american promises of military alliance.
- b. the League of nations inadequate , ineffective and incomplete
- c. international organisation of peace consistently sabotaged

*Mylo-Lee Jones*



The English argument

- a. Increasing impatience with French security craze.
- b. objections to sanction commitments
  - aa. Great Britains world wide interest in trade .
  - bb. consequent preeminence as a naval power predestined to become the gendarme of the League under the Covenant.
  - cc. Danger of a conflict with the U.S.A. in view of their doctrine concerning the Freedom of the Sea.
  - dd. Formal commitments contrary to national and traditional policy.

5. Disarmament and reform of the League.

The revision versus security issue was brought to a head on the crucial problem of disarmament.

The British Government was prepared to revise the disarmament clauses of the Treaty . i.e., to agree to German rearmament but the French were not prepared to agree unless England offered additional security.

The present position as you know, is, that France had to bear with a very much greater degree of German ~~armament~~ rearmament and England had to agree to a very much greater measure of military commitments to French security than France had suggested at the time.

A simultaneous ~~disarmament~~ re-armament of Germany and establishment of collective security (both of course, gradually achieved) might have resulted in a peaceful and constructive liquidation of the so-called Treaty system.

But in France the nationalists and conservatives did not want to hear of revision at the price of national egotism; in Great Britain the nationalists, i.e. the Tories and Die-hards would not hear of League of Nations commitments at the price of sacrificing isolationism.

But was the Left very much more helpful? True, the Labour Party strove, with all its might, to strengthen the League and, thereby, to increase collective security. But as to the crucial problem of disarmament it can hardly be said to have ever realised its implications. True, by standing whole-heartedly for disarmament it tried to strengthen the link between the League of Nations covenant and the Treaty proper if it had succeeded the non-existent system of Versailles would have been actually transformed into a coherent whole, - the basis of a new world order.

But, frankly, did the Labour Party seriously envisage an alternative policy? What to propose, in the certainly not improbable case that the voluntary disarmament of the victorious powers should not prove possible?

It did not. Both revision and collective security would ~~ev~~ armaments. Collective security would need an armed League executive



in fact national armaments under League control and supervision. The Labour Party never faced up to this implication. It professed to be a Pacifist party and ~~ultimately succeeded~~ ultimately succeeded in linking social ism with pacifism so closely in the minds of the people that when Soviet - Russia, a new state surrounded with heavily armed enemies started to build a powerful army, many Labour people doubted on this account whether the economic system of Russia was genuinely socialist.

But not only collective security, revision also entailed approval of armaments. We have tried to show how essentially Germany's claims were linked with her desire to be allowed to be armed ~~in an armed world~~ in an armed world. The Labour Party rigidly refused to face up to the necessity of German rearmament. ~~Thus insistence on disarmament~~ Thus insistence on disarmament really implied that the readiness to agree to revision was ~~parly irrelevant~~ parly irrelevant.

Let us consider for a moment the farreaching consequences of the lack of realism in the outlook of Labour. Its pacifist idealism was detached from reality; it was pseudo idealism. In reality it meant that the Labour Party would refuse to accept the material and moral costs of a new world order. That it would continue to imagine that it could <sup>simply</sup> ban force and violence from the world ~~without~~ without first setting up a new order in which anarchic force and violence used by the powerful to subject the weak would be replaced by an international order based on <sup>social</sup> justice, in which ~~force and violence~~ force and violence would be reduced to the role of safeguarding a just order.



-22-

Apart from the justified and realist attempt ~~to~~ to force disarmament upon the victorious countries, the Labour Party's contribution was not such that ~~it would~~ in the retrospect, be possible to saddle the Tories and Die hards with the sole responsibility ~~of this country's~~ failure of this country to achieve a constructive solution. Both revision and collective security implied the acceptance of some measure of armaments. Pacifism has a heavy responsibility to carry in this ~~respect~~ respects.

#### 6. Reform of the League.

The same failure to substantiate a constructive solution is evident in the problem of the League itself.

France was forcing the League to the fore as a lever of collective security. §16

England under the slogan of no ~~new~~ new commitments and revision was consistently sabotaging the strengthening of the League. §19.

Article 16:1. Should any member of the League resort to war in disregard of its covenants under §§12, 13 or 15, it shall inso facto be deemed to have committed an act of war against all other members of the League, which hereby undertake immediately to subject it to the severance of all trade or financial relations the prohibition of all intercourse between their nationals and the nationals of the covenant breaking state and the prevention of all financial, commercial or personal intercourse between the nationals of the covenant breaking state and the nationals of the ~~other members of the League~~ any other state whether a member of the League or not.

2. It shall be the duty of the Council in such case to recommend to the several governments concerned what effective military, naval or air forces the members of the League shall severally contribute to the armed forces to be used to protect the Covenants of the League.

Article 19: The Assembly may from time to time advise the reconsideration by members of the League of Treaties which have become inapplicable and the consideration of international conditions whose continuance might endanger the peace of the

World.

-23-

England asked for the implementation of Artl. 19; France for the implementation of Article 16. England was as slow to do the one as France was to do the other.

The same question is put also in another way. This also has not lost its topical interest. Whether universality or effective sanctions were more essential? Obviously universality would make sanctions almost unnecessary. ~~However~~ On the other hand, experience has shown how little the presence of the aggressors has prevented them from aggressing. The truth is that League of the Nations who believe in the principles of the League because their interests ~~run~~ run parallel to it, would be a much more likely starting point of a new order than a League universally containing all nations, both the friends and the enemies of the League.

This same problem ~~is~~ was raised ~~in~~ in a still other form by the Four ~~Power~~ Power Pact of Mussolini.

## 7. The Four Power Pact.

The English and French controversy was argument of partners who wished to establish a new peace order but where not agreed ~~upon~~ upon the priority of the essential move; revision and collective security.

Ever since the ~~the~~ emergence of the Third Reich an other and opposite tendency became noticeable viz towards the scrapping of the League and a frank return ~~to~~ to the balance of power with all its dangers.



-24-

On 18th March 1933 Mussolini proposed a Four Power Pact:

- a Mediation of the small powers
- b A Council of Four states.
- c Exclusion of Russia.
- d Some measure of revision to be forced upon France's smaller allies.



-1-

## Germany and Czechoslovakia.

Let us recapitulate ~~the~~ what appeared to be the main ~~lines~~ outlines of German foreign policy.

1/ The ~~main~~ main of German foreign policy is the acquisition of contiguous territory in the East. In the words of ~~Mein Kampf~~ The political Testament of the

German nation as formulated by Hitler in Mein Kampf: be  
 a/ "Remember that the strength of our people should never be allowed to be allowed to reside in overseas possessions but only in the mother country itself, on European soil. Refuse to regard our Germany as safe as long as ~~there is~~ not sufficient soil ~~available~~ at her disposal for every one of her persons for centuries to come". Remember that the right to the soil is the only right which is truly holy, and that the most holy sacrifice in the world is that of the blood shed in the conquest of such soil".

b/ "We want to break for ever with the pre-war German policy which was directed towards colonial and trade advantages and wish to turn to the soil and settlement policy of the future. This means that we must look towards Russia and its small subjected neighbours, for where else is there any soil available in Europe to-day..."

2/ To unite all the Germans, in one way or another; the achievement of the German Peoples Community, the famous Volksgemeinschaft.

Besides the 67 m in Germany herself, together with Austria 73 Mill. Czechoslovakia 3.5 m, Poland 1.2 ~~millions~~ 1.1 m; Hungary 550,000; Rumania 800,000; Yugoslavia 700,000; Danzig 420,000; Denmark 60,000; Memel and Lithuania 190,000;

-2-

3/ Notto extend the frontiers of Germany proper so as to include foreign races

4/ It is from this idea that the supra-territorial Empire idea arose; the conglomerate of vassal states under German leadership. Prince Rohan in "Europe's Fate in the Balance".

This book is banned in Czechoslovakia.

Three characteristics of the Reich idea:

- a. a definite racial ~~idea~~ ideal; the Teuton ideal.
- b. necessarily unlimited in extent since it is essentially not territorial, but supra-territorial;
- c. its enemy is evil; i.e. it does not confront a definite enemy. Wherever and whenever Evil is converted to Good; the Reich changes the former enemy into a vehicle of the Reich idea.

The two problems underlying the Reich solution are:

- a. how to overcome class war; the answer is with the help of the corporate organisation of industry;
- b. How to overcome the racial conflict i.e. the problem of racial minorities.

The new Order of Labour and the new Order of the Nations are the two pillars of ~~the~~ an up to date ~~Empire~~ Empire. In other words the Reich is to be built on Fascism and on a system of racial autonomies under German hegemony and protectorate. This means the end of the sovereign states involved, only not in the type of a League of Nations of an internationalist type but of a Germanic Empire of an intensely nationalist type.

NB. The social & national question combined. British Empire meant Pax Britannica and at the same time the introduction of Capitalism.

5/ Racial and social interventionism as the method of Reich building are entirely in accordance with this aim.

- a. German protectorate over all Germans, first the 10 million on the frontiers; then the rest living in Czechoslovakia (3.5), in Poland (1.2) in Rumania (0.8), Yugoslavia.



-3-

- at  
 b. anti-Communism can be any time made to play against any State in this area in order to reinforce racial claims of Czechoslovakia.

Göbbels Speech about the Pope. Not reliably anti-Communist. The Pope refused to recall the Nuncio or rather to break off diplomatic relationships with the Spanish Government. Göbbels described this as "providing him with food for thoughts. ..."

- 6/ On the other hand, racial considerations are not allowed to determine policy in a one-sided fashion. E.G. Southern Tyrol or in Rumania or Hungary where the racial minority would have to be made to conform to the exigencies of the German Reich

- a. very moderate tone of outland German publications
- b. Henlein's camouflage for years at end;
- c. preventing separatist tendencies from developing, especially in case German subversion makes life of the consequently weakened states almost intolerable. Nationals enjoined to remain "loyal citizens" which means consistently disloyal citizens, but after all citizens of the other state.

Quote Klagges (Dietrich): On "Race and Foreign Policy" Deutsche Geschichte als Nationalpolitische Erziehung:

"Race by itself does neither warrant the political unity of a nation nor does it offer a sound basis for its foreign policy. Racial purity remains of paramount importance for the permanent existence of a people; still politics as such are carried on by nations not by races. Foreign policy therefore deals with nations and their interests; accordingly, international relations must definitely be based on interests, not on racial kinship. History speaks in no uncertain voice on this point."

- 7/ Extension of the self-sufficiency area in the Danube so as to gain time for the consolidation of the new Reich and its military force. A vast increase in raw material supplies, food, extended war allow the lowering of costs.



-4-

allow the lowering of the cost of ~~production~~ production etc. Germany will not become self sufficient but she will have put off considerably the time when she would have to return to international cooperation or to go to war. In fact a nationalist German Empire of Eastern Europe will become vulnerable both nationally and socially than present-day Germany. War will become certain than it is to-day. But time will have been gained.

8/ The new methods of penetration

A/ a in foreign policy: the bilateral non-aggression treaty combined with a harmonizing of foreign policy. The bilateral treaty means that the League of Nations Covenant becomes inapplicable and therefore Germany is certain to have gained the neutrality of the other states even though Germany should be the *prima facie* aggressor in the conflict in question.

b a parallel foreign policy of Austria since 11 June 1936  
Poland February 1934  
Czechoslovakian demands.

B/ in economic way PREMILITARY LEVY IDEA ON AN EMPIRE BASIS

The bilateral agreement clearing quota, trade, exchange, capital export stand still arrangements etc. Regional Preference i.e. the restriction of the most favored nation clause to the region concerned. Including the order for munitions.

C/ in the racial issues.

The development and acceptance of a new international law on racial minorities including  
a) their corporate ~~internal~~ internal status;  
b) international status under the protectorate of their constitutional Great Power.  
A statute of international validity a new kind of Monroe doctrine.

It is with these racial issues that we are here concerned.

-5-

## II. THE RACIAL ISSUES IN EASTERN EUROPE.

- 1/ The Danubian region a region of mixed settlement.

Quote Kossuth to Teleki on the Danubian position.

- 2/ The new States continue to be mixed states.

	8,8	6,8	6,0	
	Hungary,	Austria,	Bulgaria	the new "pure" national states
				not without some qualification: Hungary 550,000 Germans
but	32			
15	Poland	non Polish majority	3,5	
13	Czechoslovakia	non Czech majority (German, Magyar, Poles, Slova)		
18	Rumania	bare Rumanian majority (German Magyar, Rus) Macedonians		
14	Jugoslavia	non-Serbian majority. Croatian, Slovenian, Bosniak.		
	Even	Esthonia 1,1 (30,000 Germans)		
		Latvia (1,9) (70,000)		
		Lithuania (2,5) (190,000)		
		Finland (3,7) big Swedish minority		

- 3/ The balance of the Treaties on the right side by some 4:1.

21-8	--13	9 1/2 mill non-Magyars
		3 1/2 Magyars lost their homes.

34-7	--27	23,5 non-Germans found a home
		3 1/2 Germans lost their home.

33 million found it; 7 million lost it.

- 4/ The ~~actual~~ balance ~~is~~ even more favourable :

big landed estates broken up in the new parts of)  
Jugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Austria, the Baltic states.

- 5/ The rights of racial minorities are about schools, the use of their language in the judicial, local government, courts, share in the social and economic benefits of government. Rumanian and Yugoslav sins. Czech record very good.

- 6/ Revision problem closely connected with it.



-6-

- Unexpected ~~reactions~~ reactions :
- 7/ But while only one country is interest ed in revision ( HUNGARY )  
the question of racial minorities is a very general one;
- a/ Poland , Jugoslavia, Rumania stand more to lose by its  
fulfilment than any else;
- b/ but the fulfilment of the question means also that  
Hungary may lose its revision claim for ever!
- 8/ German policy is the disintegration of all these states. The issue  
~~most~~ most ~~at~~ liable to this end. Not revision but  
racial minority status. If that was the only question , then  
this might be quite useful. But as a matter of fact it is only  
an instrument of German Empire policy, and a most dangerous  
one that.
- aa. Encouraging quite unjustified separatism or auton  
~~nomism of Slovaks~~
- bb disintegrating the national states and bringing them  
under the influence of Germany . The  
non-national state is the true solution, but  
Germany working towards the Balkanisation of  
this region in order to make all subservient  
to herself.

Peace Ballot.  
No isolation.

Empire element.  
League Policy.

Failure due to      1) Military mistake.  
                         2) Social factor.      OIL.  
                         3) Lopsided League.

Spain      the same factor hindering Britain (first days of Civil War)

#### THE LEAGUE IN JEOPARDY.

Azana responsible for

SPAIN      Casas Viejas (Jan 12) 16 people shot out of hand.

1933      (Sept 9) Azana resigns; Lerroux takes over

            (Oct 8) Barris'      Coalition Azana and Lerroux.

Nov 19      ELECTIONS

Right 207      A

Radical 104

167

473

Catalan  
right

Socialists 59      )  
Catalan left 19)      77

Dec. 17 Lerroux Government with Gil Robles.

1934      Socialist

Oct 7 Lerroux

Oct 8 (rising)      Legionaries & Morrish regulars take Oviedo.



The left beaten at the polls in Nov. 1933.  
" " " " Oct. 1934  
was brought back by the President.

1935

(breaking up of  
the Radicals)

Six total cabinet crisis and three  
extra-parliamentary governments.

P

V

Apr. 7

cabinet

May 3

Government  
Lerroux & Gil Robles.

payments for colonial

July 26 Nombela Affaire

Oct 13 M. Strauss complaint "

Radicals dropped by Gil Robles.

Dec. 17

P

V

Premier Senor Jose Giral

Second Period. Hitler's advent in Germany. Russia and Italy change sides. So does Poland. Of this later.

England qualifies its revisionism and becomes inclined to collective security lines.

The effects of Russia's change of alignment on two second-rate powers:

Italy and Poland (both seek cover) because their value as allies and/or enemies of France is lessened.

On England. The most fateful development of post-war history. Russia's change of alignment. England's world policy brought into confusion. The naval basis. - U.S.A. - Japan. - Downing St. fights the entrance of the hippopotamus into European waters.

Russia no more expansionist. - England not more "capitalist" than France. - Foreign policy usually completely divorced from social policy.

a) England fights Russia's entrance into the League, then makes it harmless. Franco-Russian treaty far from being an alliance. Locarno-upheld.

b) Germany's foreign policy based on anti-Russian coalition. Hitler and Sir John Simon. England refuses to decide. From Feb. 3rd (London memorandum to Hitler) up till now, England refuses to choose between Russia and Germany.

#### THE MEDITERRANEAN ISSUE RAISED.

Italy makes use of two facts - a) a change in the arms position: relative effectiveness of weapons of war. The effectiveness of the air armament against fleets in narrow seas, especially if these are not protected from the air.

b) France's good will so far as North East Africa goes.

England decides to fight this issue on League grounds (peace ballot), "collective security", (The League as a shelter against alliances)

England fails. 1) Military mistake (experts wrong)  
2) Reluctance to go ahead against Mussolini.  
3) Dependence upon France in working the League machine  
Split on Russia's role. Two League Policies.



The influence of existing conventions, whether of middle-class origin or otherwise, on the forms of life of the working-class in this country.

The wealth and scope of both personal life and social contacts are restricted unnecessarily. Working class people are frequently inhibited from using their incomes according to their real needs by prevailing conventions which are not based on those needs.

xx

1. Mobility
2. Personal life
3. Real needs
4. Use of resources.

In many various ways the mobility of the individual is impaired by actual conditions of housing, the accepted forms of conviviality and social contacts. In this respect housing and hospitality are the main factors.

Apart from the conventions concerning hospitality and the use of housing space, the freedom of shaping personal life depends also on other factors such as: forms of amusement; holidays; religious and political activities.

The clearer the conditions become to us under which a fuller personal life and social contacts are possible, the clearer become the real needs. It is in reference to these that it is pertinent to enquire into the manner in which actual resources are spent. The answer is supplied by an investigation into the costs and financial inconveniences of the actual forms of life in so far as they are determined by

1. Housing
2. Hospitality
3. Holidays
4. Health insurance
5. Education
6. Amusements
7. Religious and political activities.

- § Mobility : The ease and freedom of meeting friends and comrades, of visiting distant places, of making the best of leisure time and holidays depends largely on the actual possibilities of physical mobility.

Failure has vast effects in the Mediterranean and England is forced back into the revisionist policy. The League in jeopardy.

The same issue raised again at the other entrance of the Mediterranean - in SPAIN.

The League Policy may mean the liquidation of the League and of Collective Security in order to set up a balance of powers policy in the sense of Mussolini's four power pact (against Russia)

or

Establishing an effective League power of the democratic and Socialist states (against Germany, Italy and Japan). This can be done on regional lines.

The internal situation deeply influenced (unexpectedly) by Russia's need of allies. The moderation of the Communist International is a main factor of world politics. In Spain the problem of democracy at stake. Here again the British policy faced with same issue. Italy behind the scenes.



I.

Crisis in human affairs. Transition from one age to another.  
Such analysis of practical importance.

Eden: "Crisis of humanity. .. Hurricane Forces."

Our whole position may depend on how far public opinion can realise the nature of the crisis.

New understanding of politics necessary, and therefore new methods of education and training in the democracies. Only realist methods can lead to results.

The realist approach. Arises from the recognition of the objective nature of events in history. They are the outcome, not of the wishes of individuals or of multitudes, but of an objective need of civilisation. This is the determining factor.

The need of civilisation: Civilisation suddenly gets itself into a situation for which a solution is possible and therefore must be found. This need today is for the working out of a new organisation of economic life internationally.

3 main points:

1. General pattern of International affairs.
2. Position of the great powers in it.
3. Exact definition of that position in terms of the liquidation of the Versailles Treaty.

1. Gen. pattern
  - a. We are passing out of the age of national conflicts into the age in which social conflict has been added to it. Complications result - national states use social conflicts for national ends.
    - e.g. i. anti-Comintern Pact.
    - ii. More vaguely democracies holding together.
  - b. Social slogans used for national purposes:
    - e.g. "Czecho-Slovakia is Bolshevik."
  - c. Civil strife fomented to further interests of outside national states.  
Hence overlapping of international and civil wars. Very
  - d. close to periods of religious wars where where religionists joined together. Or to times when national states used religious factions. e.g. Catholic France using Protestant princes to weaken Germany.  
Today Italy and Ger. use internal oppositions in other states.
  - d. Wars today may also be purely national or purely social.

The transformation of the social system in such an age may present itself as a requirement of religion. Or, as in slave wars, an issue may be intra-religious.

- II. Germany's position in this pattern. She leads and is pivotal in both the social and national conflict. i. anti-Communist pact. ii. Revisionist - anti-Versailles.

Thus USSR and France brought together. (the one nationally, the other socially-endangered.) Thus Germany can link foreign affairs with her home front socially. See Spain.

Ger. can also intervene racially: Protect Germans; oppose Socialism. Here she never compromises.

USSR also believes in interventionism - Spain.

Democratic Powers want to disclaim intervention in favour of democracy. But this self-donating attitude on the part of the democracies only proves success of Fascists. They cannot keep it up. In retrospect it will appear like trying to do the impossible.

III. Historical background of this. What was role of Versailles in bringing this situation about? Treaty often made responsible for rise of Nazism. Is this true?

Nazism is the pure form of Fascism. Not due to treaty, or to Prussian character. There are Fascists all over the world. Similarly "it can't happen here". Fascism is a general phenomenon arising from reasons of a general order, cf. Feudalism and Capitalism.

Fascism is a tendency inherent in Capitalism. But its method of rise and its institutions and methods will differ from country to country. Certainly Versailles and post-war policy influenced rise of Fascism in Ger. But did not actually bring it about

Post-war falls into 2 sections: i. End of war - 1932.  
ii. 1933(3rd Reich) - today.

Where did weakness of Versailles system lie? In retrospect ~~whxxxxxx~~ easily seen. Losers were despoiled: i. of money (reparations)

ii. of territory

iii. of weapons - unilateral disarmament.

Now we see that this state of affairs could only be permanent if Germany were occupied or made a mandate administered by victors.

This was impossible, because USA and England repudiated promise of military alliance to France.

A new Covenant instead, as base of League of Nations, with sanctions (collective security.)

Hence ambiguous character of German rearmament, unilateral.

a. purely military measure of victors.

b. made covenant unworkable because League based on principle of voluntary assocn. . This pre-supposes equality of status.

But equality of status did not exist. (unilateral disarmament, i.e. inferior status.) This inequality was a fateful step in power politics.

"The victors claimed the privilege of remaining on the animal level, loudly declaring the now disarmed vanquished to be seraphic angels who needed no arms."

This absurdity was only not patent because in the treaty there was a bridge: the promise of the victorious countries to disarm. Then equality would have made the League possible. The day this hope broke down the treaty disappeared from the world. Only lasted as long as it did because it took people all that time to recognise that nothing had been done.