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PREFACE

The aim of this paper is to formulate the political philosophies of Adolf Hitler and Neville Chamberlain using as the source from which these political philosophies are to be formulated only their recent public statements and addresses. The political philosophies of these two statesmen should be of considerable interest today as these two men are so much in the limelight. Furthermore any determination of either the history of this period or any subsequent period must be closely tied up with a fine understanding of these political philosophies. For Mr. Hitler and Mr. Chamberlain as leaders of their respective countries, two of the most important and influential countries of the world, have been perhaps the two chief figures in shaping the trend of events leading up to and including the first phases of the present conflict.

I wish to thank the members of the philosophy department of the State University of Iowa for assistance given me in writing this paper. Especially do I wish to thank Professor Martín for his fine cooperation and very helpful council in making more presentable this thesis.

Henry Burns Amsden

Iowa City, Iowa
August, 1940.
POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY
OF
ADOLF HITLER
Chapter I
THEORY OF THE STATE

Section I, The German Community

The political philosophy of Adolf Hitler centers very largely about a few main principles. The fundamental one underlying his entire theory of the State being that of the German community. This conception of the German community not only forms the basis of his theory of the State but is also the unifying principle around which his entire political philosophy is centered.

The theory of a German community is clearly tied up with a German race theory. Hitler seems to have followed the Teutonic race theory of Houston Stewart Chamberlain more closely than some of the more general Aryan race theories. In a speech at Danzig September 19, 1936 Hitler clearly pointed out not only the racial basis of the German community but also the racial purity of this community, "This Germany of German folk community, of all German blood..."

Thus, the German community is conceived by Hitler as consisting of those peoples belonging to a supposedly pure Germanic race. Not only is this German community considered to be racially pure but also superior, a community that has been responsible for the major cultural advancements of continental Europe.

Having accepted the superiority and purity of the

German community it was only natural that Hitler would believe that everything possible should be done not only to preserve this racial purity and hence its superiority but also to improve its purity. This desire for greater racial purity has been expressed in two ways: positive, in the expulsion of non-Germans from the Reich, especially the Jews; and negative, in the refusal to incorporate non-Germans into the Reich. In this later instance the distinction might well be drawn between incorporation into the German Reich and incorporation into the German sphere of influence and control. Though the actions centered about these expressions have been largely rooted in Hitler's racial theory of the German community this theory has not been the only motive behind these actions. There is also the practical aspect. That is, by centering the hatred of the nation upon definite groups of peoples and at the same time constantly emphasizing the idea of a German racial community Hitler has been able to actually weld the German nation into a spiritual community.

Hitler uses the term German community in a two-fold sense. That is, the German community is divided into what he terms the German folk community and the German Reich community. The German folk community, on the one hand, includes all people of 'German blood'; while, on the other hand, the German Reich community includes only those of the German folk community who are actually citizens of the Third Reich.
The dynamic nature of Hitler's political philosophy has to a large extent its basis in this two-fold distinction. For Hitler has continually insisted that the German Reich community must be made coincident with the German folk community. All Germans living outside of the German Reich are regarded as being basically German citizens, German citizens who are forced to remain a part of a foreign nation and whose very existence depends upon the whims of other racial groups. On February 20th, 1938 before the Reichstag Hitler outlined the position of those Germans that are the citizens of other nations: "Separation from State sovereignty of the Reich cannot lead to the loss of racial or political rights." Germany is regarded by Hitler as the champion of all Germans outside of the Reich. In a speech at Nuremberg on September 12, 1938 he says: "And I say that if these tortured creatures cannot obtain rights and assistance by themselves, they can obtain both from us." Thus, he not only has done everything possible to incorporate these Germans into the Reich but he has also aided them to organize in such a manner that they could exert internal pressure upon the governments.

One of the chief causes for Hitler's intense hatred of the Versailles Treaty and the League of Nations has been this forced separation of German minorities from the German Reich. The Versailles Treaty in remaking the

map of Europe separated these millions of Germans from the Reich, while the League of Nations on the other hand became the guarantor of this treaty. The part played by the Versailles Treaty and the League of Nations is pointed out in a speech at Wilhelmshaven on April 1, 1939: "Millions of Germans were either torn away from the Reich or were prevented from returning."


Section 2. **German Unity.**

Hitler's conception of the State is closely tied up with the question of German unity. The State is an expression of the German community, that is, the foundation of the State is the unification of the German community into an organic whole. Considered from an historical standpoint the German State came into existence when the National-Socialist Party under the leadership of Hitler, the Fuhrer, had drawn the German community of the Republic into a highly unified and interdependent whole. With this unification the actual creation of the State had taken place though the State did not become complete until the various German minorities had been incorporated so that the German Reich community was coincident with the German folk community.

The term organic may be applied literally to Hitler's conception of the State. Hitler himself used this term in 1935 when he addressed the National-Socialist Party Congress:
"If we consider the people as one great organism and if we realize that each piece of work, no matter where it be done or what form it takes, is to the ultimate gain of the whole..." 5.

Unity does not mean merely political, economic or spiritual solidarity but the actual incorporation of all the various factors of society into a single undifferentiated whole.

It is very difficult to ascertain to just what extent Hitler's organic conception of the State is a result of speculative thinking and to what extent it is due to the impress of material conditions. Conditions in Germany were such as not only to demand immediate action but revolutionary action. However, Hitler in interaction with these conditions did produce a completely reorganized German society along the lines of an organic whole.

To achieve and preserve the unified nature of the German community which was so essential to the salvation of Germany it was necessary to dispose of all factors that tended to divide the interests or allegiances of the individual. Thus, Hitler attempted to destroy all classes and organizations. Labor unions, employee organizations, classes and political parties were disbanded. In a speech at Berlin on May 10, 1933 Hitler indicated this basic need for national unity:

"...we want to bring it about that the two contracting parties will face each other in such a way that both will think nationally from the bottom of their hearts, that both

5. Adolf Hitler from speeches 1933-1938, Terramare Publication (Berlin 1938) p. 68.
will see only the nation before them, and both will unquestionably be ready to subordinate everything to service for the commonweal." 6.

Still another major principle in the unification of the State is the necessity of breaking down all distinctions between the various types of work. The individual must come to feel that the type of work that he does is of no consequence -- the only thing that matters is how well the particular job is accomplished. For each individual has his own job to carry out in the State and it is just as essential as that of the next man. This idea is clearly brought out in a speech given in Berlin on April 30, 1939:

"Every individual, wherever he stands in the economic scheme, has a task in life that he must fulfill in the service of the all, whether as a leader of a business enterprise or as a worker therein, as an organizer or as an expert." 7

Compulsory labor service has been inaugurated by Hitler as a further means of breaking down the prejudice against common labor. Every young man must between his eighteenth and nineteenth birthday spend six months doing manual labor for the government.

In present day National Socialistic Germany the individual is completely integrated into the organic whole of society. Individuality or freedom of enterprise such as we know in this country is looked upon by Hitler as merely unbridled license. In a proclamation given on

January 30, 1934 he indicated that the individuals must be drawn into a community of action:

"...the mobilization of human energies took place...
From the swarming millions of our youth to the gigantic community of workers of the fist and brow, active in one front." 8.

A rather interesting point of analogy may be drawn between the State theory of Hitler and that of Thomas Hobbes. Certain of Hitler's speeches, especially one given at the National-Socialist Party Congress in 1936, suggest a pre-social condition quite similar to the pre-social condition propounded by Hobbes:

"Unlimited individual freedom...renders the seemingly free individual the helpless victim of the struggle for existence and of the harshness of life on this planet." 9.

"...the introduction of that restraint upon themselves...in which we see them live in commonwealths, is the foresight of their own preservation." 10.

This statement of Hobbes not only indicates the nature of man's life in this condition of absolute freedom but also the necessity of introducing certain restraints. This same trend of thought is to be found in Hitler's speech above:

"Long years ago organized life arose at the cost of unlimited individual freedom." 11.

The various church organizations have been among the chief obstacles blocking Hitler's realization of a

11. Ibid. p. 45.
unified German community. He desired to unify the churches of Germany for several reasons; first, Germany being divided into many sects keeps the German people conscious of social differentiation; and secondly, the churches commanded a considerable leeway in the freedom of their actions. Hitler tried soon after coming into power to unite the various Protestant denominations into a single Protestant Reich Church, but he met such opposition that he was forced at least for the time being to give up the idea of a unified church of Germany. In the second matter he has been able to achieve a considerable success, that is, in limiting the actions of the churches and bringing them into conformity with the State purpose. The churches are absolutely limited in the scope of their activities to strictly theological matters and must in no way enter into politics or interfere in any governmental activity. This is clearly outlined in a speech given at Hamburg on August 17, 1934:

"The National Socialist State professes positive Christianity. I will make an honest effort to protect the two great Christian confessions in their rights, prevent attacks on their teachings and bring their duties into accord with the viewpoint and the necessities of the present State." 12

The most important factor about which revolves the entire program of the unification of the German community is that of education. Perhaps no other political leader has realized more fully the part that education can

and must play in the formation of a modern society. No other single factor has been of more importance in the National Socialization of Germany. Hitler's philosophy of education may be considered as being of a two-fold nature; formal and propagandistic. Both types are utilized to the utmost. Hitler not only admits that he has absolute control over the creation of public opinion but is quite incensed with the leaders of other countries in as much as they either cannot or will not control the journalists or other agencies creating public opinion. In a speech before the Reichstag April 28, 1939 Hitler cited this lack of control of the journalists of other countries as the only factor that might give rise to war in Europe:

"...it is a punishable neglect, to use no worse word, if the leaders of nations with corresponding powers are not capable of controlling their newspapers..." 13.

Not only does this propaganda serve to keep the older generations whose value standards are too firmly established to be changed in line with the policies of the government but it serves as a conditioning background for the formal education of the younger generations. However, as far as the realization of the basic political philosophy of Hitler is concerned such realization must necessarily depend upon the formal education of the younger generations. For this political philosophy is based upon a different value standard. Not only schools fall under this classification

of formal education but also the various government-sponsored clubs and groups, the labor service and military service, as all of these are almost as much organizations of a formal educational nature as they are institutions of a specific purpose. Thus Hitler has bent the educational facilities of Germany mainly toward the creation of a new set of value standards, so that in time the future generations of Germany will come to look on the values of National Socialist Germany as the true standard of value rather than merely the product of necessity.
Chapter II
THEORY OF GOVERNMENT

Section I. Relationship between the Government and the State

The German community as stated in the previous chapter is the focal point about which revolves the entire political philosophy of Hitler. In the previous chapter it was shown how the state was an expression of the German community, being the unified German Reich community. In the same sense that the German Reich community through its unification was the expression of the German folk community so is the government through its power of unification the expression of the State. Thus Hitler's political philosophy presents itself as a sort of hierarchy having its basis in the German folk community.

Section II. The National-Socialist Party

The situation in Germany from the standpoint of government seems to be quite similar to that existing in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. That is, the German government is synonymous with the National-Socialist Party in much the same manner as the United Soviet Socialist Republican government is synonymous with the Communistic Party. All the German people are members of the National Socialist State, which means merely that their lives are organized along National-Socialistic lines in the same sense that they might be organized along capitalistic lines as in this country or communistic lines as in the
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, but not all the people are members of the National Socialist Party. The National-Socialist Party includes the elite of Germany. Only those men belong to the party who are for some reason or another considered to be leaders.

Hitler still retains the Reichstag in Germany. It is not, however, to be considered a democratic assembly, at least, not in the sense that it was a democratic assembly during the period of the Republic, but as a party organ. In a speech before this assembly on January 30, 1939 Hitler pointed out to its members their function as a governmental agency:

"For your position here is not that of elected members of parliament, but you are here as National-Socialist fighters whom the Movement itself has presented to the German people. Your function consists in the main in the forming of the nation and in the moulding of the community, in educating the nation to think on genuinely national and socialist lines. It is for this reason that the German people has chosen both me and you." 1

Hitler emphasizes again and again throughout all of his speeches the fact that the present German Government, that is, he and the party, was elected by the people. This is particularly emphasized in a speech before the Reichstag on May 21, 1935:

"...Germany, too, has a democratic constitution. The present National-Socialist Government also has been

appointed by the people and feels itself responsible to the people." 2

"The German people have elected with 38,000,000 votes one single Deputy as their representative. This is perhaps the sole essential difference between the German Reich and other countries." 3

There can be no question concerning this statement; for it is a matter of historical record that Hitler and his party were not only elected by the people but by a considerable popular majority. However, at this point any resemblance to democracy as we conceive it completely ceases. We in this country believe in a perpetual democratic process, that is, political sovereignty is conferred for a definitely limited length of time with the people retaining the rights of recall and referendum. On the other hand as Hitler conceives democracy this original transfer of sovereignty is final. Furthermore, the National-Socialist Party having once received this sovereign power from the people will not only retain it but will not permit any deviation from this political philosophy. This absolute sovereignty is not only a matter of governmental theory but also a matter of preserving the unity of the State.

Not only does Hitler point out that the National-Socialist Party was elected by the people but that it represents them. The term representation in his political philosophy has a meaning peculiar to itself. In the light of our political philosophy the term representation

carries the connotation that the political leader will maintain his actions in accordance with the wishes of the people. On the other hand Hitler means by this term that the party will represent the interests of the people as a German community. What the party considers to be the interest of the community need not coincide in the least with the wishes of the people, qua individuals. However, this does not mean that these do not coincide; for through the use of propaganda Hitler does maintain a very close relation between them.

In connection with Hitler's theory of government the analogy already pointed out between the political philosophy of Thomas Hobbes and that of Hitler can be carried still further. In the previous chapter the comment was made that Hitler seemed to have conceived of a pre-social state in which man had unlimited freedom and that a state of complete freedom proved to be an impossible situation necessitating some sort of limitation. This analogy might well be pushed still farther. For the general tenor of Hitler's speeches suggests a social contact theory somewhat similar to that propounded by Hobbes. In a speech before the Reichstag May 21, 1935 he refers to the fact that he holds his office and authority by virtue of a grant given him by the people: "The German people has elected one man as its representative by an overwhelming majority." 4 This may be compared to a statement of

Hobbes: "...to confer all their power and strength on one man...that may reduce all their wills, by plurality of voices, to one will." For Hobbes this grant being once given meant that it was given for all times and carried with it absolute power: "...being thereby bound by covenant to own the actions and judgments of one." On October 3, 1937 Hitler clearly indicated his complete sovereignty as Fuehrer: "We have set up one authority which is responsible to no one but the nation."

Earlier in this chapter there was suggested the existence of a hierarchy of principles in Hitler's political philosophy. At that time there was pointed out a development, at least logical from the German folk community to the State and from the State to the Government. The capstone can now be placed on this hierarchy. In the same sense that the party was shown to be synonymous with the government it can be shown to be synonymous with the Fuehrer. Thus the ultimate and most complete expression of the German folk community is Hitler himself as the Fuehrer of this community. In a speech before the Reichstag on May 21, 1935 he indicates this fact:

"The present National-Socialist government also has been appointed by the people...
The German people have elected with

6. Ibid. p. 114.
38,000,000 votes one single deputy as their representative." 8

The Fuehrer stands, then, at the apex of the pyramid of German leadership. It is in connection with the problem of leadership that the party yields its major contribution to the community. It furnishes the leadership of the nation not only for the minor offices of the party organization but ultimately for the highest offices of the country. In a speech before the Reichstag on January 30, 1939 Hitler pointed out the need of leaders:

"...those who had been born to be leaders but who lacked opportunity, being overlooked and shut out from action by an arrogant, vitiated and exclusive class of society. Thus it is in the interests of a State by means of a careful selection to make investigations again and yet again in order to find what talents exist in the nation and how they may best be used."

Hitler makes an interesting case to the effect that his party organization and hence his social organization permits a greater opportunity for democratic selection than does any other socio-political order. This extensive party system needs so many workers that it opens countless opportunities for leadership. As his society is organized as a unified classless German community a greater opportunity is given for the rise of capable young leaders. Other societies in the world are organized along class lines and only those belonging

to a certain class or classes have the opportunity for advancement. In Germany as there are no classes the rise of leaders is purely on a basis of ability and merit. The reason for this extremely complex party organization is probably two-fold. One reason being to form the basis for a completely oriented society. The other may possibly be democratic in the above sense, that is, the attempt to incorporate into the party everyone who might possibly become an opposition leader. In his speech to the Reichstag January 30, 1939 he said:

"The organization of the National-Socialist community requires millions of active members...This is the best guarantee of the safety of state and people in the face of the revolutionary ideas of individuals and disruptive tendencies of the time...Danger comes only from those who are overlooked, but are at bottom creative geniuses." 10

Chapter III
ECONOMIC THEORY

Perhaps at one time it might have been possible to examine the political philosophy of a man and avoid the field of economics. Today, however, this is no longer possible. In the case of Hitler it would be absolutely impossible as his political philosophy is of such an inclusive nature as to be in reality a complete social philosophy. The entire field of economics; production, consumption, exchange and currency, is but an aspect of his political philosophy. Thus, in as much as Hitler's economic principles have had such a wide spread effect not only on the internal political conditions of Germany but also upon international political relations it seemed advisable to devote a chapter to his economic theory.

Section I. "Lebensraum".

In much the same manner that Hitler's theory of the state turned on the principle of the German folk community his economic theory has its basis in what he terms "Lebensraum". This term is used to indicate a certain territorial extent natural for the necessary existence of Germany. By "natural" Hitler seems to mean a self-sufficient national unit. In discussing the Versailles Treaty before the Reichstag on the seventh of March, 1936 Hitler indicates these national territorial necessities: "Frontiers were drawn, not according to the clear necessities of life and
recognition of factual traditions..."

Hitler frequently uses the term "Lebensraum" as a synonym for Central Europe. However, he does not propose to actually incorporate all of this area into the Reich. Such an action would be contrary to his conception of a unified and homogeneous German folk community. He does propose though to extend the influence of Germany over Central Europe creating a sphere of influence, political and economic, with Germany dictating the policies of the Central European countries. The necessity of some such plan is pointed out in a speech before the Reichstag on April 28, 1939:

"From an economic point of view independent existence is, in the long run, impossible for these countries (Central European) except on the basis of relationship with the German nation and German economy." 2

Thus Germany would be able not only to insure herself of practically all the basic necessities but also to form a politico-economic cartel of sufficient size and power to enable securing in the open market all other necessities.

The demand for "Lebensraum" is not only motivated by a lack of raw materials but also by a problem of overpopulation that is just as impelling. Hitler pointed out the ratio between population and land area to

to the Reichstag on May 7, 1936:

"Here 67,000,000 people are living on a very restricted and not very fertile area. 3 This means roughly 136 per square kilometer."

Yet rather than attempting to reduce the population Hitler has adopted the opposite policy. He arrived at the conclusion that only by the use of force could the German State incorporate the entire German folk community and satisfy her basic territorial demands. Thus, for military reasons it seemed expedient to expand the population in order to provide a large reserve of man power.

Closely tied up with this principle of a natural sphere of "Lebensraum" is an equally fundamental principle, that of national self-sufficiency. In an address to the German Nation on September 9, 1936 Hitler pointed out one of the goals of the second Four Year Plan was to make Germany:

"Wholly independent of foreign countries in respect to all those materials which can in any way be produced through German capabilities..."4.

This principle, too, is to a large extent the result of material conditions existing in Germany at the time that Hitler came into power; the reserves of Germany were gone, the currency had become devaluated until it was practically worthless, foreign exchange had disappeared, and German productive facilities were at a standstill. These conditions combined with the inability of other countries to continue

extending credit to Germany forced her into the adoption of some type of national self-sufficiency. Also Hitler partly adopted this principle of national self-sufficiency for the same reason that he desired to increase the population, military. He had witnessed the effects of a blockade on Germany during the World War and desired to forestall the possibility of this happening in case Germany found herself again at war. Further, as he intended to create a great military machine there arose the necessity of procuring certain military supplies that were unobtainable in Germany and could not be artificially produced. This plan necessitated the hoarding of every bit of foreign exchange that could be obtained for the purchase of these materials.

Another problem connected with the principles of "Lebensraum" and national self-sufficiency is the demand for return of the German colonies which were taken from her in accordance with the Versailles Treaty. The connection between these is two-fold. On the one hand there can be little doubt as to the value to Germany of the raw materials that could be obtained from these colonies and which are unobtainable in continental Europe. On the other hand Hitler stresses again and again the necessity of restoring Germany by means of the restoration of her colonies to her rightful place of honor and prestige in the hegemony of nations. These two aspects may be illustrated by excerpts
from two of Hitler's speeches one given in Berlin on October 9, 1935 and the other before the Reichstag on January 30, 1939:

"It is good to have colonies and raw materials..." 5

"The fact remains that a nation of 80 millions will not be willing permanently to be assessed differently from other nations." 6

Section 2. Production.

Production is the fundamental factor in Hitler's economic theory about which all other matters of an economic nature revolve. As the German folk community was seen to be the basis of the State and the National-Socialist Party the focal point of the Government so may production be regarded as the focal point of national self-sufficiency. As has already been pointed out, by the time Hitler came into power the final collapse of the German economic system had occurred and Germany as a consequence had been forced into a type of national self-sufficiency.

The adoption of a policy of national self-sufficiency by Germany could not possibly be done with as little change in her basic economic system as might be possible in this country, for instance. For Germany is a country of definitely limited types of raw materials. Due to this limited nature of German raw materials the basis of a policy of self-sufficiency production must by necessity be labor. That is, even to approach such a

position those raw materials that Germany does not possess or possesses in an insufficient quantity. This can only be done by a tremendous expenditure of labor which fortunately happens to be one of Germany's surpluses.

Hitler's organic conception of society dovetailed into these conditions rather well. This principle of complete orientation of the individual together with the considerable German capacity for organization was able to bring order out of chaos and put self-sufficiency production on a workable basis.

Labor is the main foundation of an economic system based upon this principle of self-sufficiency production, at least in the case of Germany. For this reason Hitler found it expedient to change the popular attitude towards labor. In a May Day address 1933 he made this aim clear:

"What we want is to re-educate the German people by making it every one's duty to work, and thus to impress upon them that manual labor is just as honorable as any other activity." 7.

Perhaps the primary institution in this educational program is that of the Compulsory Labor Service. It has already been pointed out in chapter I the place this institution has in the unification of the German community. From the viewpoint of the State no distinction is made between the different types of work. All that is of consequence is that the job is done and that it is done

to the best of the worker's ability.

Labor is for Hitler merely one of the many functions of the State, and, as such, is under complete jurisdiction of the Government. Not only is the individual laborer assigned to a certain job, but the hours, wages, and conditions etc. are regulated by the Government. The individual laborer loses all individuality and becomes merely a cog in a great machine. The only time that he is noticed is when he ceases to properly fulfill his particular job. His pride and prejudices must be satisfied by the achievements of the national community and the thought that his fellow workers live and labor as he does.

A conscious effort has been made on the part of Hitler to end the conflict between labor and capital. In the light of his political philosophy all such differences are to be settled by a merger of both factions into the common matrix, the unified national community. Hitler has for this reason disbanded all labor and employer organizations. His aim being to completely obliterate any such differentiation of society, leaving only the unified State. Thus, rather than separate branches in the scheme of production there will be only an undifferentiated field of production. In a speech given on April 30, 1939 he indicated this unification:

"Every individual, wherever he stands in the economic scheme, has a task in life that he must fulfill in the service of the all, whether as a leader of a business enterprise or as a worker therein, as
an organizer or as an expert." 8.

It is quite obvious that any successful attempt to establish a self-sufficient State necessitates the power to regulate consumption as well as production. Hitler has been as successful in the regulation of consumption as he has been in the regulation of production. Consumption has been regulated in two ways; first, by the use of ration cards limiting the quantity a single person may consume; and secondly, by the use of substitutes. In an address to the German Nation on September 9, 1936 Hitler emphasized the need for government control of consumption:

"It is, therefore, also the great task of our national economy to guide the consuming power of our people in those directions in which we can satisfy it from our own national production." 9.

As has already been pointed out the withdrawal of credits from foreign countries at the beginning of the depression when Germany most needed them was bound to result in a complete collapse of the financial system that Germany had been able to resurrect during the post-war years. At the time Hitler gained control of the government German currency was, both at home and abroad, rapidly losing any semblance of value, with no prospects of obtaining any backing to bolster it up. Hitler established a controlled currency in the sense that its value depended upon

governmental decree. However, even in Germany a currency of this type without some semblance of backing was inadequate, and so Hitler evolved the theory of backing German currency with German production. He expresses this idea in a speech before the Reichstag on January 30, 1939:

"...we have learned to realize that the value of a currency lies in a nation's power of production, that an increasing volume of production sustains a currency, and could possibly raise its value, whereas a decreasing production must, sooner or later, lead to a compulsory devaluation." 10.

This currency system seems to be almost a kind of barter system carried on of course within a confined area under more or less regulated conditions. At the most, currency of this type merely serves as an intermediary between services and goods having no value in itself. Hitler indicated this conception in a speech given September 9, 1936 at Nuremburg:

"...capital is merely an economic auxiliary device and therewith is likewise subordinate to the greater necessities of the people." 11.

In other words a laborer getting paid so many marks for his labor does not expect them to have any value in themselves or to represent any value, but he does expect and believe that these will give him access to certain goods which are produced in Germany. Furthermore, as the government arbitrarily sets the value of these marks the laborer knows that this value will remain in close relationship with

production. Hitler refers to such a relationship in his Reichstag speech of January 30, 1939:

"A natural ratio was established between expanding production and money in circulation. Stable prices which were maintained at all cost, were rendered possible only by stable wages." 12.

Though Hitler has achieved a considerable success in the creation of a self-sufficient Germany he has not completely succeeded. The chief failure to reach self-sufficiency in the realm of those consumption-goods that are basically essential to life has been in the field of food stuffs. Hitler points out this fact in a speech given September 9, 1936: "...because of the unavoidable imports, especially in the case of food." 13. In view of the fact that these imports are necessary Hitler was faced with a particularly grave situation, as Germany was not only bankrupt but had practically no foreign exchange. If she was to retain even some semblance of her old standard of living, some new form of international exchange had to be devised.

Germany as a highly industrialized nation is capable of producing larger surpluses of certain goods. The problem never has been one of production but of finding markets possessing international purchasing power, that is, foreign exchange. The last ten years in particular have found many other countries of the world in much the same predicament as Germany. Most of these countries, however,

produce chiefly surpluses of agricultural products and raw materials. In order to meet this situation Hitler put Germany on a straight barter basis with those other countries of the world lacking, as Germany, the necessary exchange to make purchases in the international market. This type of exchange system is indicated by Hitler in a Reichstag speech given on January 30, 1939:

"But under these circumstances the German system of exchanging for every piece of honest work an equally honest piece of work, is a more decent practice than payment in foreign currency which a year later will be devalued by so and so much per cent." 14.

Say, for example, that Germany desires or needs to purchase a million pounds of coffee but lacks the exchange credit necessary to pay for it. However, she does have for instance a considerable surplus of optical goods. By means of a special trade mission Germany would arrange to make a direct trade with Brazil of so many microscopes etc. for so much coffee. Technically speaking from the standpoint of the exchange market there would not have been an international transaction, though such a transaction would undoubtedly have a considerable effect on exchange rates.

Hitler has found it to be more efficient for several reasons to work up these trade deals in the form of trade treaties extending over a period of several years. Not only has this plan made possible greater production planning but it has also given Germany a considerable

influence over the economic and political conditions of other countries. Hitler in a Reichstag speech given on January 30, 1939 hinted at the part power must play in such a system:

"Ultimately the economic structure of present-day Germany is bound up, for better or for worse, with the foreign political security of the State." 15.

---

Chapter IV

THEORY OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Section I. Power and Force in International Relations.

Possession of power and the use of force are considered by Hitler to be the natural and necessary prerequisites of successful international relations. In a speech given March 16, 1935 announcing universal military conscription in Germany Hitler gave expression to the part the army would play:

"What the German government...desires is to make sure that Germany possesses sufficient instruments of power not only to maintain the integrity of the German Reich but also command international respect and value as a co-guarantor of general peace." 1.

He points again and again to the deplorable social, economic and political conditions in post-war Germany and explains them in the light of German disarmament. This explanation is in reality neither logical nor adequate as Germany had fought a long war to the very end of her resources and was a completely ruined nation long before she capitulated. However, whatever is the historical basis for assuming German disarmament to have been the cause of post-war conditions in Germany there can be little doubt that this inequality of armaments has furnished Hitler with one of his strongest popular appeals.

Hitler proposed the theory stating that Germany laid

down her arms in 1918 because President Woodrow Wilson had promised a new world order in which international disarmament would be the order of the day, the only prerequisite being German disarmament. In a Berlin speech on October 14, 1933 Hitler pointed out:

"The German people has fulfilled its disarmament obligation to more than full measure. The turn would seem to have come for armed nations to do no less than meet their analogous obligations." 2.

He also points out in this same speech that the whole problem of armaments is but a matter of equality: "...the German people and the German government have not demanded weapons at all, but equality." 3.

Hitler seems to consider a powerful army to be one of the necessary prerequisites for national existence. In the German National-Socialistic State the army has been given a prominent position. It plays an important role in all fields of international relations, economic, social and political. In a speech on June 6, 1937, he gave an illustration of this fact:

"There could be no commercial enterprise if the steel shield of national armed might were not held protectingly over it." 4.

It may safely be said that Hitler has been one of the worlds most ardent advocates of negotiation. In every case prior to the settlement of his grievances against another country he has given it the opportunity to

negotiate and settle these differences without actual war. However, his conception of negotiation is quite different from that generally held in this country. What in reality it has amounted to has been the granting to his neighbors the opportunity of acquiescing to his demands without first being crushed. In other words, unless the demands of Germany were fully complied with the country in question must feel the wrath of Germany. Hitler in a Reichstag speech indicated this: "I shall carry on thus, fighting until the situation is acceptable to Germany." There can be no question in the fact that Hitler has shown a genius for presenting his demands at the most propitious moment. However, having once been presented they remain for all practical purposes exactly as stated and the only changes made are those concerning minor details of how the individual articles are to be executed. In one instance Hitler pointed out that the problem was vital and that he had "...the firm determination to settle this problem one way or another." The only case in which Hitler seems to have entered into actual negotiations as we know them was at the Munich settlement and it is interesting to note how rapidly he threw aside the results of these negotiations and made good his original demands. It may be safely said of Hitler that he wanted peace in Europe as much as any other states-

man; for as long as Europe was at peace it meant that his demands were being met and that he was achieving his goal.

The Versailles Treaty was considered by Hitler to be a blight upon German honor as well as a denial of her right to existence and must necessarily be eradicated. In a speech before the Reichstag on April 28, 1939 he pointed out this fact:

"...to raise my German people up out of the depths of defeat and to liberate it from the bonds of the most infamous dictate of all times, for this alone has been the aim of my actions." 7.

Thus he considered it a sacred obligation to repudiate this Treaty point by point and section by section. Hitler's hatred of the League of Nations is no less intense than his hatred of the Versailles Treaty. This hatred of the League of Nations is two-fold: first, the League of Nations stood as a guarantor of the Versailles Treaty which represented the defeat and humiliation of Germany; secondly, the League of Nation's formal means of international settlement stood in the way of the realization of Hitler's plans. These two reasons are given in a speech before the Reichstag on October 6, 1939:

"The League degenerated more and more into a clique of parties interested in the Versailles dictate." 8.

"I did, it is true, refuse to submit the question of German vital rights to some non-competent international body in the form of humble requests." 9.

Hitler is the great modern advocate of the Machiavellian principles. It is quite clear that he holds the belief that if the end is worth while then any means is justifiable that makes possible the attainment of this end. In a speech before the Reichstag on April 28, 1939 Hitler pointed this out:

"...I know full well that...it is not so much the methods that are taken into account in history as success and not success of methods as such but rather the general good which the methods yield." 10.

Thus history would be the final judge of whether a leader's actions were right or wrong, judging only in the light of results. In this connection an interesting aspect of Hitler's character may be thrown into relief. He insists that the prime attribute of a good leader is his willingness to shoulder all responsibility for the consequences of his actions. This conception may to a considerable extent be an outgrowth from one of the charges he makes against democracy. That is, the feeling that the great shortcoming of democracy lies in the shifting of responsibilities by its political leaders. In a speech given on December 7, 1931 he pointed this out:

"Those masses want to feel some one single head is responsible and not the ubiquitous anonymity of the state bourgeois party system." 11.

Section 2. European Peace.

The need of a new European order is the key

principle about which Hitler's foreign policy is built. The only foundation upon which European peace can be achieved is the establishment of such an order. The primary and absolutely essential prerequisite for the construction of such an order is the abrogation of the Versailles Treaty and the League of Nations. In a speech before the Reichstag on October 6, 1939 Hitler pointed out:

"Thus, the revision of the Versailles Treaty carried through by me did not cause any chaos in Europe, but on the contrary produced the prerequisite of clear, stable and bearable conditions." 12.

This order is to be constructed by the Great Powers upon the age-old principal of partitionment of the world into prescribed spheres of influence. These spheres of influence would be drawn in accordance with the historical development and interests of the Great Powers. Each country would be absolutely free in its own particular sphere of action from the interference of other countries. Hitler sees in Central Europe not only the natural but the rightful German sphere of influence. He pointed out in a speech to the Reichstag on April 28, 1939:

"We Germans support a similar doctrine (Monroe) for Europe -- and, above all, for the territory and the interests of the Greater German Reich." 13.

England and France the two major guarantors of a European status quo based on the Versailles Treaty settlement could not participate in or sanction any major

land-grabbing scheme. For the mind set of their respective peoples was definitely against any such settlement as that proposed by Hitler and being democratic states this was a deciding factor. Thus they were forced to preserve conditions as they were, and all attempts by Hitler to achieve his goal of a German Central Europe were met with opposition. It was only natural that Germany would seek to form an alliance to counter balance this more or less natural alliance between England and France. Hitler turned to Germany's historic ally Italy and found Mussolini in a receptive mood. There were several reasons for this receptive frame of mind on the part of Mussolini; first, the allies had failed to fulfill the promises they had made to Italy during the world war; second, in Mussolini's own attempts to form an Italian Empire he had met with the same opposition from England and France; third, both countries possessed a common fear and hatred of communism. In fact the original nature of this Rome-Berlin axis was in the form of an anti-comintern pact. The inability on the part of the Anglo-French alliance to accept the dynamic principles of Germany and Italy forced these two countries into an almost indisolvable union.

Hitler has long been an advocate of the creation and maintenance of a European balance of power as the only means of preserving peace. That is, rather than the existence of a chaos of international intrigue there would
be only two or three major alliance groups. Hitler expressed this before the Reichstag on May 21, 1935:

"But such a catastrophe may happen all the more easily, the more a network of criss-cross international obligations makes the localization of a small conflict impossible and increases the danger of the states being dragged in." 14.

PART II
POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY
OF
NEVILLE CHAMBERLAIN
Chapter I
THEORY OF THE STATE

Section 1. The Evolutionary Growth of Society.

It is considerably more difficult in the case of Neville Chamberlain to ascertain a definite theory of the State than in that of Adolf Hitler. As Hitler was establishing a new government based on principles differing from those of the government that he was replacing it was quite natural that he should go into considerable detail regarding the philosophical basis of the State. On the other hand, Chamberlain was merely another man continuing in the established traditions of a government of long standing. Hence, it was not necessary to lay down any new political principles or go to any length in reaffirming the old ones. Most of his remarks, therefore, are confined to governmental administration and those problems related to this task.

As far as it is possible to determine any particular theory of the State on the part of Chamberlain he seems to hold that the State is a man made institution. A social institution that has been slowly evolving as a result of man's interaction with his environmental conditions and which is still in the process of development. There are no allusions in Chamberlain's speeches to the effect that the State came into being at any particular moment or as the result of any given act. Rather, it is merely man's social efforts directed towards the establish-
ment of a better way of life. He hinted at this purpose-
ful development of society in a speech given at Birmingham
on February 24, 1940:

"That whole system which has gradually
been built up by civilized states and which
with all its faults does represent an
earnest and genuine endeavor to free our-
selves from the barbarities of the Middle
Ages, and to establish an order more in
keeping with the fundamental principles of
Christianity." 1.

Thus, this process has been going on for countless generat-
ions and during this time has expressed itself in many
different forms. The individuality peculiar to each State
is largely the result of environmental conditions peculiar
to these States. However, this dissimilarity of States
is not exclusively the result of dissimilarities of the
environmental matrix from which they developed. It is also
to a considerable degree the result of the different stages
of development in which these States are. For instance,
the United States of America would differ from the United
Kingdom not only because of a difference in its environment
but also because of being a much younger State. This
distinction is pointed out in a speech given in London on
October 2, 1934:

"However, I rather depreciate these
comparisons between one country and another...
Conditions are never the same and it may well
be that what is right and proper for an
old, highly developed country like ours is
quite unsuitable for a new community whose
people are less experienced and perhaps
less patient than ours." 2.

It seems safe to say that Chamberlain regards the State as being synonymous in extension with its governmental jurisdiction. That is to say the delimiting factor which distinguishes one State from another is political sovereignty. There may, thus, be peoples of a common language and cultural heritage living side by side and yet belonging to different States. For instance, in the case of the Sudeten Germans living in Czechoslovakia, Chamberlain though clearly recognizing their close affinity with the peoples living in the German State still regarded them as being a part of the Czechoslovakian State as they lived within its governmental jurisdiction.
Chapter II

THEORY OF GOVERNMENT

Section 1. Relation of Government to State.

As has already been noted the government is not an expression of the State but rather the State and the government stand together giving each other reality. However, neither is in itself the basic factor but rather each is the expression of a consciously motivated evolutionary process. For neither the government nor the State would have any reality if it were not for a social desire on the part of the people to maintain a government. Chamberlain points out that the English people have over a considerable period of time gradually developed a form of government that is in best accordance with their own peculiar requirements. This conception is clearly brought out by Chamberlain in a speech given at London on December 9, 1937:

"For ourselves we prefer and we mean to maintain that form of democracy we have built up for hundreds of years and which is best suited to the habits and ways of thought of our people." 1.

Thus, it might be said that the people are the government and the State.

Section 2. Democracy.

The fundamental factor in Chamberlain's theory of government is the people, not qua community but rather as a collection of individuals. The government, then, is

means of expressing the will of the greatest number of these individuals. The people, however, do not express their will directly but indirectly through popularly elected representatives to whom has been delegated the authority to act in their behalf. This delegation of authority is not absolute as these representatives are elected for a specified length of time at the end of which they must stand for reelection if they are to retain their public office. Furthermore, the electorate retains the right not only to deprive any representative of his office but also to have him tried for misconduct in public office.

The ordinary business of life would be impossible if there were no authoritative power sovereign to the desires of the separate individuals. Without the restraining influence of government would modern society which especially demands the utmost in cooperative action be impossible. Chamberlain points out this need for some kind of regulation in a speech before the House of Commons on April 3, 1939: "The common business of life cannot be carried on in a state of uncertainty..." However, democratic government is not merely a means of obtaining the security necessary for the maintenance of life. It is also a means of guaranteeing certain liberties. For underlying the principle of democracy is the belief that there exist certain liberties that are absolutely

essential to a worthwhile life. These basic liberties were summed up by Chamberlain in a speech given in London on December 9, 1937: "...liberty of speech, thought and action..." These are not liberties which merely make life pleasant for they are liberties that have come to be an essential part of the lives of those people living in democratically governed States. In a speech given in London on September 27, 1938 Chamberlain expressed the sentiment of the average Englishman concerning liberty: "I believe that life without liberty would not be worth living."

Perhaps these liberties are more fully appreciated in England than they are in this country. For in England they represent centuries of struggle and bloodshed, while in this country the struggle was chiefly concerned with economic liberties and lasted for only a very few years. In fact it might well be pointed out that any struggle over personal liberties has been very largely concerned with the limitation of them.

Section 3. Parliament.

As far as the actual process of government is concerned Chamberlain's theory of government, to the extent that he expresses one in his public speeches, appears to be identical with that which is in actual practice in Great Britain. Thus, the fundamental institution of government

4. Vital Speeches, October 1, 1938, volume 4, p. 445
5. The Parliament of Great Britain consists of two Houses; the House of Lords which is made up of the peers of the United Kingdom, having a full membership of about 740 members, and the House of Commons which is composed of about 615 members elected by direct ballot.

is appointed by the King though in actuality the King must, if a Government is to be formed, appoint the admitted leader of the party or coalition of parties controlling the House of Commons. The Prime Minister as leader of his party then forms a cabinet acceptable to those by whom he was elected. The tenure of the Government is dependent upon the length of time that the Prime Minister's Party retains control of the House of Commons.

Such a system necessitates the Government keeping its finger constantly on the pulse of public sentiment. However, Chamberlain realizes that mere knowledge of public sentiment is insufficient to insure successful operation of a democratic government. For if any democracy is to function properly the public must be kept informed of the problems facing the government and those facts relating to these problems in order that its opinion may have some homology with the required solutions. Chamberlain points out this need in a speech given before the House of Commons on July 26, 1938:

"It cannot be certain that a proposal of that kind will necessarily bring about a solution of this problem... ...it would go far to inform public opinion generally as to the real facts of the case."7

However, not only must the public be kept informed as to the actions of the government but the Government in its turn must be kept informed as to the public's sentiment.

and from time to time especially on vitally important matters get the approval of the electorate. This is rather clearly brought out in a speech given at Glasgow on October 14, 1935, at which time the Government was carrying on critical negotiations with Italy over her invasion of Ethiopia:

"The government must know the mind of the country concerning its defences."  

"But declarations of support, impressive as they have been in recent weeks, cannot be the equivalent of a fully ascertained, peremptory instruction from the community as a whole."  

Thus, the House of Commons is the direct representative of the electorate. It is the focal point of Chamberlain's theory of democratic government in which all other major governmental institutions center. That is, the other parts of the government are directly answerable to the House of Commons. In a speech given before the House of Commons on October 3, 1939 he points out this dependency:

"In the event of questions arising as to any particular censorship operation, the Minister in charge of the department affected will answer for it in Parliament."  

Section 4. **Democracy In Relation To Other Countries.**

Democracy, at least as conceived by Chamberlain, is not dynamic, that is, it does not tend to spread into other non-democratic States. Chamberlain points out again and again that the democratic States are not interested in

changing the governmental form of other States. He indicates this democratic viewpoint in a speech given in London on November 9, 1938:

"But it does seem to me to be entirely contrary to the spirit of democracy to attempt to deny to any other nation the right to adopt any form of government they may prefer." 11.

All that democracy demands is that all States be free to retain whatever form of government they have chosen. The infiltration of the democratic principle into non-democratic States is not the result of any purposely directed action on the part of the democratic governments. On the other hand, one must be hesitant in assuming this dynamic quality to be an essential attribute of the totalitarian political philosophy. That is, the two Western European dictators finding themselves isolated in a Europe dominated by England and France found it to their advantage to expand their political philosophy.

However, Chamberlain does not maintain that governments must remain unchanged. For he regards governments in the same light that he does the State, as a continually developing social institution. This evolutionary conception is brought out in a speech given in London on November 9, 1938:

"...history shows us that forms of government do not remain unchanged. Alterations, modifications and even reversals have taken place in every generation in some country or another and there is no reason to suppose that even today any of us have

reached the final, unalterable stage."¹².

Chapter III
ECONOMIC THEORY

Section 1. Capitalism.

It is quite apparent from the tenure of his speeches that Chamberlain is an exponent of that economic system, based on the principle of freedom of individual enterprise, known as capitalism. For he has the conviction that in the main private enterprise can best and most efficiently serve both itself and society if freed from a maximum amount of governmental intervention. This conviction is expressed in a speech given before the House of Commons on March 24, 1938:

"In the view of the Government, it is not for them to try to dictate to the great industries the detailed action which will be necessary for overcoming difficulties. It is in accordance with our traditions that these industries themselves, through their joint machinery should work out the details in the manner which is likely to be most effective." 1.

Thus, there exists a rather close resemblance between Chamberlain's principle of non-intervention and the principle of laissez-faire as propounded by Adam Smith. That is, they both have basically the same fundamental point of view, the belief in freedom of enterprise. However, this analogy should not be pressed too closely; for there must necessarily be a considerable difference in the

extent to which each man would propose applying this principle. This difference is necessary for two reasons; first, a difference in outlook, as Smith spent the greater part of his life in speculative writing, while Chamberlain has devoted many years to public service, especially in the field of government finance; and secondly, society has become so complex and integrated since the time of Smith that it requires a closer relationship between the various social institutions. Furthermore, Chamberlain would not agree with Smith when he says that the development of certain industrial techniques"...is not originally the effect of human reason...It is the necessary...consequence of a certain propensity in human nature..."2. Chamberlain sees in the development of new commercial and industrial techniques the results of applied knowledge. This conception is brought out in a speech given in London on December 8, 1933:

"...we made it clear that we expected our own traders and manufacturers to improve their methods of production and marketing."3.

For several reasons it is apropos to discuss in a paper primarily concerned with political philosophy an economic system which is so closely tied up with the doctrine of laissez-faire. First, a governmental policy of laissez-faire is in reality as much a principle of a

political philosophy as an economic policy of government regulation. Second, in a modern society a policy of complete laissez-faire would be impossible. This economic theory serves to further illustrate Chamberlain's fundamental democratic outlook. For, rather than the individual being granted by the government certain economic rights and privileges, the electorate gives up to the government certain powers of restraint and regulation.

Section 2. **International Economic Interdependency.**

Chamberlain might well be termed an internationalist not only from the standpoint of his economic theory but from that of his entire political philosophy. For he holds that the entire world forms an interrelated and interdependent whole in which each country reflects the policies and conditions of every other country. Not only is the economic chaos of the world today international in nature but also its solution. This conception is clearly stated in a speech given in the House of Commons on July 10, 1933:

"We ourselves still remain of the opinion we have held all along, that is, that the chief troubles from which the world is suffering today are international in their origin and can only be solved by international action and agreement." ⁴

Thus, the economic policies of all countries must be in harmony with one another, especially those of the larger States. No country can withdraw within its own borders and follow a program of self-sufficiency. Such a system would destroy itself as well as disrupt those operating in

---

⁴ *New York Times*, July 11, 1933, p. 3.
other countries. In this same address Chamberlain points out this fact:

"The thought that any country can be sufficient unto itself and can solve its own problems without reference to what is happening in the rest of the world is, I am sure, one which will not bear the light of experience." 5.

The only solution to these economic problems confronting the world today, then, is some form of international cooperation; for no nation is capable of finding alone a solution to its own problems. However, there is an essential prerequisite necessary not only to international cooperation but to cooperation of any kind. That is, the fundamental conditions are confidence and understanding upon which must rest any possibility of successful international cooperation. Chamberlain points out these conditions in a speech given in London on November 9, 1937:

"It is the sincere desire of His Majesty's Government to see those relations firmly established on a basis of mutual friendship and understanding." 6.

He has the utmost confidence that all problems confronting the nations of the world can be settled by means of cooperation if only these preliminary conditions are established. This possibility is pointed out in a speech given in London in July 3, 1939:

"There is always some way of reaching an agreement if two men are really determined to reach it. Those maxims which apply to individuals apply to nations too." 7.

5. Ibid.
Chamberlain clearly shows the impress of the many years spent in public finance as he places considerable stress on the importance of economic problems. Perhaps, as in the case of Marx, he is inclined to overemphasize the role played by economic factors in society. He indicates their importance in a speech given in London on April 29, 1937: 

"...those economic difficulties which today are keeping so large a part of the world discontented and uneasy." 

These economic difficulties of the world are further complicated by being closely connected with political factors. Thus, any solution to these problems must not only include international cooperation upon economic matters but also upon political matters. For not only does each separate aspect of society present a highly integrated whole but also the integrant fields stand in such close relationship as to result in a highly fused world society. In a speech given in London on May 16, 1935 Chamberlain points out this relationship:

"But unfortunately in this field of economics are apt to get mixed up with politics and with psychological reactions that are not amenable to sober reasoning." 

Chamberlain is of the belief that the majority of the world's economic difficulties are due to the lack of stabilized exchange rates in the world. He points out this fact in a speech given in London on May 16, 1935:

"I fully realize the difficulties which arise from the constant fluctuations of exchange... if it (stabilization) could be made on satisfactory lines would so greatly benefit every country in the world." 10.

The possibility of achieving such a stabilization is dependent upon some form of international agreement. Furthermore, any attempt to stabilize exchange must ultimately depend upon finding some means of currency stabilization within the various nations. For as long as national currencies are free to fluctuate either as a result of the lack of proper backing or a policy of "exchange control," there can be no exchange stabilization. This stabilization of currency can only be achieved in two ways, either by finding an adequate standard upon which to base currency or by international agreement. Chamberlain holds that in the long run gold is the most satisfactory standard upon which to base national currency, but until such time as world conditions are improved no country can return to the gold standard. He indicates in a speech given before the House of Commons on March 7, 1935 this ultimate return to a gold standard:

"...ultimately I see no better international standard than gold at some time or another I think in all probability we and other countries may go back to that international standard." 12.

10. Ibid.
However, until it is possible for all countries to return at the same time to a gold standard stabilization can only be achieved through some form of international agreement.

If exchange stabilization could be achieved there would remain only one hindrance to that "normal trade" which is so vital to world prosperity-- tariff barriers. Chamberlain's Government has not only pursued a policy of "moderate tariff" but where ever possible one of tariff reduction. Chamberlain points out this policy in a speech given in London on December 9, 1937:

"...a series of agreements with foreign countries under which we have been able to accomplish widespread reduction of tariffs..." 14.

However, such a policy could only be carried out in accordance with an agreement among the major exporting countries of the world; for it would be suicidal for any single nation to reduce its tariffs. This fact is pointed out in a speech given in Birmingham on December 8, 1933:

"...if we are unfairly discriminated against when that unfair discrimination takes the form of subsidies or quotas or special taxes directed against other countries." 15.

In this matter of trade and tariff another point of analogy may be drawn between Chamberlain and Adam Smith. For Smith was a firm believer in free trade;

"To give the monopoly of the home-market to the produce of domestic industry... must, in almost all cases, be either a useless or a hurtful regulation." 16.

Smith conceived of two instances in which restriction of free trade was essential; first, "...when some particular sort of industry is necessary for defense of the country." 17. Second, "...when there is a tax on the produce of the like home market." Thus, Smith in his speculative writings noted the reciprocal nature of tariffs, a fact which Chamberlain some one-hundred and sixty-five years later found necessary to take into consideration when forming Government policies.

17. Ibid., p. 427.
18. Ibid., p. 429.
Chapter IV

THEORY OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Section 1. Peace.

Chamberlain's entire foreign policy has been directed toward one end and that is, European and world peace. Though he possesses a real and sincere hatred of war a complete explanation of the prodigious efforts that he and his Government have expended in an effort to maintain world peace is to be found elsewhere in a considerably more tangible form. For Chamberlain as most Britishers, realizes that "Britain's interest lies in the pacification of the whole world."1 In a speech made at London on June 10, 1936 he pointed out that the very nature of the British Empire was not one conducive to security:

"...this country, with all its wealth, all its territory, all its trade connections...provide a standing temptation to a possible aggressor which some day might prove to be irresistible." 2

Thus, the attempt has been not merely to achieve peace in the form of an armed truce, but to establish those conditions of world harmony that would remove all possibility of war.

Such a condition of world harmony is possible only if there exists a general feeling of understanding and confidence among the nations of the world. For it

is only when such a state exists that the statesmen of these nations can meet together and amicably search for and find the solution to their common problems by means of international cooperation. In a speech before the House of Commons on August 24, 1939 Chamberlain pointed out this need:

"We want to see established international order based upon mutual understanding and mutual confidence."

"We cannot build up such an order unless it conforms to certain principles which are essential to the establishment of confidence and trust." 3.

The last few years, however, have not been occupied so much with the establishment of world harmony as with frenzied attempts to merely stave off open conflict. Appreciating how closely the nations of the world are in interaction with one another Chamberlain realized that the outbreak of any conflict no matter how exiguous was extremely likely to result in a world conflict. For this reason he has done everything in his power to further the use of arbitration as the means of settling international disputes. It was this desire that took him to Munich. It was not a question of disagreeing with German claims for he freely admitted that in the main they were valid. His only contention was that arbitration and not force should be the method employed to settle international disagreements. For the use of force would be resisted by force and the resulting

conflict would embroil the other nations of the world in the maelstrom of armed conflict.

Growing out of this belief that peace must be preserved at almost any cost was the policy of appeasement. This was an attempt to satisfy by means of concessions the demands of several countries, particularly Germany, at least until British armaments were of such a nature as to allow her again to enter the arena of power politics. Chamberlain outlined this program in a speech given in Birmingham on March 17, 1939:

"But I had another purpose, too, in going to Munich - that was to further the policy ... which is sometimes called European appeasement... If that policy were to succeed it was essential that... each one should be contended to obtain reasonable facilities for developing its own resources, securing its own share of international trade and improving the conditions of its own people. I felt that although that might well mean a clash of interests between different States, and an understanding of what were the limits of the desires of others, it should be possible to resolve all differences by discussion and without armed conflict." 4.

Chamberlain has but little faith in the League of Nations as a potent factor in the cause of world peace. Its chief value is limited to what little good-will and understanding it is able to create between nations. Perhaps the greatest cause for the failure of the League of Nations was the failure to include a clause providing

4. *Vital Speeches*, April 1, 1939, volume 5, p. 359
legal means for revising the Versailles Treaty thereby necessitating a forceful revision on the part of the vanquished nations. Furthermore, refusal of the United States to enter and the withdrawal of several other major powers sealed its fate.

However, Chamberlain is fully cognizant of the part that armaments and the ability to apply force must play in modern society. The League of Nations was built around that insufficient force of economic sanctions and was unable to enforce its articles. Chamberlain points out in an address given at Birmingham on December 20, 1925 the need on the part of the League of Nations for power:

"...whatever the form of pressure which the League may exercise upon an aggressor in the future, the ultimate recourse... is the fact of force and nothing else. Unless the aggressor is satisfied there is against him a potential force too great for him to withstand, then you will never have any security." 5.

He has long been an advocate of rearmament; for to remain unarmed in a rapidly rearming world would be suicidal, that is, if a nation desired to preserve its sovereignty. Also without some means of backing up her demands Britain found her diplomacy to be ineffective. In a speech before the House of Commons on July 26, 1938 Chamberlain pointed out the progress being

made in rearmament:

"We are making rapid progress with our great rearmament program...let us not be unmindful of the fact that though it is good to have a giant's strength it is tyrannical to use it like a giant." 6

While Chamberlain was stressing this tremendous progress of the British rearmament program Winston Churchill was pointing out the irony of his statements. For while Britain was making great strides toward rearmament her major competitor was making still greater ones.

PART THREE

COMPARATIVE SUMMARY
Section 1. Theory of the State.

The theory of the State occupies a paramount place in the political philosophy of both Hitler and Chamberlain. For it is the fundamental principles of the theory of the State which gives to each of these two political philosophies its own distinctive character. The basic principle in both cases lies in the particular conception of the community. It is, however, at just this point that Hitler and Chamberlain divericate.

Hitler on the one hand regards the community as being an actually existent entity having reality in itself. On the other hand Chamberlain regards the community as merely a group of people that have as the result of common problems of social life evolved common institutions for the solution of these problems, one of which is the State. The emphasis has thus been placed on exactly the opposite factor, as Hitler subordinates the individual to the community which is most fully actualized in the State, while Chamberlain subordinates the State to the individual. Being bases on such widely divergent principles it is only natural that these political philosophies would develop so dissimilarly.

Hitler's conception of the community has resulted in what might be termed an "introvert society", that is, the German folk community being both racially pure and of a superior calibre must be self-contained in order to preserve this purity and superiority. As a result of this outlook there has been very little amalgamation with the
surrounding peoples and their cultures. Rather it has been a matter of utilization. This has inexorably led to too great an emphasis being placed on the in-group as opposed to the out-group, resulting in the feeling that if there is not actual conflict between German interests and those of the rest of Europe at least there is very little similarity. Furthermore, the form of economic self-sufficiency necessitated by conditions existing in Germany at the time Hitler came into power has to a considerable extent re-enforced this in-group feeling. Such a viewpoint not only is not conducive to international cooperation but quite the opposite leading to international misunderstanding, hatred and conflict. Hitler points out again and again that the German people must through great deeds discard their feeling of inferiority and realize their true destiny.

Chamberlain's conception of the community on the other hand is expressed in just the opposite type of society, an "extrovert society". For inasmuch as any differences exists between States they are merely a matter of development and not a difference of kind. No great emphasis is placed on these differences existing between one State and another, that is, as a barrier to interstate relationships. There is a much greater tendency to examine other peoples and their cultural achievements on the basis of merit and to incorporate and absorb whatever may seem to be of value in these societies. However, I don't mean to suggest that any Englishman would actually
follow such a procedure but rather that it is not theoretically impossible. This conception of the State coupled with the recognition of the interdependency of States tends to make for greater international cooperation not only in attempting to find a solution for those problems that are admittedly international in nature but also for those problems that are in many quarters regarded as primarily intranational in nature.

Section 2. **Theory of Government**

The theories of government held by Chamberlain and Hitler are no less diametrically opposed to each other than those of the State. In government Chamberlain sees but another social institution that as the result of a particular social need has been evolved by man, while Hitler on the other hand conceives of government as merely an expression of the State.

To merely point out that Chamberlain is an exponent of democracy and that Hitler is an advocate of totalitarianism would be rather superficial; for it is possible to some extent to explain the reason for this divergence of opinion. That is, there are certain principles held by each man which furnish the background for their particular governmental conception. While Chamberlain and Hitler both hold that government should express the "general will", they are in complete dis-

agreement as to the means by which it can be realized. Hitler believing the people to be either unwilling or incapable of expressing their "general will" is of the opinion that it must be expressed for them and that this can be done most efficiently by some one individual who has interests other than the German community. Chamberlain would not contend that the democratic process does not more nearly express the "will of all" than the "general will". However, possessing a considerably higher opinion of the individual members of the community than Hitler he would hold that such a democratic expression is more closely akin to the "general will" than that expressed by a government in which the sovereignty resides in a single person. Thus, the fundamental reason for these two men holding such divergent governmental theories is found to be tied up with the way in which they regard the community, when considered as a collection of individuals. Chamberlain regards the individual members as being the reality which has given actuality to the government while Hitler regards the State as expressed in a government to be the reality which makes possible the actuality of the individual.

In the theory of government held by both Chamberlain and Hitler the party plays an important role. In England the party system is a means of giving expression

to the major interests of the electorate while in Germany it is the chief means of perpetuating the National Socialist Government by seeing to it that the will of the people conforms to the "general will" as conceived by the Fuehrer. There must, thus, necessarily be a difference in the number of parties possible in two such different political systems. In Germany there can be but one party, the National-Socialist Party, all other parties must be disbanded. For a plurality of parties would represent a plurality of viewpoints and such a plurality would not be consistent with Hitler's conception of a unified German community. In England the opposite would be the case for not only is there no need for absolute unity but disagreement is one of the fundamental factors of democracy. The major difference in regard to this point is that any difference of opinion in a society governed by a totalitarian government is able to a considerable extent to disorganize society while in the case of a democratic society difference of opinion not only does not disorganize society but is considered to be a healthy influence upon the development of that society. Thus, there is a need for several parties that are organized in such a manner as to be able to represent the will of the people. This is probably one of the major faults of our present government, that is, that there are but two parties and policies is merely a question of ins and outs.

In both theories of government education plays a
vital role. In a totalitarian State education is a means of preserving the necessary unity, that is, the means of bringing the will of the people into harmony with the will of the government. In a democratic State education rather than being a means of indoctrination is an institution by means of which the people as a whole are taught to see the problems of government and to have some understanding of their solution in order that as an electorate they may not only express a sound will but also realize whether or not this will is being put into practice by those men elected to public office for this express purpose.

Section 3. Economic Theory

In the case of the economic theory of Hitler and Chamberlain there is to be found the same wide divergence that exists between their theories of the State and government. Chamberlain as far as is possible in a modern society advocates a policy of laissez-faire, while Hitler on the other hand advocates the opposite policy of the complete orientation of all the economic faculties of society. The difference in the theory of government makes possible if it does not necessitate such a difference of economic theory.

Thus, there is a considerable difference in the political philosophy lying behind these two economic theories. In the case of Chamberlain any control on the part of the government of business is the result of a democratic process. That is, the people have through legal
channels consented, at least tacitly, to give up some of their rights to freedom of enterprise in order that society may function more efficiently and harmoniously. In the political philosophy of Hitler rather than the individual surrendering some of his rights it is a matter of the government permitting to some extent a freedom of enterprise.

Another major difference in the economic theories of Hitler and Chamberlain lies in the goal to be achieved by the economic policies of the State. Hitler conceives the goal of the economic policy of a State to be national self-sufficiency. As has already been indicated this principle of national self-sufficiency is the result of several factors: means of achieving the desired political unity, greater preparation for war, material conditions existing in Germany at the time Hitler came into power. Chamberlain holds that the realization of such a policy even if desirable would be impossible; for the very essence of modern society is the interdependency of nations not only political but economic. Hence the entire economic policy of England has been directed towards the expediting of the free flow of international trade.

Section 4. Theory of International Relations

There is no greater similarity to be observed between Chamberlain and Hitler's theory of international relations than was found in the preceding theories. Their
approach to the problem of inter-State relations is from a completely different theoretical point of view. Chamberlain on the one hand would be termed an internationalist while on the other hand Hitler is an exponent of the theory of balance of power. Chamberlain holds that all of the nations of the world the smallest as well as the largest are tied so closely together that inter-State relations if they are to achieve any sort of harmony must be on the basis of cooperation. Hitler is of the opinion that international relations is not a matter concerning all States but only the major powers; for the lesser States fall naturally into certain spheres of influence and exist merely as satellites to these major powers. They owe not only their economic and political existence to these major powers but also their social and cultural achievements. Thus, European affairs would rest in the hands of three or four major powers and peace would be the result of a proper balance being maintained between these States. However, Chamberlain realizes no less than Hitler that the major powers control almost completely the destiny of the world, but he would still hold it advisable for these smaller States to be given some voice in the regulation of inter-State affairs.

The means whereby these systems could be given realization would necessarily differ. Hitler sees this balance of power being maintained by the formation among the major powers of two fairly equal coalitions with the
smaller states gravitating toward one or the other. Chamberlain on the other hand is of the opinion that a system of international cooperation must eventually be based upon some form of League or Federation among the nations.

Both Chamberlain and Hitler have been fully aware of the chief deficiency of the present League of Nations, that is, its lack of power. Hitler has indicated this knowledge by riding rough shod over its dictates while Chamberlain has expressed it by refusing to place any faith in its dictates, though he does believe that it serves to create better understanding and friendship among nations. Chamberlain would like to revive the League of Nations by giving to it the necessary power to enforce its dictates.

There is another major difference in the theory of international relations of Chamberlain and Hitler, that is, the part to be played by force. Both men realize that under present conditions it is only through the possession of power that a nation can make its diplomacy effective. Chamberlain would make negotiation and arbitration the sole means of settling international disputes with power being used only to insure the use of such methods. Hitler too, would prefer to satisfy his demands by means of negotiation but not being able to achieve them in this manner he believes in the application of force. This difference is no doubt largely the result of the different
positions held by England and Germany since the war. In other words it has been more or less a matter of haves and have-nots. Hitler has been willing rather than to become lost in the maze of formal diplomacy to cut the Gordian knot and chance everything on a policy which inevitably meant war.
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