

Table of Contents

Introduction	2-3
Appeasement and the Lessons of Munich	4-11
By: Avi Davis	
Appeasement in Europe, Then and Now	12-22
By: Robert Spencer	
Terror and Appeasement	23-24
By: Melanie Phillips	
Appeasement 101.....	25-27
By: Victor Davis Hanson	
Appeasement or ‘Grand Strategy’	28-29
By: Diane West	
Appeasement Revisited	30-31
By: Vaclav Harvel	
The Right Time for An Islamic Reformation.....	32-33
By Salman Rushdie	
Appeasement and Why Europe Balks	34-35
By: Daniel Pipes	
Syria Joins the Axis of Evil.....	36-39
By: John R. Bolton	
Today’s Defeatists: The 21st- Century cut-and-run.	40-45
By: Donald Kagan	

Appendix

Text of Munich Agreement	46-47
Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain	48
Clement Atlee, House of Commons, October 3, 1938	49-50
Winston Churchill, House of Commons, October 5, 1938	51-53
Prime Minister Chamberlain, House of Commons, October 5, 1938	54-55
“Peace for Our Time,” September 30, 1938.....	56
Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain	

Introduction

The essays in this booklet commemorate the 70th Anniversary of the Munich Agreement and its impact and relevance for our times.

Less than a century after it occurred, Munich still holds place in the popular imagination and its lessons may be more instructive than ever. In a post-9/11 world we face a two pronged threat - that of Islam inserting itself into Western civilization and the real threat of a nuclear armed Iran. Neither development augurs well for the Western world.

As of this writing, the United States and Israel are hoping that the latest report from the UN's IAEA report on Iran will boost their efforts in pushing for tougher sanctions against Iran. Meanwhile, five former secretaries of state, Warren Christopher, Henry Kissinger, Madeleine Albright, James Baker III and Colin Powell agreed at a 90-minute session at George Washington University that the US should talk to Iran and that the military options against it are not feasible. As Israel faces a real threat to its existence, the US refuses to accommodate any planned attack upon Iran and five former secretaries of state are advocating negotiations with a leader who threatens genocide and is both a Holocaust denier and admirer of Adolf Hitler. The experience of Munich teaches us that political leaders, no matter what their experience or expertise, can make terrible mistakes. And the failure to accept that any threat to Israel is actually a threat against Western civilization, is exactly the same kind of mistake made at Munich 70 years ago.

In the past year we have seen the West's continued apathy in its failure to confront Russia when it invaded Georgia; the ongoing acceptance of North Korea as a nuclear power and the accession to Syria's de facto reign in Lebanon.

More frightening than any of these however, is what is happening within our own communities. In England, Sharia compliant courts now exist, side by side, with English courts. In America, certain terms such as 'jihad' were excised from a new lexicon on terrorism for fear of offending Muslims. In many countries, journalists, authors and commentators who criticize Islam are being fined, prosecuted and even jailed. From banning books, to rampant honor killings, to widespread genital mutilation, to acceptance of many other encroachments on Western values - the West does indeed appear to be locked in a new process of appeasement.

In many ways, the current leadership of the West may have indeed, forgotten the lessons of Munich. The essays in this book are from such diverse writers such as Sir Winston Churchill, Salman Rushdie, Vaclav Havel, John Bolton, Victor Davis Hanson, Diana West, Robert Spencer and others are offered as reminders of those lessons.

Sir Winston Churchill , a hero of the 20th century once said:

“This is the lesson: never give in, never give in, never, never, never,—in nothing, great or small, large or petty—never give in except to convictions of honour and good sense. Never yield to force; never yield to the apparently overwhelming might of the enemy.”

We, who live in an age of great military and financial might, with resources that Neville Chamberlain could never have dreamed of possessing, have the power to fight back against these alarming trends. In the context of today’s challenges, Sir Winston’s words ring truer than ever.

Elisa Vandernoot, Editor

Appeasement and the Lessons of Munich

By Avi Davis

The memory of the Munich Agreement dredges up strong images and perhaps even stronger emotions. The handshake in Munich in the early hours of the morning of September 30, 1938; the ill-fated Heathrow Airport address, with an exhausted Chamberlain fluttering the Munich Agreement in the wind; the false proclamations of peace announced by British daily newspapers the next day. But the stronger images are those we associate with the aftermath: scarred battlefields, cratered cities, billowing crematoria, emaciated concentration camp victims and the newsreels revealing piles of rotting corpses.

With the benefit of hindsight, we can review the series of events that led to one of the greatest diplomatic debacles in history and ask some compelling questions: What motivated the actors in this drama? What kind of world view informed a policy that impeded any serious effort on the part of the Western democracies to confront Hitler and to abandon a democratic country with whom they were allied? And more to the point, what lessons have the Western democracies gleaned from the Munich Agreement in recognizing current threats to Western civilization?

The Meaning and History of Appeasement

“Appease(ment)” is defined by the Oxford English Dictionary alternatively as “to bring peace, pacify, settle strife or disorder;” and “to pacify, assuage or allay anger or displeasure.” But since 1938, the word has garnered a political meaning all of its own. A third entry in the OED defines “appeasement” in a derogatory sense, “used of the British Prime Minister’s efforts from 1937 to 1939 to stave off the threatened aggression of the Axis Powers.” Of course, for many political leaders, commentators and pundits, appeasement today signifies far more than one instance of failed diplomacy. It has come to define cowardice and irresolution in the face of aggression.

Yet the fact that the dictionary uses a historical event to give context and meaning to a word, is powerful evidence of how deeply ingrained the events and lessons of 1938 have seeped into the consciousness of the West.

But is it entirely fair? Appeasement, after all, was a function of the foreign policies of all the Great Powers in the 19th Century. It was regularly and skillfully employed by European political leaders from Metternich to Bismarck to Salisbury in order to create a balance of power that kept Europe largely at peace for 100 years. Imperial Rome had employed policies of appeasement to govern its far flung empire and so did Great Britain when its own imperial ambitions began to outgrow its reach. An example is how the U.K., confronted with the rising menace of a unified Germany, sought to strengthen its global position by appeasing the United States in the 1890s. Between 1896 and

1903 Great Britain acceded to American demands to explicitly accept the Monroe Doctrine; submitted British Guiana's border dispute with Venezuela to international arbitration; agreed to the construction of the Panama Canal and settled a Canadian- American border dispute in the U.S' favor. All were examples of a willingness to appease a foreign power's demands in the interests of broader future interests.

The First World War and the various crises leading up to the commencement of hostilities in Europe in 1914, jettisoned the carefully crafted 'concert of Europe'. The land grab of the late 19th and early 20th century in Africa and Asia, and the imperatives of empire building, brought an end to the willingness of statesmen to subordinate territorial ambition to practical diplomacy. In its place emerged muscular foreign policies which scraped and grinded against one another until they ignited the spark of an all consuming confrontation.

That some felt that the devastation of the First World War should have finally brought Europe back to its diplomatic senses, is revealed in the diaries and writings of many young British diplomats who attended the Versailles Peace Conference in 1919. Men such as Harold Nicolson and John Maynard Keynes, who were later to play important roles in the British government in the 20s and 30s, derided the Peace Treaty as a betrayal of the principles of diplomacy that they had learned from their study of the master statesmen of the 19th Century. Rather than punish Germany as the instigator of the Great War and reduce that country to penury, more judicious minds, they argued, would have rehabilitated the country and strengthened its fledgling democratic institutions. Instead, in their opinions, the Peace Treaty became an instrument of Allied retribution and a continuation of the self-oriented policies that had resulted in the unnecessary collapse of international order in the first place.

It is little wonder then, that over the next twenty years, a succession of British leaders were complicit in undoing the harshness of the Versailles Treaty. Many politicians in Britain felt that Germany, now a democracy, had been wrongfully stripped of its position among the nations of Europe and saddled with a guilt which the entire continent actually bore. The willingness to abide Germany's resurrection was therefore not only an attempt to accept their own share of guilt for the Great War's desolation, but a necessary policy to restore the balance in international relations which the Peace Treaty had eclipsed. This is the reason the British parliament endorsed the Anglo- German Naval Treaty of 1935 which implicitly violated the terms of the Versailles Treaty. It is the reason the Allies failed to respond to Germany's re-occupation of the Rhineland in 1936 - another serious breach - and the cause for the abandonment of democratic Austria when Hitler marched his troops into Vienna in early 1938.

British policy for four hundred years had been to align itself against any rising power bent on continental domination. Therefore, an ascendant Germany needed to be thwarted by carefully constructed alliances and the application

of assertive diplomacy. However, such a policy was also built upon the foundational understanding of a certain normalcy among European leaders. In Adolf Hitler, the new German authoritarian, Western leaders thought they saw a statesman who acted according to generally accepted principles of statecraft. To men such as England's Stanley Baldwin and Neville Chamberlain and France's Leon Blum, Hitler could be dealt with as an equal, because they believed that ultimately he would both think and act like them.

This was the Allies' most consequential mistake. For Adolf Hitler was not a modern day statesman at all - but rather a throwback to the tribal leadership of the Germanic tribes who had destroyed Rome. Adolf Hitler could neither be deterred by appeals to reason, nor by appeals to self interest. He could not, in other words, be appeased. He was uninterested in the economic rationalizations other European leaders made against war; he was similarly uninterested in the humanitarian reasons to prevent another war on the scale of the first. For Hitler, war in itself was a strategic objective, a function of his desire to harden the German spirit in order to make it worthy of the Thousand Year Reich he visualized. It is therefore instructive that while many historians have ascribed to Hitler a victory at Munich, the man himself viewed the entire episode as a defeat. He had been dissuaded from going to war when his all political instincts and personal desires propelled him in that direction.

Neville Chamberlain's Role

Neville Chamberlain, on the other hand, who has been portrayed for decades as a dupe and fool, was actually nothing of the sort. He was a canny politician with a strong sense of the national mood. He not only reflected the near universal desire of the British citizenry to avoid war, but was practicing the kind of personal international statecraft which had worked so well for the leaders of his father's generation. Chamberlain, aloof and self-righteous, believed that the fate of civilization hinged on the decisions of just a few men. He therefore expected his fascist counterparts in Germany and Italy to play along with his determination "to make gentle the life of Europe."

But the British leader, whose policies more or less dictated those of France (who felt too weak militarily to go to war alone against Germany) cannot be excused for his egregious miscalculations. He failed to assess the strategic consequences of Germany's union with Austria; he failed to appreciate the deterrent value of combining an accelerated rearmament program with a firm commitment to defend France and the Low Countries with troop deployments; he failed to understand that Eastern Europe could not be defended by Britain and France but only with the intervention of the Soviet Union. His unwillingness to explore the option of an alliance with the communists would doom Eastern Europe to Nazi domination.

Chamberlain's personal style and arrogance set the tone for the disaster which

overcame the West in the twelve months following the Munich Agreement. Yet the lessons of Munich should not focus on Chamberlain's foibles, but on what the West as a whole might have accomplished had it reached a unified consensus about Adolf Hitler's ambition to dominate Europe.

Counterfactual scenarios can feed endless speculation on the question of what might have happened had England and France stood up to Hitler. What if they had seen through Hitler's veil of respectability as a head of state and understood him for the unprincipled adventurer and manipulator that he actually was? What if they had vigorously combined their military and financial superiority to force a German retreat? What if, instead of shamefully abandoning Czechoslovakia to its fate, Chamberlain and Daladier had stood firm and threatened war instead of offering accommodation?

It is possible that had Hitler been handed a true defeat at Munich, his generals, who had been against a confrontation with the West, might have risen against him and removed him from power. Had he survived such a coup, a chastened Fuhrer may have re-thought his plans for territorial conquest and focused on internal control. Certainly, the outbreak of the Second World War would have been delayed if not averted, giving the West the time it needed to strengthen its defenses and build the alliances necessary to hem in an aggressive Germany. In the event that Hitler would not back down, there would have been war, and, as almost all historians agree, such a pre-emptive confrontation could have saved millions of lives.

The trouble for both historians and leaders with any pre-emptive strike or action, is that, since the event sought to be avoided never happens, one can never truly assess the magnitude of the would-be catastrophe. Yet the exploration of "what ifs" is still important for an understanding of how the world has operated since the end of the Second World War. That is because the memory of Munich retains an enormous influence over the way American political leaders react to the challenges to national security.

Indeed, every United States president since 1945 has invoked the specter of Munich to justify the execution of some aspect of foreign policy. For Harry Truman, Munich dictated intervention in Korea since: "Communism was acting in Korea just as Hitler and the Japanese had acted ten, fifteen and twenty years earlier." Dwight Eisenhower used Munich to justify the domino theory – that is, "that aggression unchecked, is aggression encouraged." John F. Kennedy cited Munich during the Cuban Missile Crisis warning that "the 1930s taught us a clear lesson: aggressive conduct, if allowed to go unchecked, ultimately leads to war."

Lyndon Johnson was propelled into escalation in Vietnam by fear of appearing to be an appeaser. He told historian Doris Kearns Goodwin: "Everything I knew about history told me that if I got out of Vietnam and let Ho Chi Minh

run through the streets of Saigon, then I'd be doing exactly what Chamberlain did..... I'd be giving a reward to aggression." Richard Nixon agreed, stating in his memoirs: "What had been true of the betrayal of Czechoslovakia in 1938 was no least true of the betrayal of South Vietnam to the communists, advocated by many in 1965." Jimmy Carter invoked Munich in his cancellation of the U.S. participation in the 1980 Moscow Olympics, following the Soviet Union's invasion of Afghanistan. "We have learned from Munich that accommodations of aggressive behavior only leads to further aggression." Ronald Reagan arguing forcefully for a strong defense: "One of the greatest tragedies of this century," he said in a 1983 speech, "was that only after the balance of power was eroded and a ruthless adversary decided to strike, was the importance of a strong defense was realized"

George H.W. Bush, in justifying intervention in Kuwait, stated: "If history teaches us anything, it is that we must resist aggression or it will destroy our freedoms. Appeasement does not work. As was the case in the 1930s, we see in Saddam Hussein an aggressive neighbor threatening his neighbors." Bill Clinton used Munich as an analogy in dealing with the Slobodan Milosevic's genocidal campaign in Serbia: "What if someone had listened to Winston Churchill and stood up to Adolf Hilter earlier? How many peoples' lives might have been saved?" George W. Bush , on the eve of launching Operation Freedom in Iraq, observed that "In the 20th Century, some chose to appease murderous dictators, whose threats were able to grow into genocide and global war."

So often is Munich still invoked on the political stage that its reference has reverted today to something of a political cliché. But if the above statements prove anything, it is that every generation of American leaders since the Second World War, has felt that aggression, if not met by a show of force, invites deep threats to national security. Sometimes they have been proven right – as was the case with Kennedy and Reagan; but sometimes they have also been proven wrong – as was the case with Johnson.

Threats to Western Civilization

What these quotes also reveal is that there will always be threats to freedom and to the Western way of life. How we deal with those threats will depend on how we characterize them. Today the threats to our civilization emerge from rogue regimes whose acquisition or near acquisition of nuclear weaponry threatens to upset the international order. In this regard, Iran and Korea stand as the prime international aggressors. Iran's genocidal threats to Israel, dismissed by so many in the West as mere puffery, will take on graver reality when Iran finally comes into possession of nuclear weapons. The West seems quite oblivious to the threats to Israel - which is a position not unlike that of the Allies' attitude towards Czechoslovakia . Even if Israel, unlike the Czechs in 1938, has the means for massive retaliation or pre-emption, the unwillingness of the West to recognize a threat to a democratic country as a threat to the itself, has important

psychological ramifications. It feeds the sense of Western disunity and its unwillingness to resolutely defend its own values.

The perceived weakness of the West in allowing these countries to continue their brazen conduct, may inevitably present it with some very serious dilemmas. Either it must be prepared to live with dangerous enemies who show little sign of restraint in the deployment of weapons of mass destruction, or else it must confront those regimes while there is still time, with ultimatums, backed by the threat of military force. Successful engagement of either regime may depend on a frank assessment as to what conciliation can realistically accomplish. Iran's leaders have already demonstrated that they have no regard for maintaining international order. Nor do they care much for the humanitarian cost of their policies. But are they prepared, like Adolf Hitler before them, to sacrifice the welfare of their own populations and perhaps the survival of their own regimes for the fulfillment of an ideological agenda? That can only be tested by the commitment of the democracies to a policy of confrontation, and, if necessary, military force.

Since August, 2008, another nation has joined this club of rogues, although its membership has not quite yet been validated. Russia's invasion of Southern Ossetia and its trampling of Georgian independence augurs a return to 'sphere of influence' international politics of the 19th Century. While Russian hegemonic ambitions may be related only to its own region and not to world domination, it is not clear whether the resurgent northern nation's quest is to extinguish democracy altogether or to remove the threats of independence movements on its southern and western borders. The Russian desire to regain lost national honor after the ignominious collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, bears much in common with the collapse of Germany following the First World War. But whether this means that Vladimir Putin is on the road to a dictatorship that bodes a new confrontation with the West, is still unclear. As Russia gains strength and confidence, the West will need to find a forceful response to that country's next invasion or intimidation of a neighboring democracy. For Western silence or inaction will almost certainly be interpreted in Moscow as assent.

While appeasement has traditionally been regarded as reflecting the relations between nation states, the reality is that today in London, Paris, Madrid, Berlin – and even in some cities in the United States - a new form of appeasement has arisen which now demands our attention. With the growth of the multicultural state and the emphasis by nearly every modern democracy on pluralism, Islamic fundamentalism, operating under the umbrella of "cultural diversity" has grown in strength and appeal to young Muslims disaffected with Western life. In recent years, the Salman Rushdie Affair, Danish cartoon riots, French riots, the London and Madrid bombings and the slaying of well known Dutch filmmaker Theo Van Gogh are all examples of the growing strength and confidence of Islamic fundamentalism in Western society and its strategy of using democratic

protections to advance a destructive agenda.

As Robert Spencer capably demonstrates later in the pages of this booklet, rather than recognizing the seriousness of the threat that this movement presents to democratic life and freedom, Western democracies have abetted its growth. In England, the highest prelate in the country, the Archbishop of Canterbury, has voiced his opinion in favor of independent Islamic courts to adjudicate family and financial matters within the Muslim community of Britain. He has been supported in this view by Britain's Chief Justice. Such an argument has as its natural corollary the fragmentation of the common law as a universal code for one people. It is an ominous sign of societal breakdown which Islam is all too willing to exploit.

In France, imams preach destruction of the West as their 'democratic right', protected by the law, while in some areas rioters burn cars nightly almost unimpeded by French police. In certain areas of France and other parts of Europe, honor killings, genital mutilation, spousal abuse and arbitrary violence against non-believers, takes place unchallenged by local authorities for fear of upsetting cultural sensitivities.

Acquiescence

Those who seek to expose these developments are often met with derision, isolation and even prosecution. Writers such as France's Michel Houellebecq and the late Italian author Oriana Fallaci have been prosecuted for incitement. In Canada, journalist Mark Steyn has been prosecuted for his views, while in Holland, Ayaan Hirsi Ali, a Dutch legislator, was forced to flee her own country because the authorities could not guarantee her safety. Throughout Europe, there is increasing trepidation in criticizing Islam and the Muslim community – not only for fear of offending Muslims, but also in dread of tripping the wires of the guardians of political correctness. One is reminded of Winston Churchill's admonition to the House of Commons following the Munich Agreement:

“ I hear it said sometimes now - that we cannot allow the Nazi system of dictatorship to be criticised by ordinary, common English politicians. Then, with a Press under control, with every organ of public opinion doped and chloroformed into acquiescence, we shall be conducted along further stages of our journey.”

Have we, in the 21st Century, been “chloroformed and doped” into acquiescence? If so, changing that reality must begin by reassessing how we understand the concept of appeasement. It needs to be stretched in our understanding beyond its current application from aggressive states to aggressive populations as well. For to broaden the definition is to also broaden our acceptance of the threat to our communities, societies and civilization.

When we think of Munich today, we recall two nations negotiating desperately for their own survival. But that's not the way Neville Chamberlain necessarily thought of his role. He considered himself a savior who was negotiating to save not only Britain but the world from the prospect of a cataclysm. The thought that his actions might actually hasten that cataclysm, never seemed to cross his mind – and millions of people went along with him. What he and Daladier and others failed to understand was that it was neither Britain, France nor Czechoslovakia as individual nations nor the “world” (which included the fascist governments) that were imperiled at Munich. The Nazi assault on Europe was a moral crusade aimed at undermining the foundations of Western civilization. While the Nazis certainly sought the destruction of democratic government, they also planned the excision of Judeo-Christian values and the social framework built upon them. At Munich, Hitler probed the strength of Western resolve to protect those values. When he found that it couldn't or wouldn't defend them, he was emboldened to move forward with his own territorial and genocidal objectives.

Today it is therefore not enough for democratic governments to characterize the provocations of rogue regimes or minority populations as merely criminal activities or troubling security issues. They are civilizational threats. Events such as the 9/11 attacks on the World Trade Towers, the London Underground plots or the Madrid bombings were not just new atrocities or political theater perpetrated to bring attention to a cause. They were the work of patient strategists and planners who understand the psychological and political weaknesses of the West and the perceived cravenness of its response to provocation.

Ultimately, then, there are three vital lessons the West must continue to glean from the Munich experience:

First, appeasement only works, if it works at all, when the appeasing nation operates from a position of military, economic, and psychological superiority.

Second, all countries who subscribe to the Western democratic tradition and the rule of law, must remain constantly vigilant and unified in their understanding that any attack on a democracy, is also an attack upon their own values and principles.

Third, preemptive war, so shrouded in political obloquy these days, may at times not only be a military necessity, but a moral imperative.

Without these understandings, another Munich – with all attendant disasters it brought down upon the civilized world, may be visited upon us once again.

Avi Davis is the Executive Director and Senior Fellow of the American Freedom Alliance in Los Angeles.

Appeasement in Europe, Then and Now

By Robert Spencer

The concept of appeasement is usually applied to conflicts between nation-states, with the most infamous example being the attempt by Great Britain and France to appease Nazi Germany just before World War II. Despite its dismal twentieth century record, however, appeasement has again become the diplomatic weapon of choice for many European government officials – this time not in the context of war between nations, but as a way to deal with restive, growing, and unassimilated Muslim populations within their own countries.

It may be astounding to informed onlookers that Europe would again be pursuing a policy of appeasement in any context. But hindsight is easy; in the nineteenth century, appeasement was an effective policy to which all the Great Powers had recourse at one time or another. The difference between the nineteenth century and the 1930s was that in the earlier period the West was appeasing from a position of strength, not weakness. In the 1930s, Britain and France were both war-weary and horrified by the pointless carnage of World War I. In that environment it seemed reasonable to make concessions, even ones with significant political ramifications, in order to ensure a lasting peace. Increasing sentiment in both countries that the Treaty of Versailles had been unjust to the Germans, and that those injustices needed to be redressed, compounded these sentiments.

Appeasement-minded politicians, therefore, believed that the course they were pursuing would heal the long-standing enmity between Germany and the Western democracies, and head off another world war. On September 27, 1938, British Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain explained and defended the appeasement policy in an address to the British people and a speech in the House of Commons. He positioned himself as the representative of those who were deeply worried by the prospect of another world war:

“First of all, I must say something to those who have written to my wife or myself in these last weeks to tell us of their gratitude for my efforts and to assure us of their prayers for my success. Most of these letters have come from women -- mothers or sisters of our own countrymen. But there are countless others besides -- from France, from Belgium, from Italy, even from Germany, and it has been heartbreaking to read of the growing anxiety they reveal and their intense relief when they thought, too soon, that the danger of war was past.”

He went on, infamously: “If I felt my responsibility heavy before, to read such letters has made it seem almost overwhelming. How horrible, fantastic, incredible it is that we should be digging trenches and trying on gas masks here because of a quarrel in a far-away country between people of whom we know

nothing. “ If a world war must break out, he suggested that it should be over something more important than the territorial integrity of Czechoslovakia: “If we have to fight it must be on larger issues than that. “ He told the Commons that he was being inundated with letters from people who were asking “if they were asked to go to war in order that the Sudeten Germans might not join the Reich. “ He claimed that by dismembering Czechoslovakia, he was saving it from “annihilation “ and giving it “a chance of new life as a new State, which involves the loss of territory and fortifications, but may perhaps enable her to enjoy in the future and develop a national existence under a neutrality and security comparable to that which we see in Switzerland to-day.”

The parallels with the present situation are many, even though in the global jihad today Europe doesn't face a conventional threat from a nation-state. Nevertheless, Sharia supremacists wish to transform and remake in their own image Western European societies no less thoroughly than did the Nazis. And after World War II, Vietnam and the Cold War, the West in general is just as war-weary, if not more so, than Europe was in the 1930s. Recalling the dissatisfaction in the democracies with the Versailles Treaty and the devastation it had wrought upon the German economy, many influential politicians in both Europe and the United States believe that the foreign policy posture of the United States and Britain since September 11, 2001 has been unjust to the Islamic world – and unjust to the extent that it has created resentments that would disappear if this posture were abandoned.

Add to this mix a multiculturalist ethos that exalts the presence of foreign and non-assimilated cultures within Western countries perceived as large umbrella structures for a huge variety of diverse peoples, and the stage is set for a policy of appeasement of political agenda and the ideology of Islamic supremacism. European elites today believe that by admitting large numbers of Muslim immigrants into their country and making special accommodations for Islamic culture and practices, Europe will achieve a new cultural flowering – but left unconsidered in this is the nature of political Islam, which when dominant is hardly hospitable to rival political systems or cultures.

Britain: cultural concessions and cultural collapse

Cultural appeasement has become the norm in Europe today. The old model of requiring that immigrants assimilate and adopt the customs and mores of their new country has given way to a multiculturalist model that envisions immigrants maintaining their own practices and cultural habits in their new country. In the case of Islam, since Islamic law contains a complete model for society and governance that is considered to be divinely inspired and superior to all its rivals, multiculturalism accommodation is short-sighted, and tantamount to cultural suicide. And given that Islam also is unique among the religions of the world in containing a developed doctrine, theology and legal system that mandates warfare against unbelievers, this accommodation is difficult to distinguish, either

in intention or effect, from outright appeasement.

The nation in which this policy stands most vividly exposed as appeasement pure and simple is Britain. Many of its cultural accommodations border on the risible:

- British schools dropped teaching about the Holocaust for fear that Muslim students would find the lessons offensive.
- British officials spent thousands of pounds reorienting prison toilets so that they wouldn't face Mecca (Islam forbids Muslims to face Mecca or turn their back to it when urinating or defecating).
- The Association of Chief Police Officers in July 2008 ordered that police sniffer dogs wear "booties" when searching inside the homes of Muslim suspects, in order to avoid offending against the Islamic principle that dogs are unclean.
- The British banks Halifax and NatWest banned piggy banks to keep from offending Muslims, as Islam also considers pigs unclean. Despite the fact that piggy banks do not include any pork or pork products, Salim Mulla of the Lancashire Council of Mosques, was pleased: "This is a sensitive issue and I think the banks are simply being courteous to their customers."
- A non-Muslim teacher disciplined two schoolchildren after they refused to participate in classroom exercises that involved reciting Islamic prayers. The mother of one of the boys commented: "This isn't right, it's taking things too far. I understand that they have to learn about other religions. I can live with that but it is taking it a step too far to be punished because they wouldn't join in Muslim prayer. Making them pray to Allah, who isn't who they worship, is wrong and what got me is that they were told they were being disrespectful." Another parent remarked: "The school is wonderful but this one teacher has made a major mistake. It seems to be happening throughout society. People think they can ride roughshod over our beliefs and the way we live."
- An 18-year-old boy with Down's syndrome and a mental age of five was charged with "racial assault" after a playground scuffle with a Muslim schoolmate at the special needs department of Motherwell College in Lanarkshire.

Many Muslims have spoken about their intention to impose, as soon as they are able to do so, Islamic law, Sharia, upon the non-Muslim populations of Western countries. They are doing so today by portraying accommodation of Islamic law as a matter of "civil rights" and multiculturalist "diversity." This effort got a tremendous shot in the arm in Britain in July 2008, when the Lord Chief Justice, Lord Phillips of Worth Maltravers, said in an address at the London Muslim Centre that "it is possible in this country for those who are entering into a contractual agreement to agree that the agreement shall be governed by law other than English law." Including Islamic law? Yes: "There is no reason

why principles of sharia, or any other religious code, should not be the basis for mediation or other forms of alternative dispute resolution.”

At first glance there was nothing remarkable in this. The Lord Chief Justice was calling simply for the voluntary application of Sharia in private arbitration, and emphasized that the decisions of such arbitration would be subject to British law: “So far as the law is concerned, “ he explained, “those who live in this country are governed by English and Welsh law and subject to the jurisdiction of the English and Welsh courts. “ As such, “it must be recognised however that any sanctions for a failure to comply with the agreed terms of the mediation would be drawn from the laws of England and Wales.”

What’s more, he decisively rejected the idea that the notorious Sharia penalties of stoning for adultery and amputation for theft would be implemented in Britain: “There can be no question of such sanctions being applied to or by any Muslim who lives within this jurisdiction.”

But if he hedged his statement about the use of Sharia for private arbitration so carefully, why were the Lord Chief Justice’s remarks a victory for the stealth jihad? The answer to this lies in the nature of Sharia itself. In Islamic law, private matters are not so easy to separate from public ones. If a woman is judged in a private Sharia court to be guilty of adultery, the Sharia penalty is stoning. The Lord Chief Justice spoke coolly of not allowing such punishments, but once the principle that Sharia can be applied in Britain is accepted, calls to increase its scope will begin immediately. The next step will be challenges to the principle he stated that whenever British law and Sharia come into conflict, Sharia must give way. And given the prevailing multiculturalist relativism, soon enough that principle will give way also.

In his address Lord Phillips praised the Archbishop of Canterbury, Rowan Williams, who famously said in February 2008 that it was “inevitable “ that Sharia would come to Britain. “An approach to law which simply said – there’s one law for everybody - I think that’s a bit of a danger, “ said the Archbishop. He had apparently forgotten, if he ever knew, that the idea of “one law for everybody “ was one of the great achievements of Judeo-Christian civilization, and was rooted in the idea of the dignity of all human beings as created in the image of God. Once a society discards the principle of “one law for everybody, “ it lays the groundwork for protected and privileged classes, and ends up inevitably with a tyranny in which some groups are denied basic rights.

Lord Phillips and Archbishop Williams appear to be unaware that if Muslims ever came to power in Britain, they themselves would enforce one law for everybody -- a law that would reduce both of them to a second-class status of institutionalized discrimination.

They will, before too long, to find that those they have been so earnest to accommodate are not mollified at all by their actions, but have come up with

new lists of demands. As there is always more Sharia to accommodate, at a certain point they will have to draw the line – or else consent without a struggle to their conquest and Islamization.

The inevitable outcome of this appeasement policy came in August 2008, when Muslim town council leaders at the Tower Hamlets Council in east London issued edicts banning all councilors, Muslim and non-Muslim, from eating during meetings before sunset during Ramadan. One non-Muslim Councillor, Stephanie Eaton, protested: “Our community consists of a huge number of different religions, all of which should be valued, and no one religion should be accorded more status or influence than others.”

She was, of course, right about that, but she and all British non-Muslims should have known that the Tower Hamlets Council food ban was an inevitable result of the accommodation of Muslim practices in Britain. Given the political and supremacist character of traditional Islam, it was only a matter of time before calls for special accommodation of Muslim practices would lead to the next step: demands that non-Muslims behave in accordance with Muslim sensibilities.

Step by step, Sharia is coming to Britain, and still very few Britons have noticed, or decided to resist. The mainstream parties are completely AWOL on this issue, leaving the field to race separatists who cloud the issue by bringing in questions of ethnicity that are actually quite distinct from the question of whether or not Britain will acquiesce to being subjugated under Islamic law. This led to the unfortunate fact that three years after the July 7, 2005, jihad terror attacks in London, the jihad in Britain was stronger than ever – and it has gained much of its strength from proceeding not by means of more terrorist attacks, but by means of a stealth jihad of taking advantage of the Britons’ anxiety to accommodate Muslims – and of course, the same stealth jihad is advancing also on the European Continent and, to a lesser extent, in America as well.

France: supine authorities, assertive minorities

French authorities have also been reluctant to antagonize their growing and restive Muslim minority. The multiculturalism that has utterly taken over among the Western intelligentsia has made it difficult for them to take action against Muslim jihadist doctrines even when they threaten the stability of secular society. According to Michel Zaoui of the Representative Council of Jewish Institutions in France (CRIF), “The previous leftist government didn’t do anything to discourage anti-Israel and anti-Semitic propositions by militant Islamic preachers, in part because their philosophy was to show sympathy to the ‘damned’ and poor. Now, the rightist government would like to act but is afraid of antagonizing Muslims.”

Indeed, when the popular French writer Michel Houellebecq called Islam “the stupidest religion” and “a dangerous religion right from the start,” he was

hauled into court on charges of inciting racial hatred — though, of course, Muslims are of all races. The rector of the Grand Mosque of Paris, Dalil Boubakeur, who is generally regarded as supportive of the French secular regime, cried: “Islam has been reviled, attacked with hateful words. My community has been humiliated.”

Houellebecq faced a 70,000-euro fine and eighteen months in prison, but he was ultimately cleared of the charges. The late Italian journalist Oriana Fallaci, author of a rhetorical attack on Islam entitled *The Rage and the Pride*, faced unsuccessful attempts by French Muslims to get the book banned. The guardians of “tolerable” speech had better luck against Sixties screen siren Brigitte Bardot, who has been convicted five times in her native France for “inciting racial hatred” — in every case for remarks considered denigrating to Muslims. In June 2008, a court fined the 73-year-old Bardot 15,000 euros (around \$23,000) as punishment for writing that the Islamic community in France was “destroying our country and imposing its acts.” The court apparently didn’t consider the possibility that imposing Islamic law was precisely what many Muslims in France had in mind.

Though the charges against Houellebecq and Fallaci didn’t stick, these trials set a dangerous precedent. While one can say anything one desires about Christianity without facing criminal charges, Islam is regarded as a protected minority religion—and perhaps, covertly, as being too volatile to criticize without risk of violence.

Meanwhile, Islam is on the march in France, as has been seen with the electoral success early in the decade of the Union of French Islamic Organizations (UOIF), which represents most of the 1,500 mosques in France. The UOIF is linked both with the Saudi Wahhabis and the radical Egyptian Muslim Brotherhood. At the beginning of the Iraq war in 2003, the Brotherhood recruited several thousand Egyptians to fight in Iraq in the name of jihad. In France the UOIF is a voice of Islamic reaction — at its conventions (which have been attended by upwards of 100,000 people) it sponsors workshops with titles like “Liberated Women, De-Natured Women.” UOIF secretary-general Fouad Alaoui, after negotiations with the government on the status of Muslims in France, announced that he rejected a “definition of secularism that seals off religion in the private sphere.” UOIF President Thami Breze declared his support for a “modification of secularism, in order to respect certain specificities of Islam.” Just as Czechoslovakia’s borders had to be modified in 1938 to appease Hitler, so would French secularism have to be modified in the twenty-first century to appease the social and political imperatives of Muslims in France.

In the face of this the French government created an Islamic Council that would ease the integration of Muslims into French society as a whole. This initially backfired, when in April 2003, the UOIF won 19 of 58 seats on the Council, compared to only 15 for the group favored by the government, the moderate Mosque of Paris. Also, some twenty percent of French mosques refused to

have anything at all to do with the Council, which was formed with the express purpose of creating an “official Islam for France.”

Why would the French government want to create an “official Islam for France”? Perhaps it is because the French government recognizes Islam as a looming threat to France’s identity and sovereignty. Journalist Christopher Caldwell noted in 2003:

“. . . practically all of France’s 1,200 mosques are funded by foreign governments. Of the country’s 230 major imams, none is French. In fact, imams are often chosen by foreign governments for loyalty to their ideological priorities. These priorities are decidedly not those of France. One imam in Roubaix met Lille mayor Martine Aubry on the edge of the Muslim-majority neighborhood where he preaches, declaring it Islamic territory into which Mme. Aubry — the most important minister of labor in modern French history, the early favorite to win France’s presidential elections in 2007, and the daughter of former prime minister Jacques Delors — had no authority to venture.”

And according to Antoine Sfeir of Paris’s Middle East Studies Center, “For a long time the UOIF has been trying to infiltrate the cogs of state and assume control of the Muslim community by marginalising secular Muslims. “

Sarkozy: strong and weak

Mme. Aubry, of course, was not elected President of France in 2007. Nicolas Sarkozy was – a man who had appeared to be anything but an appeaser after the UOIF’s electoral victory, when he was Interior Minister. At that time Sarkozy warned Islamic extremists: “We want to say very simply: imams who propagate views that run counter to French values will be expelled. “ He simultaneously affirmed that Muslims had a place in France: “It is precisely because we recognize the right of Islam to sit at the table of the republic that we will not accept any deviation....Any prayer leader whose views run contrary to the values of the republic will be expelled. “

And Sharia? “Islamic law will not apply anywhere, because it is not the law of the French republic. “

In March 2007, shortly before he was elected President, Sarkozy affirmed French cultural integrity when asked about Islamic polygamy, which is widely practiced in France:

Question: What do you think of polygamy?

Answer: I respect all cultures throughout the world, but so that it is quite clear: if I am elected President of the Republic, I will not accept

women being treated as inferior to men. The French Republic holds these values: respect for women, equality between men and women. Nobody has the right to hold a prisoner, even within his own family. I say it clearly, that polygamy is prohibited in the territory of the French Republic. I will fight against female genital mutilation and those who do not wish to understand that the values of the French Republic include freedom for women, the dignity of women, respect for women -- they do not have any reason to be in France. If our laws are not respected and if one does not wish to understand our values, if one does not wish to learn French, then one does not have any reason to be on French territory.

For statements of this kind, Sarkozy was widely vilified among Muslims in France. And when he was elected President, young Muslim men in Paris rioted, smashing store windows and fighting with police in protest against his victory. Yet for all his fearsome reputation, Sarkozy also favored policies that opened the door to the appeasement of Muslims in France, and ultimately to the advancement of an Islamic supremacist agenda that would, in accordance with traditional Islamic law, relegate non-Muslims and women to inferior status.

Nor was this a reaction to Muslim anger at his being elected President: in the wake of the November 2005 Islamic riots that convulsed France, Sarkozy, then Interior Minister, spoke out in favor of “positive discrimination “ that would give preferential treatment to Muslims applying for jobs. While he explained that this would correct the discrimination that he said Muslims suffered from in France, he did not consider the possibility that this preferential treatment would only reinforce the deeply ingrained attitudes among Muslims that the believers were the “best of peoples “ (Qur’an 3:110) while unbelievers were the “vilest of created beings “ (Qur’an 98:6). This may not have been outright appeasement, but it was certainly as short-sighted as analyses by appeasers are generally. When Sarkozy became President of France, he pressed forward with plans for a “Union for the Mediterranean, “ which would, he declared, do nothing less than “change the world. “ This association of European and North African majority-Muslim countries would give North African Muslims an unprecedented voice in the internal policies of Europe, and would endow their immigrant countrymen in Europe with power and influence beyond their numbers. Sarkozy, for his part, defended the project in terms that recalled Chamberlain speaking about his arrangements for the demise of Czechoslovakia. “Failure, “ said Sarkozy in April 2008, “would mean taking a terrible responsibility towards our children and all future generations. “

Fitna and free speech: A missed opportunity

And in March 2008, when Dutch politician Geert Wilders issued his film *Fitna*, which was critical of the way in which Muslims have used the Qur’an

to justify violent acts, Sarkozy sided with Dutch Prime Minister Jan Peter Balkenende, who criticized Wilders. After Balkenende stated that he was in “total disagreement “ with Wilders and warned that the film could lead to violent Muslim protests, Sarkozy said that he supported Balkenende, and, according to a spokesman, was “highly aware of the question of Islam’s place in European societies, and French society in particular. “ Balkenende also tried to mollify Muslims by publicly disavowing the connection between Islam and violence: “We reject this interpretation,” he declared. “The vast majority of Muslims reject extremism and violence.”

But was Wilders really responsible for the connection of Islam with violence? The answer can be found in the film itself. The main part of *Fitna* features a series of quotations from the Qur’an, followed by scenes of violent acts committed by Muslims.

For example, the first verse of the Qur’an presented in *Fitna* is 8:60: “Against them make ready your strength to the utmost of your power, including steeds of war, to strike terror into the hearts of the enemies of Allah and your enemies. “ Wilders follows this with heart-rending scenes from September 11 and the 2004 Madrid train bombings, as we hear two women, among the many victims, calling for help on those days. The women are indeed terrified, but what does this have to do with Qur’an 8:60? An Islamic preacher – not Wilders or any other non-Muslim -- soon appears in the film to answer this question, stating in terms that clearly recall that verse of the Qur’an: “Annihilate the infidels and the polytheists, your (Allah’s) enemies and the enemies of the religion. Allah, count them and kill them to the last one. “

In short, the film was simply accurate – and Balkenende, Sarkozy and other European heads of state should have defended it. It was extremely unfortunate that they did not, and did not even seem to understand the full dimensions of the problem. For the release of the film became the pretext for an energetic effort by international Islamic organizations to restrict free speech in the West, particularly regarding Islam. At a time when Muslims around the world are committing acts of violence and justifying them by reference to Islamic teachings, this would restrict Western officials and media analysts from discussing the Islamic supremacist threat precisely at the moment when they were directly confronted by it.

The demand for legal protection from criticism is a central focus of the world’s most powerful Islamic organization, the Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC), which is comprised of fifty-seven governments of Muslim-majority states (including the reified “State of Palestine “). The OIC in 2008 declared its intention to craft a “legal instrument “ to fight against the threat to Islam they perceived “from political cartoonists and bigots. “ “Islamophobia,” declared OIC Secretary General Ekmelledin Ihsanoglu, “cannot be dealt with only through cultural activities but (through) a robust political engagement. “ This is a careful euphemism calling for restrictions on freedom of speech. Abdoulaye Wade, the

President of Senegal and chairman of the OIC, made this point explicit: “I don’t think freedom of expression should mean freedom from blasphemy. There can be no freedom without limits.”

The OIC stepped up its international campaign against free speech *Fitna* appeared. The organization condemned the film in “the strongest terms, “ claiming that Wilders’ movie was “a deliberate act of discrimination against Muslims “ intended only to “provoke unrest and intolerance.”

The attempt to compel Western states to ban insults to Islam is quickly picking up speed: by June 2008 Ihsanoglu was ready to declare victory in clearly supremacist terms: Muslims had dictated to the West the “red lines that should not be crossed, “ and the West was complying. He said that OIC initiatives against “Islamophobia “ had resulted in “convincing progress at all these levels mainly the UN Human Rights Council in Geneva, and the UN General Assembly. The United Nations General Assembly adopted similar resolutions against the defamation of Islam. “ He added: “In confronting the Danish cartoons and the Dutch film ‘Fitna’, we sent a clear message to the West regarding the red lines that should not be crossed. As we speak, the official West and its public opinion are all now well-aware of the sensitivities of these issues. They have also started to look seriously into the question of freedom of expression from the perspective of its inherent responsibility, which should not be overlooked.”

The success of this campaign bodes ill for the ability of those states to defend themselves against the global jihad in all its forms – since Islamic supremacists and their allies routinely characterize all investigation of the Islamic roots of the jihadist agenda as “hate speech. “ Sarkozy’s unwillingness or inability to see what was at stake – a malady he shared with virtually all European leaders -- boded ill for Europe’s future as a home of free people. As does its Chamberlainesque appeasement policy toward Islamic supremacism.

The Islamization of Europe

Will tourists in Paris in the year 2108 take a moment to visit the “Mosque of Notre Dame” and the “Eiffel Minaret?” Through massive immigration and official dhimmitude from European leaders, Muslims are accomplishing today what they failed to do at the time of the Crusaders: conquer Europe. How quickly is Europe being Islamized? So quickly that even historian Bernard Lewis, who has continued throughout his honor-filled career to be disingenuous about Islamic radicalism and terrorism, forthrightly told the German newspaper *Die Welt*: “Europe will be Islamic by the end of the century.”

Or maybe sooner: if demographic trends continue, France, Holland, and other Western European nations could have Muslim majorities by mid-century. Meanwhile, these growing Muslim minorities are increasingly assertive and

disruptive. Consider some recent indicators from other European nations:

- Sweden's third-largest city, Malmö has become a Middle East outpost in Scandinavia. A quarter of the city's population is now Muslim, and that number is growing rapidly. Nor are the Muslims of Malmö inclined to be peaceful and tolerant. Even the police are afraid: "If we park our car it will be damaged — so we have to go very often in two vehicles, one just to protect the other vehicle," reported a police officer in Malmö. Meanwhile, Swedish ambulance drivers will not enter some areas of Malmö unless police accompany them." In April 2007, large-scale riots broke out in Malmö, with Muslims battling police and firemen, pelting them with stones and eggs.
- The Nordgårdsskolen in Aarhus, Denmark, has become the first Dane-free school. The students now come entirely from Denmark's fastest-growing constituency: Muslim immigrants.
- Also in Denmark, the Qur'an is now required reading for all upper-secondary school students. There should be nothing wrong with requiring student to read the Qur'an, but given the current ascendancy of political correctness on the Continent, it is unlikely that critical perspectives will be included.
- The Netherlands now recognize polygamous Muslim marriages, although as of August 2008 polygamy is still against the law in the Netherlands — if the polygamous marriage takes place outside the Netherlands, Dutch officials will accord it legal recognition.

What Europe has long sown, it is now reaping. In her book *Eurabia*, Bat Ye'or, the pioneering historian of dhimmitude, chronicles how this has come to pass. Europe, she explains, began thirty years ago to travel down a path of appeasement, accommodation, and cultural abdication in pursuit of shortsighted political and economic benefits. She observes that today "Europe has evolved from a Judeo-Christian civilization, with important post-Enlightenment/secular elements, to a 'civilization of dhimmitude,' i.e., Eurabia: a secular-Muslim transitional society with its traditional Judeo-Christian mores rapidly disappearing"

If Western Europe does become Islamized, as demographic trends suggest, before too long America will be facing a world that is drastically different and more forbidding than today.

Robert Spencer is an Associate Fellow of the American Freedom Alliance and Director of Jihad watch.com a program of the David Horowitz Freedom Center.

Terror And Appeasement

By Melanie Phillips

The head of the Police Service of Northern Ireland, Sir Hugh Orde (who most certainly should know better) said a few days ago that Britain could only stop al Qaeda by negotiation. A little while back there was a clamour for talking to the Taleban. This is all part of a huge establishment push for talking to terrorists (on both sides of the Atlantic – indeed, this is already becoming a major issue in the US presidential election) including Hamas, Hezbollah and Iran. The argument is a perfect distillation of the hubristic ignorance and solipsism of the west which views everything through the prism of its own cultural assumption that the entire world operates according to the rules of rational self-interest and that all conflict can be solved by dialogue. Indeed, the dominant belief is that conflict can only be ended through dialogue, and there can be no military solution to terrorism.

In Britain, much of this thinking is driven by the experience of Northern Ireland where the ‘peace process’ is commonly held to have ended the conflict between Republicans and Loyalists. I have written previously about the reasons why this analogy is hopelessly and dangerously flawed -- not least because the ‘peace process’ only happened because the British Army actually beat the IRA into at the very least a permanent stalemate. In other words, the military victory was crucial. If they had not been beaten, the IRA would not have decided they had no alternative but to use democratic politics instead of the Armalite to achieve their goals.

That’s why it’s so disappointing that Sir Hugh Orde, of all people, should have said he could not think of a single terrorism campaign in history that ended without negotiation. In fact, there has not been a single terrorism campaign in which terrorists have been talked to where the terrorism hasn’t worsened as a direct result – as indeed happened in Northern Ireland, where the back-channel secret talks with the IRA long before the ‘peace process’ emboldened them to perpetrate yet greater atrocities. The same thing has happened over the years with Hamas, Hezbollah and Fatah. As Hussein Massawi, a former leader of Hezbollah, so helpfully put it:

We are not fighting so that you will offer us something. We are fighting to eliminate you.

It is safe to assume that al Qaeda would not dissent from that proposition.

Within a few hours of Sir Hugh’s published remarks, there was some practical evidence of the wrongness of his position and that of all the other appeasers who say that terrorism can never be ended through military means. The CIA has declared al Qaeda is virtually defeated in Iraq and that the country is seeing its lowest level of violence for four years... The relative calm produced by the

Shia ceasefire has coincided with what the CIA is now calling the 'near strategic defeat' of al Qaeda in Iraq, and a growing rejection of the group's murderous ideology across the Middle East.

While the commander of the British forces in Afghanistan has said that the Taliban are on the brink of defeat:

The new 'precise, surgical' tactics have killed scores of insurgent leaders and made it extremely difficult for Pakistan-based Taliban leaders to prosecute the campaign, according to Brig Mark Carleton-Smith. In the past two years an estimated 7,000 Taliban have been killed, the majority in southern and eastern Afghanistan. But it is the 'very effective targeted decapitation operations' that have removed 'several echelons of commanders'.

Clearly, these wars are far from over; only a fool would assume that the Taliban and al Qaeda are now finished -- far from it, I fear. But it seems equally clear that they have been seriously weakened as the result of these military campaigns which have recently turned a corner and achieved startling success. It is in fact only military or policing campaigns that can defeat terrorism; since the strategic purpose of terrorism is to force a general acceptance of its political aims, talking to terrorists invariably tells them that they are winning and inspires them to step up their campaign. It is indeed because the world has talked to Middle East terrorists over the years that we are now facing what we are facing.

Melanie Phillips is a journalist who writes for the Daily Mail and the Spectator in the United Kingdom. This article appeared on The Spectator on June 2, 2008

Appeasement 101

by Victor Davis Hanson

It is easy to damn the 1930s appeasers of Hitler — such as Stanley Baldwin and Neville Chamberlain in England and Edouard Daladier in France — given what the Nazis ultimately did when unleashed. But history demands not merely recognizing the truth post facto, but also trying to reconstruct the rationale of something that now in hindsight seems inexplicable.

Appeasement in the 1930s was popular with the European public for a variety of reasons. All of them are instructive in our hesitation about stopping a nuclear Iran, or about defending the right of Western newspapers to print what they wish — or about fighting radical Islamism in general.

First, Europe had nearly been destroyed during the Great War, a mere 20 years prior. No responsible postwar leader wished to risk a second continental bloodbath.

Unfortunately, Hitler understood that all too well. In a game of diplomatic chicken, he figured many responsible democratic statesmen had more to lose than he did, as the weaker and once-beaten enemy.

British intellectuals, like European Union idealists today, wrote books and treatises on the obsolescence of war. Conflicts were supposedly caused only by rapacious arms merchants and profiteers at home, not by anti-democratic dictators who interpreted forbearance as weakness. Winston Churchill was a voice in the wilderness — and demonized as a warmonger and worse.

Today, the 50-year Cold War is over, and Europe is at last free of burdensome military expenditure and the threat of global annihilation. Like Osama Bin Laden, Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad senses a certain weariness in much of the West as it counts on perpetual peace.

He assumes that most sober Westerners will do almost anything to avoid military confrontation to stop a potential threat — even though, unlike Hitler, Ahmadinejad not only promises to liquidate the Jews but reveals his method in advance by seeking nuclear weapons.

Some naive conservatives in pre-war Europe thought the German and Italian fascists would prove a valuable bulwark against communism, and so could be politically finessed. So, too, it has been at times with Islamic fascism. Arming the mujahadeen in Afghanistan, Pakistan or Saudi Arabia was once seen as an inspired way of thwarting Soviet communist imperialism.

At the time of the Ayatollah Khomeini's homicidal fatwa against Salman Rushdie, religious conservative commentators from Patrick Buchanan to New York's Cardinal O'Connor attacked Rushdie, rather than defended the Western right of free expression. Apparently, they felt such Islamic threats to supposed blasphemers might have positive repercussions in discouraging left-wing anti-Christian attacks as well.

In the 1930s, the doctrine of appeasement fobbed off responsibility of confronting fascism onto the League of Nations. Both France and England were quiet about the 1936 Italian invasion of Ethiopia and the German militarization of the Rhineland. They counted on multilateral action of the League, which issued plenty of edicts but marshaled few troops.

Likewise, the moral high ground today supposedly was to refer both the Iraqi and Iranian problems to the United Nations. But considering the oil-for-food scandals and Saddam's constant violations of U.N. resolutions, it is unlikely that the Iranian theocracy has much fear that the Security Council will thwart its uranium enrichment.

As fascism spread, France worked on fortifying its German border with the Maginot Line, Oxford undergraduates voted to refuse "in any circumstances to fight for King and Country," and British newspapers decried the Treaty of Versailles for unduly punishing Germany. This was all long before the "no blood for oil" slogan and Al Gore in Saudi Arabia apologizing to his Wahhabi hosts for the supposed American maltreatment of Arabs.

But *deja vu* pertains not just to us, but our enemies as well. Like the Nazi romance of an exalted ancient Volk, the Islamists harken back to a mythical purity, free of decadence brought on by Western liberalism. Similarly, they feed off victimization — not just recent defeats, but centuries-old bitterness at the rise of the West. Their version of the stab-in-the-back Versailles Treaty is always the creation of Israel.

Just as Hitler concocted incidents such as the burning of the Reichstag to create outrage, Islamist leaders incite frenzy in their followers over a supposed flushed Koran at Guantanamo and several inflammatory cartoons, some of them never published by Danish newspapers at all.

Anti-Semitism, of course, is the mother's milk of fascism. It is always, they say, a small group of Jews — whether shadowy cabinet advisers and international bankers of the 1930s or the manipulative neoconservatives and Israeli leadership of the present — who alone stir up the trouble.

The point of the comparison is not to suggest that history simply repeats itself,

but to learn why intelligent people delude themselves into embracing naive policies. After the removal of the Taliban and Saddam Hussein, the furious reply of the radical Islamist world was to censor Western newspapers, along with Iran's accelerated efforts to get the bomb.

In response, either the West will continue to stand up now to these reoccurring post-Sept. 11 threats, or it will see the bullies' demands only increase as its own resistance weakens. Like the appeasement of the 1930s, opting for the easier choice will only guarantee a more costly one later on.

Appeasement or ‘Grand Strategy’

by Diana West

Boy, when it comes to Saudi Arabia, that Condi Rice and Bob Gates sure drive a tough bargain.

Visiting “the kingdom” (the grating, fairytale nickname for that oil-rich human-rights pit), the U.S. secretaries of state and defense delivered a blunt message: If you keep fomenting and financing global jihad; if you keep teaching and preaching the eradication or repression of non-Muslims; if you keep trampling human rights, women’s rights, freedom of conscience and freedom of speech; and, last but not least, if you keep supporting Sunni insurgents in Iraq who are battling American troops, well, then, the United States of America will be forced to act. Yessir, you can bet your bottom petrodollar. You Saudis keep doing all that bad stuff and Uncle Sam is going to... deliver \$20 billion of cutting edge weaponry to you, ASAP.

That’ll fix them.

Or will it fix us? It’s easy to get things mixed up unless you remember the latest version of the Bush Doctrine: You’re either with us, or we sell you smart bombs.

In the Bush administration, such appeasement counts for Grand Strategy. The leading Sunni state, Saudi Arabia, is supposed to serve as a counterbalance to Shi’ite Iranian terror-statism. Forget about Saudi Arabian terror-statism. (That messes up the Grand Strategy.) And, please, don’t wonder what happens if/when jihad revolutionaries, already thought to have infiltrated Saudi security forces, get their hands on our smart bombs. Inspired by the teachings of James Baker — practically an honorary Saudi princeling — Condi, Bob, and, of course, George, see the Saudis as Our Moderate Allies. Who cares if they promote jihad doctrine? Who cares if they sponsor Hamas? Who cares how many Saudis support (or belong to) al Qaeda?

The Saudis and their fellow Sunni states including Egypt and Jordan are supposed to agree with the Bush administration that they have a stake in stabilizing Shi’ite-majority Iraq — which, in Bush-land, is supposed to serve as a curb on Shi’ite Iran, and not simply turn into the natural ally thereof. It’s in the Sunni states’ interests, the Grand Strategy goes, to help stabilize Iraq, and, while they’re at it, to support the so-called peace process between Israel and the Palestinians — or, rather, between Israel and “good” Fatah Palestinians, not “bad” Hamas Palestinians. Never mind that both groups’ charters call for the destruction of Israel. And never mind Saudi support for Hamas.

The Sunnis aren’t buying the administration’s world view, which, in politically correct fashion, ignores the \$64,000 Islamic question: Why on Allah’s green earth would these states want to staunch the bleeding of ideological enemy number

one (us) in Iraq? Of course, these same states are happy to buy American guns and ammo. Which may make Condi, Bob and George masters of let's-make-a-dealpolitik. But that's not saying much.

Oh, but the Saudis have promised to open an embassy in Baghdad and come to peace talks with Israel, administration boosters will say. Well, not exactly. The Saudis said they will consider opening the embassy, and they will consider coming to a peace conference. Frankly, opening that Baghdad embassy makes Saudi sense (it's so much easier to supply insurgents in Iraq using the diplomatic pouch). But since when is the presence of a world-class human-rights violator at a peace conference something worth groveling for?

Answer: Since this week, when the United States, represented by Condoleezza Rice, signed a joint statement endorsing the Saudi's pet peace plan, the one that sends Israel back to indefensible, pre-1967 borders. What comes in return? Arab recognition of Israel. (Oh, joy. The retrograde human-rights violators might possibly recognize the freedom-loving democracy.) This is one big booby prize. It also marks a momentous, if weirdly unremarked-upon shift in American policy that proves one calamitous truth: jihad terrorism works.

It's a dispiriting truth for a dispiriting time. American resolve has given way to American submission, and practically unnoticed. Very little outrage over the Saudi sale has bubbled over, even in what could still be called the war camp. Israelis themselves have expressed little or no dissent. So far, with the exception of New Jersey Republican Rep. Mike Ferguson, the anti-Saudi support group seems centered in a small segment of the Democratic Left: New York Reps. Jerrold Nadler and Anthony Weiner, Florida Rep. Robert Wexler, leftist writer Robert Scheer, and, gulp, presidential candidate John Edwards.

Which leaves us where, exactly? Somehow, it seems appropriate to reply: wandering in the wilderness.

Diana West is the author of the "The Death of the Grown-Up: How America's Arrested Development Is Bringing Down Western Civilization."

Appeasement Revisited

by Vaclav Havel

I vividly remember the slightly ludicrous, slightly risqué, and somewhat distressing predicament in which Western diplomats in Prague found themselves during the Cold War. They regularly needed to resolve the delicate issue of whether to invite to their embassy celebrations various Charter 77 signatories, human rights activists, critics of the communist regime, displaced politicians, or even banned writers, scholars, and journalists – people with whom the diplomats were generally friends.

Sometimes we dissidents were not invited, but received an apology, and sometimes we were invited, but did not accept the invitation so as not to complicate the lives of our courageous diplomat friends. Or we were invited to come at an earlier hour in the hope that we would leave before the official representatives arrived, which sometimes worked and sometimes didn't. When it didn't, either the official representatives left in protest at our presence, or we left hurriedly, or we all pretended not to notice each other, or – albeit on rare occasions – we started to converse with each other, which frequently were the only moments of dialogue between the regime and the opposition (not counting our courthouse encounters).

This all happened when the Iron Curtain divided Europe – and the world – into opposing camps. Western diplomats had their countries' economic interests to consider, but, unlike the Soviet side, they took seriously the idea of “dissidents or trade.” I cannot recall any occasion at that time when the West or any of its organizations (NATO, the European Community, etc.) issued some public appeal, recommendation, or edict stating that some specific group of independently-minded people – however defined – were not to be invited to diplomatic parties, celebrations, or receptions.

But today this is happening. One of the strongest and most powerful democratic institutions in the world – the European Union – has no qualms in making a public promise to the Cuban dictatorship that it will re-institute diplomatic Apartheid. The EU's embassies in Havana will now craft their guest lists in accordance with the Cuban government's wishes. The shortsightedness of socialist Prime Minister José Zapatero of Spain has prevailed.

Try to imagine what will happen: at each European embassy, someone will be appointed to screen the list, name by name, and assess whether and to what extent the persons in question behave freely or speak out freely in public, to what extent they criticize the regime, or even whether they are former political prisoners. Lists will be shortened and deletions made, and this will frequently entail eliminating even good personal friends of the diplomats in charge of the screening, people

whom they have given various forms of intellectual, political, or material assistance. It will be even worse if the EU countries try to mask their screening activities by inviting only diplomats to embassy celebrations in Cuba.

I can hardly think of a better way for the EU to dishonor the noble ideals of freedom, equality, and human rights that the Union espouses – indeed, principles that it reiterates in its constitutional agreement. To protect European corporations' profits from their Havana hotels, the Union will cease inviting open-minded people to EU embassies, and we will deduce who they are from the expression on the face of the dictator and his associates. It is hard to imagine a more shameful deal.

Cuba's dissidents will, of course, happily do without Western cocktail parties and polite conversation at receptions. This persecution will admittedly aggravate their difficult struggle, but they will naturally survive it. The question is whether the EU will survive it.

Today, the EU is dancing to Fidel's tune. That means that tomorrow it could bid for contracts to build missile bases on the coast of the People's Republic of China. The following day it could allow its decisions on Chechnya to be dictated by Russian President Vladimir Putin's advisers. Then, for some unknown reason, it could make its assistance to Africa conditional on fraternal ties with the worst African dictators.

Where will it end? The release of Milosevic? Denying a visa to Russian human rights activist Sergey Kovalyov? An apology to Saddam Hussein? The opening of peace talks with Al Qaida?

It is suicidal for the EU to draw on Europe's worst political traditions, the common denominator of which is the idea that evil must be appeased and that the best way to achieve peace is through indifference to the freedom of others. Just the opposite is true: such policies expose an indifference to one's own freedom and pave the way for war. After all, Europe is uniting in order to defend its freedom and values, not to sacrifice them to the ideal of harmonious coexistence with dictators and thus risk gradual infiltration of its soul by the anti-democratic mindset.

I firmly believe that the new members of the EU will not forget their experience of totalitarianism and non-violent opposition to evil, and that that experience will be reflected in how they behave in EU bodies. Indeed, this could be the best contribution they can make to the common spiritual, moral, and political foundations of a united Europe.

Václav Havel , a novelist and playwright, is a former President of the Czech Republic.

The Right Time for An Islamic Reformation

By Salman Rushdie

When Sir Iqbal Sacranie, head of the Muslim Council of Britain, admitted that “our own children” had perpetrated the July 7 London bombings, it was the first time in my memory that a British Muslim had accepted his community’s responsibility for outrages committed by its members. Instead of blaming U.S. foreign policy or “Islamophobia,” Sacranie described the bombings as a “profound challenge” for the Muslim community. However, this is the same Sacranie who, in 1989, said that “Death is perhaps too easy” for the author of “The Satanic Verses.” Tony Blair’s decision to knight him and treat him as the acceptable face of “moderate,” “traditional” Islam is either a sign of his government’s penchant for religious appeasement or a demonstration of how limited Blair’s options really are.

Sacranie is a strong advocate of Blair’s much-criticized new religious-hatred bill, which will make it harder to criticize religion, and he actually expects the new law to outlaw references to Islamic terrorism. He said as recently as Jan. 13, “There is no such thing as an Islamic terrorist. This is deeply offensive. Saying Muslims are terrorists would be covered [i.e., banned] by this provision.” Two weeks later his organization boycotted a Holocaust remembrance ceremony in London commemorating the liberation of Auschwitz 60 years ago. If Sir Iqbal Sacranie is the best Blair can offer in the way of a good Muslim, we have a problem.

The Sacranie case illustrates the weakness of the Blair government’s strategy of relying on traditional, essentially orthodox Muslims to help eradicate Islamist radicalism. Traditional Islam is a broad church that certainly includes millions of tolerant, civilized men and women but also encompasses many whose views on women’s rights are antediluvian, who think of homosexuality as ungodly, who have little time for real freedom of expression, who routinely express anti-Semitic views and who, in the case of the Muslim diaspora, are -- it has to be said -- in many ways at odds with the Christian, Hindu, non-believing or Jewish cultures among which they live.

In Leeds, from which several of the London bombers came, many traditional Muslims lead inward-turned lives of near-segregation from the wider population. From such defensive, separated worlds some youngsters have indefensibly stepped across a moral line and taken up their lethal rucksacks.

The deeper alienations that lead to terrorism may have their roots in these young men’s objections to events in Iraq or elsewhere, but the closed communities of some traditional Western Muslims are places in which young men’s alienations can easily deepen. What is needed is a move beyond tradition -- nothing less than a reform movement to bring the core concepts of Islam into the modern age, a Muslim Reformation to combat not only the jihadist ideologues but also the dusty, stifling seminaries of the traditionalists, throwing open the windows

to let in much-needed fresh air.

It would be good to see governments and community leaders inside the Muslim world as well as outside it throwing their weight behind this idea, because creating and sustaining such a reform movement will require above all a new educational impetus whose results may take a generation to be felt, a new scholarship to replace the literalist diktats and narrow dogmatisms that plague present-day Muslim thinking. It is high time, for starters, that Muslims were able to study the revelation of their religion as an event inside history, not supernaturally above it.

It should be a matter of intense interest to all Muslims that Islam is the only religion whose origins were recorded historically and thus are grounded not in legend but in fact. The Koran was revealed at a time of great change in the Arab world, the seventh-century shift from a matriarchal nomadic culture to an urban patriarchal system. Muhammad, as an orphan, personally suffered the difficulties of this transformation, and it is possible to read the Koran as a plea for the old matriarchal values in the new patriarchal world, a conservative plea that became revolutionary because of its appeal to all those whom the new system disenfranchised, the poor, the powerless and, yes, the orphans.

Muhammad was also a successful merchant and heard, on his travels, the Nestorian Christians' desert versions of Bible stories that the Koran mirrors closely (Christ, in the Koran, is born in an oasis, under a palm tree). It ought to be fascinating to Muslims everywhere to see how deeply their beloved book is a product of its place and time, and in how many ways it reflects the Prophet's own experiences.

However, few Muslims have been permitted to study their religious book in this way. The insistence that the Koranic text is the infallible, uncreated word of God renders analytical, scholarly discourse all but impossible. Why would God be influenced by the socioeconomics of seventh-century Arabia, after all? Why would the Messenger's personal circumstances have anything to do with the Message?

The traditionalists' refusal of history plays right into the hands of the literalist Islamofascists, allowing them to imprison Islam in their iron certainties and unchanging absolutes. If, however, the Koran were seen as a historical document, then it would be legitimate to reinterpret it to suit the new conditions of successive new ages. Laws made in the seventh century could finally give way to the needs of the 21st. The Islamic Reformation has to begin here, with an acceptance of the concept that all ideas, even sacred ones, must adapt to altered realities.

Broad-mindedness is related to tolerance; open-mindedness is the sibling of peace. This is how to take up the "profound challenge" of the bombers. Will Sir Iqbal Sacranie and his ilk agree that Islam must be modernized? That would

make them part of the solution. Otherwise, they're just the "traditional" part of the problem.

Salman Rushdie is a novelist and essayist whose works include "The Satanic Verses."

Appeasement and Why Europe Balks

by Daniel Pipes

Leading French politicians made some remarkably defeatist pronouncements last week. Rejecting any U.S. military action against Iraq, President Jacques Chirac said that “War is always the admission of defeat, and is always the worst of solutions. And hence everything must be done to avoid it.” Foreign Minister Dominique de Villepin put it more emphatically: “Nothing justifies envisaging military action.” To all this, the German chancellor beamed with approval.

In response, U.S. Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld dismissed France and Germany as “old Europe.” The Post blasted them as the “Axis of Weasel.” Cartoonist Tony Auth dubbed them the “Axis of Annoyance.” An even better name would be “Axis of Appeasement.” “Appeasement” may sound like an insult, but it is a serious policy with a long history - and an enduring appeal highly relevant to today’s circumstances.

Yale historian Paul Kennedy defines appeasement as a way of settling quarrels “by admitting and satisfying grievances through rational negotiation and compromise, thereby avoiding the resort to an armed conflict which would be expensive, bloody and possibly very dangerous.” The British Empire relied heavily on appeasement from the 1860s on, with good results - avoiding costly colonial conflicts while preserving the international status quo. To a lesser extent, other European governments also adopted the policy.

Then came 1914, when in a fit of delirium nearly all Europe abandoned appeasement and rushed into World War I with what Yale historian Peter Gay calls “a fervor bordering on a religious experience.” A century had passed since the continent had experienced the miseries of war, and their memory had vanished. Worse, thinkers such as the German Friedrich Nietzsche developed theories glorifying war.

Four years (1914-18) of hell, especially in the trenches of northern France, then prompted immense guilt about the jubilation of 1914. A new consensus emerged: Never again would Europeans rush into war. Appeasement looked better than ever. And so, as Adolf Hitler threatened in the 1930s, British and French leaders tried to buy him off. Of course, what worked in colonial wars had utterly disastrous results when dealing with an enemy like the Nazis.

This led to the policy of buying off totalitarian opponents being discredited. Throughout the Cold War, it appeared the Europeans had learned a lesson they would never forget. But forget they did, soon after the Soviet Union collapsed in 1991.

In a brilliant Weekly Standard essay, Yale's David Gelernter recently explained how this happened. The power of appeasement was temporarily hidden by World War II and the Cold War, but with the passage of time, "The effects of the Second World War are vanishing while the effects of the First endure."

Why? Because, writes Gelernter, the First World War is far more comprehensible than the Second, which is "too big for the mind to grasp." Politically and spiritually, it feels increasingly as though World War II never took place.

In fact, Gelernter argues, "It's the 1920s all over again," with that era's visceral loathing of war and readiness to appease totalitarian dictators (think of North Korea, Iraq, Syria, Zimbabwe and others).

He finds today's Europe "amazingly" similar to that of the 1920s in other ways too: "its love of self-determination and loathing of imperialism and war, its liberal Germany, shrunken Russia and map of Europe crammed with small states, with America's indifference to Europe and Europe's disdain for America, with Europe's casual, endemic anti-Semitism, her politically, financially and masochistically rewarding fascination with Muslim states who despise her and her undertone of self-hatred and guilt."

Gelernter proposes that 1920s-style self-hatred is now "a dominant force in Europe." And appeasement fits this mood perfectly, having grown over the decades into a worldview "that teaches the blood-guilt of Western man, the moral bankruptcy of the West and the outrageousness of Western civilization's attempting to impose its values on anyone else."

Which brings us back to the unwillingness of "old Europe" to confront Saddam Hussein. World War II's lesson (strike before an aggressive tyrant builds his power) has lost out to the '20s attitude ("nothing justifies envisaging military action").

This self-hating weakness will lead again to disaster, no less than it did leading up to World War II. The United States finds itself having to lead the democracies away from the lure of appeasement. Iraq is a good place to start.

Syria Joins the Axis of Evil

By John R. Bolton

The six-party talks on North Korea's nuclear weapons program are set to resume on Sept. 27 in Beijing. Since the last session, a raft of "working group" meetings and Democratic People's Republic of Korea propaganda events have purportedly shown "progress" in implementing the Feb. 13 agreement to eliminate the North's nuclear capabilities. On Oct. 2, South Korean President Roh Mu-hyun will travel to Pyongyang to embrace Kim Jong Il. Mr. Roh hopes to boost political allies in a close presidential race against opponents of his appeasement policies.

But this entire diplomatic minuet has been reduced almost to insignificance by news from an unexpected place: the Middle East. A dramatic and apparently successful night-time Israeli air attack on Syria, whose details remain extraordinarily closely held, has increased the stakes. North Korea immediately condemned the raid, an action that raises this question: What is it about a raid in Syria that got Kim Jong Il's attention?

Israel's specific target is less important than the fact that with its objection to the raid, North Korea may have tipped its hand. Pyongyang's interest in the raid may be evidence of secret nuclear cooperation between the regime and Syria. There is much still unknown about a potential North Korea project in Syria, such as whether it was a direct sale of technology or equipment to the Syrians, a stand-alone facility or some sort of joint venture. In any case, the threat to Israel of such a project would be acute, perhaps existential--which is why it would risk all-out regional war to strike pre-emptively.

Even if we "only" have evidence of continued North Korean ballistic missile cooperation with Syria, that alone should keep the North on the U.S. list of state sponsors of terrorism.

Outsourcing strategic programs is nothing new for North Korea. For years, Pyongyang has been an aggressive proliferator of ballistic-missile technology, especially to the Middle East. In 1998, North Korea conducted a successful Taepo Dong missile launch and shortly thereafter gained an enormous propaganda boost by announcing a moratorium on launch-testing from its territory. But it didn't halt missile development and benefited greatly from Iran's ballistic missile program. Sharing data made eminent sense since both countries used the same basic Scud technology. Having successfully worked this shell game in ballistic missiles, it should come as no surprise that North Korea would try it again in the nuclear field.

Iran's increasing hegemony over Syria makes Syrian-North Korean cooperation in nuclear matters unlikely without its consent. Although Iran's involvement here

is murky, its incentive to conceal its own nuclear program raises the possibility of a three-way deal. Most chillingly, the United States and Israel must now ask whether the Iranian and North Korean nuclear challenges can be resolved in isolation from one another.

Until more details become public, debate over the full extent of Syrian-North Korean cooperation will continue. What the Israeli attack highlights, however--even if it does not prove conclusively for now--is that North Korea is a global threat.

If the North is engaging in nuclear cooperation with Syria, the Feb. 13 agreement should be terminated. How much more evidence of mendacity do we need before we wake up? In fact, the Feb. 13 agreement is now merely a slogan. Its deadlines and its “actions for actions” mantra have disappeared, lost in a “process” of endless meetings and working groups. This “process” is inherently favorable to Kim Jong Il because it enables the North’s legendary ability to trade the same obligation multiple times for tangible rewards, whether or not it performs.

Even if we “only” have evidence of continued North Korean ballistic missile cooperation with Syria, that alone should keep the North on the U.S. list of state sponsors of terrorism. Syria--and its senior partner, Iran--are both long-time denizens of that same list of state sponsors of terrorism. Can we really delist North Korea when it partners with other terrorist states in the most destructive technologies?

Moreover, where are Syria’s ballistic missiles--and its weapons of mass destruction--aimed? With American forces at risk in Iraq, no increase in the threats they face is acceptable, especially given Syria’s record on Iraq to date. Syria remains at war with Israel and with Lebanon’s Cedar Revolution. No one concerned about Israel’s security or Lebanon’s democracy should countenance giving North Korea a pass on the terrorism issue.

If the evidence is uncertain or mixed, the State Department will, unfortunately, desperately cling to “the process.” If so, to protect the U.S. from the national security risk and international humiliation of another Pyongyang diplomatic triumph, we must insist on real dismantling of the North’s nuclear program and a broad, deep and lasting verification mechanism. Moreover, what was once a subsidiary verification issue--North Korean outsourcing off the Peninsula--now assumes critical importance.

When will real verification experts from across our government finally receive a significant role? As one verifier said recently, “we’ll know what’s really going on when U.S. physicists start talking to [North Korean] physicists.” State’s diplomats should welcome this assistance, although traditionally they view the arrival of verifiers into arms control negotiations the same way Al Capone saw Elliot Ness

and “The Untouchables.” Of course, beyond negotiations, we need the concrete verification itself, which is barely a mirage in the six-party talks.

Developments in Syria should have brought the administration up short. Instead, the State Department has accelerated its efforts to declare “success,” a deeply troubling and dangerous sign. This reflects a cultural problem at State, where “zeal for the deal” too often trumps the substance of the deal itself.

President Bush stands at a dispositive point regarding his personal legacy on North Korea. Until now, one could say with a straight face, if not entirely accurately, that implementing the Feb. 13 agreement was the State Department’s responsibility. No longer. The Israeli strike and the possible Syrian-North Korean nuclear cooperation associated with it have presidential consequences. Further concessions to the North can now be laid only at the White House door, just as only the president can bring a tougher, more realistic attitude to the issue. That would be a real legacy.

John R. Bolton is a senior fellow at AEI.

Today's Defeatists: The 21st-century cut-and-run.

By Donald Kagan

Observers of today's fierce partisan conflict between those demanding immediate or rapid abandonment of the war in Iraq at any, or almost any, price, and others who refuse to give up the fight, might think this a rare event in American history, but it is not unprecedented. In the two World Wars of the 20th century, to be sure, the country was essentially united and fought on to victory without much dissension. In the Korean War, however, there was considerable division, and a new administration that itself had not begun the war accepted a draw — a draw that has demanded a commitment of troops ever since and presents a serious threat to this day. In the Vietnam War, deep and violent dissension at home was, perhaps, the major element in compelling the United States to accept a humiliating defeat. In neither war were the American military forces defeated and driven from the field. It was the political victory of enemies of the administration and the war it has undertaken that brought defeat.

Defining the defeatist

The results of the recent change in leadership and strategy in Iraq have made it plain that the war there is not lost nor is defeat inevitable. And yet, the war's opponents, even as the situation improves, have rushed to declare America defeated. They offer no plausible alternative to the current strategy and take no serious notice of the dreadful consequences of swift withdrawal. They seem to be panicked by the possibility of success and eager to bring about withdrawal and defeat before events make it too late.

In their embarrassment they, not their critics, have raised the question of their patriotism. However that question may be resolved, such people surely deserve to be called defeatists. My dictionary defines "defeatism" as "the attitude, policy or conduct of a person who admits, expects, or no longer resists defeat." The term appears to have been invented during the First World War in France during a dark moment when victory seemed remote or impossible. It was also applied to some in Britain in 1940 who thought that Hitler's forces were irresistible and argued for a negotiated peace with the Nazis. In light of the positive results of recent American efforts in Iraq, it seems an appropriate description of those who have already declared the war lost and their cooperators, even as it is clear that the military tide has turned.

Since the attacks of 2001 American and allied forces have driven out the Taliban regime that provided a haven for al Qaeda in Afghanistan. They have dethroned the murderous dictator Saddam Hussein from Iraq, from which he had launched wars against his neighbors, terrorized and brutalized his own people and threatened the security of the entire region. These were valuable and important steps, but they have not brought an end to the struggle. Both wars continue, and ultimate

success still seems distant and difficult. The costs and length of the struggle, have made the war and the government conducting it unpopular. Opponents of the war in Iraq, as we have seen, have declared America already defeated and demand an immediate or early withdrawal of our forces, regardless of the horrendous consequences of such an irresponsible action.

In this they have been typical of citizens of democracies engaged in long painful wars that do not promise swift victory. For example, on the eve of the Peloponnesian War Pericles told the Athenians that “men are not moved by the same feeling when they are already at war as when they make the decision to fight but change their minds in the face of misfortunes,” and so it turned out. The Athenians were suffering and the strategy for victory was not working, so defeatists and those who had opposed the war from the first demanded peace at once. As Thucydides tells us, “they began to find fault with Pericles, as the author of the war and the cause of all their misfortunes, and became eager to come to terms with Sparta, and actually sent ambassadors there, who did not however succeed in their mission. Their despair was now complete and all vented itself upon Pericles.”

Thucydides, in response, called for patriotism in time of trouble: “Since a republic can support the misfortunes of private citizens, while they cannot support hers, it is surely the duty of everyone to be forward in her defense.... the apparent error of my policy lies in the infirmity of your resolution, since... your mind is too much depressed to persevere in your resolves.... Cease then to grieve for your private afflictions, and address yourselves instead to the safety of the republic.” Ultimately, the Athenians continued the fight, recovering from what seemed certain defeat until the enemy offered a peace they could accept.

American precedent

So it was, too, in the midst of America’s Civil War. As late as 1864, after three years of fearful casualties, victory for the Union forces was not in sight. Lincoln was determined to continue the fight to restore the integrity of the Union and to abolish slavery. Original opponents of the war were joined by great numbers who were simply weary, and others who were ready to seek peace at any price, which was for some the persistence of slavery and for others the dissolution of the Union. One English friend of the Union cause expected such politicians to compromise with the South in order to take it back, slavery and all. Such an event would be shameful, he said, but still “it would leave the question to be settled by a similar process of blood by another generation.” (Civil War quotations are from Copperheads, by Jennifer L. Weber.)

In 1864 Lincoln changed generals, and undertook a more aggressive strategy, but the war continued to drag on. A hostile newspaper, wrote, “that perhaps it is time to agree to a peace without victory.” Like Pericles, Lincoln was assailed by attacks on his policies and by personal vituperation. At the Democratic convention in August 1864 a speaker told a crowd in the streets that Lincoln and the Union

armies had “Failed! Failed!! FAILED!!! FAILED!!!!” The loss of life ‘has never been seen since the destruction of Sennacherib by the breath of the Almighty and still the monster usurper wants more men for his slaughter pens.”

The Democratic convention was dominated by the anti-war faction whom the Republicans called “Copperheads,” after the poisonous snake. According to their best historian, they were “consistent and constant in their demand for an immediate peace settlement. At times they were willing to trade victory for peace. One persistent problem for [them] was their refusal or reluctance to offer a realistic and comprehensive plan for peace.” Pressed by the Copperheads, the Democrats nominated a rabidly antiwar candidate for vice president and adopted a platform that called the war a “failure,” and demanded “immediate efforts” to end hostilities....” Their platform statement would permit abandonment not only of emancipation, but of the most basic war aim, reunion. Even New York’s Republican Party boss declared that Lincoln’s reelection was widely regarded as an “impossibility...The People [were] wild for Peace.” At the end of August defeat for the Republicans and the Union cause seemed inevitable, but Lincoln refused to seek peace without victory, saying that he was not prepared, to “give up the Union for a peace which, so achieved, could not be of much duration.”

No one would have predicted that within a matter of months the war would end with a total victory for the Union forces, slavery abolished and the Union restored, but events took an unexpected turn. A series of Union military victories changed the course of the war. The Democrats, having declared or predicted defeat were, as one historian has written: “Tarred as traitors, regardless of their actual positions on the war, Democrats were ... roundly thrashed in November. In fact, the stench of treason clung to the Democrats for years; nearly a generation would pass before another Democrat, Grover Cleveland, occupied the White House.”

Such an outcome would have seemed inconceivable in the summer of 1864. Before the change in military fortunes Lincoln was under siege, especially from northern Democrats, who had opposed the war from the beginning or turned against it when it did not bring swift and easy victory. By 1864 they had a powerful investment in defeat, for a Union victory would bring them political disaster, and their rhetoric reflected their anxiety. One New York Copperhead wrote, “There is death at the heart of this glory& greatness. This war is murder and nothing else. And every man who gives a dollar or moves his finger to aid is an aider & abettor of murder.” Northern military setbacks and casualties emboldened the Copperheads, the defeatists of that day. The Boston Pilot, a Copperhead paper, wrote, “It begins to look to many folks in the North that the Confederacy perhaps can never really be beaten, that the attempts to win might after all be too heavy a load to carry, and that perhaps it is time to agree to a peace without victory.”

Even some of the president’s supporters were ready to abandon him and his policies. Henry J. Raymond, editor of the New York Times and chairman of the

Republican party, wrote that throughout the country people were convinced “that we need a change, that the war languishes under Mr. Lincoln and that he cannot or will not give us peace.... The country is tired & sick of the war & is longing for peace.” Copperheads directed the most violent personal attacks on the man who stood in their way. “God’s curse is upon the land,” wrote a Pennsylvania publisher on the day Lincoln had designated for prayer. “Does it become us to acknowledge the truth, and pray for forgiveness of God for any and every part we may have taken in upholding the sins and abominations of this wicked administration ... to put on sack-cloth and retrace our steps[?]. . . Oh, God, give us Peace! . . . Stop this bloody hell-devised carnage.” Another Copperhead took to calling Lincoln the “widow maker” or the “orphan maker.” He said any man who voted for Lincoln was “a traitor and a murderer.” If Lincoln was reelected, “we trust some bold hand will pierce his heart with dagger point for the public good.”

In the minds of the Copperheads, the abolitionists held the place now occupied in the minds of today’s defeatists by the neoconservatives. What prevented peace, the Copperheads insisted was the influence of that small but unduly powerful corps of ideologues known as the abolitionists. It was, they further insisted, “fanatical abolitionism” that started the war. Lincoln, they thought, had become its captive and deceived the people into an unnecessary and unwise war. Now he refused to abandon that war, ostensibly fought to preserve the Union, but really the result of an abolitionist plot to end slavery. In the summer of 1864 the defeatists gained control of the Democratic convention and adopted a platform that charged the Republican administration with violating the Constitution, claiming that it had been “disregarded in every part, and public liberty and private right alike trodden down [and] the material prosperity of the country essentially impaired.” “It accused them of using “extraordinary and dangerous powers” “not found in the Constitution. They called the war a “failure,” and for “immediate efforts” “to end hostilities.”

The administration’s political troubles did not escape the enemies of the Union. Many Confederates looked forward to a Democratic victory in November, expecting that it would bring them what they wanted. A clerk in the Confederate War Department wrote: “everything depends upon the result of the Presidential election in the United States. We rely some little on the success of the peace party.” When the Democrats disbanded on the last day of August there was good reason to believe that the Copperheads had won the day, that the administration of Lincoln would be out of office and that the victorious Democrats would agree to a peace that might leave the enemies of the Union in control of an independent, slave-holding Confederacy.

In November, however, Lincoln crushed his opponent, winning the Electoral College by a count of 212 to 21 and losing only three states. Who could believe that only two months earlier nearly everyone, including Lincoln himself, was sure he would lose? The change in strategy and in the leadership of the army had snatched victory from what had seemed certain defeat, and military success brought a political revolution.

Paying the political price

Perhaps it is fear of a similar outcome that explains recent comments by antiwar Democrats. Rep. James Clyburn, said that a positive report on developments in Iraq from Petraeus might divide the Democrats in Congress, who would “want to stay the course, and if the Republicans were to stay united as they have been, then it would be a problem for us,” and Rep. Nancy Boyda, shaken by the optimistic testimony of Gen. Jack Keane, just returned from a visit to Iraq, said: “And I just will make some statements more for the record based on what I heard from — mainly from General Keane. As many of us — there was only so much that you could take until we in fact had to leave the room for a while. So I think I am back and maybe can articulate some things — after so much of the frustration of having to listen to what we listened to.”

Lincoln remains an American icon and hero for many reasons, not the least of which is his steadfastness and determination in the face of difficulty. Threatened with political defeat and personal humiliation, he would not abandon the integrity and security of his country nor would he abandon its most treasured principle, freedom, to escape his troubles.

The high price paid by the Democrats after the Civil War, on the other hand, is not surprising, since they failed to end the war they opposed, and their predictions of defeat were overwhelmed and discredited by military victory. But the war in Vietnam shows that even when it is successful, defeatism may have its dangers. The armed forces of the United States did not lose the war in Vietnam. The homefront gave way just when a new strategy and new leadership was turning the tide of battle in favor of the U.S. Defeatists and the media depicted military victories as defeats. Defeatists, inside and outside the government, had prevented the employment of all necessary means for victory, as the Copperheads of the 1860s could not. Finally, they were able to cause so much disruption and disaffection at home as to force a disgraceful and dishonorable defeat that failed to achieve the primary goal of the war — self-determination and freedom from brutal Communist rule for the South Vietnamese — and left America’s friends and allies to be butchered and enslaved.

Although Americans were tired of and disgusted with the war and eager to end it, they were not pleased by its outcome and its consequences. Their distrust of the Democratic Party, seen as the home of the defeatists who were unwilling to defend American interests, was a major factor in the victories of seven out of ten Republican presidents in the elections beginning in 1968. Even the two Democrats who won in that period, Jimmy Carter and Bill Clinton, were perceived as distinct from the defeatists, and one of them ran to the right of his Republican opponent on defense and foreign affairs.

Victory in the war Americans confront today is not certain. If it comes it will arrive only after long and hard effort, but it is well to remember that the United

States has lost war only when it has chosen to fight no longer. There are defeatists aplenty among us today, and they too, shout that the war has been lost, that the government that conducts it is stupid and incompetent, that the war is not necessary and that our leaders lied to us in bringing it on, that nothing terrible will ensue if we abandon the fighting. They, too, bewail the casualties incurred in the war and proclaim their support for the troops even as they delay voting a budget to sustain the military. Such stratagems may work so long as a war goes badly. But what if the current president has found his Grant and a better strategy?

Like the Copperheads of the Civil War, today's defeatists have a huge investment in defeat and live in dread of success in the field, which could turn into disaster at the polls. In this, they would do well to understand that they are at odds with most of the American people, who are tired of the war and deplore the casualties and expense that goes with it. They want peace, but not one that is an illusion and will not last. Nor do they want a peace at any price that will bring fearful consequences and disgrace. If the defeatists have their way that is the kind of peace we will get; the American people will know whom to blame and will not quickly forget.

Donald Kagan is the Sterling Professor of Classics and History at Yale University.

APPENDIX

TEXT OF MUNICH AGREEMENT

Agreement concluded at Munich, September 29, 1938, between Germany, Great Britain, France and Italy

GERMANY, the United Kingdom, France and Italy, taking into consideration the agreement, which has been already reached in principle for the cession to Germany of the Sudeten German territory, have agreed on the following terms and conditions governing the said cession and the measures consequent thereon, and by this agreement they each hold themselves responsible for the steps necessary to secure its fulfilment:

- (1) The evacuation will begin on 1st October.
- (2) The United Kingdom, France and Italy agree that the evacuation of the territory shall be completed by the 10th October, without any existing installations having been destroyed, and that the Czechoslovak Government will be held responsible for carrying out the evacuation without damage to the said installations.
- (3) The conditions governing the evacuation will be laid down in detail by an international commission composed of representatives of Germany, the United Kingdom, France, Italy and Czechoslovakia.
- (4) The occupation by stages of the predominantly German territory by German troops will begin on 1st October. The four territories marked on the attached map will be occupied by German troops in the following order:

The territory marked No. I on the 1st and 2nd of October; the territory marked No. II on the 2nd and 3rd of October; the territory marked No. III on the 3rd, 4th and 5th of October; the territory marked No. IV on the 6th and 7th of October. The remaining territory of preponderantly German character will be ascertained by the aforesaid international commission forthwith and be occupied by German troops by the 10th of October.

- (5) The international commission will determine the territories in which a plebiscite is to be held. These territories will be occupied by international bodies until the plebiscite has been completed. The same commission will fix the conditions in which the plebiscite is to be held, taking as a basis the conditions of the Saar plebiscite. The commission will also fix a date, not later than the end of

November, on which the plebiscite will be held.

(6) The final determination of the frontiers will be carried out by the international commission. The commission will also be entitled to recommend to the four Powers, Germany, the United Kingdom, France and Italy, in certain exceptional cases, minor modifications in the strictly ethnographical determination of the zones which are to be transferred without plebiscite.

(7) There will be a right of option into and out of the transferred territories, the option to be exercised within six months from the date of this agreement. A German-Czechoslovak commission shall determine the details of the option, consider ways of facilitating the transfer of population and settle questions of principle arising out of the said transfer.

(8) The Czechoslovak Government will within a period of four weeks from the date of this agreement release from their military and police forces any Sudeten Germans who may wish to be released, and the Czechoslovak Government will within the same period release Sudeten German prisoners who are serving terms of imprisonment for political offences.

Munich, September 29, 1938.

ADOLF HITLER,
NEVILLE CHAMBERLAIN,
EDOUARD DALADIER,
BENITO MUSSOLINI.

PRIME MINISTER NEVILLE CHAMBERLAIN, HOUSE OF COMMONS, OCTOBER 3, 1938.

In my view the strongest force of all, one which grew and took fresh shapes and forms every day was the force not of any one individual, but was that unmistakable sense of unanimity among the peoples of the world that war somehow must be averted. The peoples of the British Empire were at one with those of Germany, of France and of Italy, and their anxiety, their intense desire for peace, pervaded the whole atmosphere of the conference, and I believe that that, and not threats, made possible the Concessions that were made....

Ever since I assumed my present office my main purpose has been to work for the pacification of Europe, for the removal of those suspicions and those animosities which have so long poisoned the air. The path which leads to appeasement is long and bristles with obstacles. The question of Czechoslovakia is the latest and perhaps the most dangerous. Now that we have got past it, I feel that it may be possible to make further progress along the road to sanity.

My right hon. Friend [Duff Cooper] has alluded in somewhat bitter terms to my conversation last Friday morning with Herr Hitler. I do not know why that conversation should give rise to suspicion, still less to criticism. I entered into no pact. I made no new commitments. There is no secret understanding. Our conversation was hostile to no other nation. The objects of that conversation, for which I asked, was to try to extend a little further the personal Contact which I had established with Herr Hitler and which I believe to be essential in modern diplomacy. We had a friendly and entirely non-committal conversation, carried on, on my part, largely with a view to seeing whether there could be points in common between the head of a democratic Government and the ruler of a totalitarian State. We see the result in the declaration which has been published, in which my right hon. Friend finds so much ground for suspicion....

I believe there are many who will feel with me that such a declaration, signed by the German Chancellor and myself, is something more than a pious expression of opinion. In our relations with other countries everything depends upon there being sincerity and good will on both sides. I believe that there is sincerity and good will on both sides in this declaration. That is why to me its significance goes far beyond its actual words. If there is one lesson which we should learn from the events of these last weeks it is this, that lasting peace is not to be obtained by sitting still and waiting for it to come. It requires active, positive efforts to achieve it. No doubt I shall have plenty of critics who will say that I am guilty of facile optimism, and that I should disbelieve every word that is uttered by rulers of other great States in Europe. I am too much of a realist to believe that we are going to achieve our paradise in a day. We have only laid the foundations of peace. The superstructure is not even begun....

While we must renew our determination to fill up the deficiencies that yet remain in our armaments and in our defensive precautions, so that we may be ready to defend ourselves and make our diplomacy effective--[Interruption]--yes I am a realist--nevertheless I say with an equal sense of reality that I do see fresh opportunities of approaching this subject of disarmament opening up before us, and I believe that they are at least as hopeful to-day as they have been at any previous time. It is to such tasks--the winning back of confidence, the gradual removal of hostility between nations until they feel that they can safely discard their weapons, one by one, that I would wish to devote what energy and time may be left to me before I hand over my office to younger men.

CLEMENT ATTLEE, HOUSE OF COMMONS, OCTOBER 3, 1938.

We all feel relief that war has not come this time. Every one of us has been passing through days of anxiety; we cannot, however, feel that peace has been established, but that we have nothing but an armistice in a state of war. We have been unable to go in for carefree rejoicing. We have felt that we are in the midst of a tragedy. We have felt humiliation. This has not been a victory for reason and humanity. It has been a victory for brute force. At every stage of the proceedings there have been time limits laid down by the owner and ruler of armed force. The terms have not been terms negotiated; they have been terms laid down as ultimata. We have seen today a gallant, civilised and democratic people betrayed and handed over to a ruthless despotism. We have seen something more. We have seen the cause of democracy, which is, in our view, the cause of civilisation and humanity, receive a terrible defeat.

I think that in the mind of every thoughtful person in this Country when he heard that this settlement had been arrived at at Munich, there was a conflict. On the one hand there was enormous relief that war had been averted, at all events for the time being; on the other, there was a sense of humiliation and foreboding for the future....

The events of these last few days constitute one of the greatest diplomatic defeats that this country and France have ever sustained. There can be no doubt that it is a tremendous victory for Herr Hitler. Without firing a shot, by the mere display of military force, he has achieved a dominating position in Europe which Germany failed to win after four years of war. He has overturned the balance of power in Europe. He has destroyed the last fortress of democracy in Eastern Europe which stood in the way of his ambition. He has opened his way to the food, the oil and the resources which he requires in order to consolidate his military power, and he has successfully defeated and reduced to impotence the forces that might have stood against the rule of violence.

The Prime Minister has given us an account of his actions. Everybody recognises the great exertions he has made in the cause of peace. When the captain of a ship by disregarding all rules of navigation has gone right off his course and run the ship into great danger, watchers from the shore, naturally impressed with the captain's frantic efforts to try to save something from the shipwreck, cheer him when he comes ashore and even want to give him a testimonial, but there follows an inquiry, an inquest, on the victims, and the question will be asked how the vessel got so far off its course, how and why it was so hazarded? All the faults of seamanship and errors of judgment must be brought to light, and no amount of devotion at the eleventh hour will save that captain from the verdict that he has hazarded his ship through bad seamanship. Parliament is the grand inquest of the British nation, and it is our duty to inquire not alone into the actions of the Prime Minister during the last few days or the last few weeks, but into the whole course of policy which has brought this country into such great danger and such great anxiety....

I want to turn now to the cause of the crisis which we have undergone. The cause was not the existence of minorities in Czechoslovakia; it was not that the position of the Sudeten Germans had become intolerable. It was not the wonderful principle of self-determination. It was because Herr Hitler had decided that the time was ripe for another step forward in his design to dominate Europe. I think it is necessary to be clear on this, because the Prime Minister seems to me to be laying a great deal too much stress on the anxiety of Herr Hitler for his fellow-Germans in Czechoslovakia. I have no doubt that has been so, but it did not become intense until about two years ago. It was quite a minor matter, and I fear that the Prime Minister is deceived if he thinks that the cause of this trouble has been the woes of the Sudeten Germans. I say that the question of the Sudeten Germans has been used as a counter in the game of politics, and in other conditions Herr Hitler might just as well have used the people of Memel, the people of South Denmark, the people in the Trentino or the Germans in South Tyrol....

The history of the last seven years is the background of this crisis, and the first point I must make to the Government is this. This crisis did not come unexpectedly. It was obvious to any intelligent student of foreign affairs that this attack would come. The immediate signal was given by the Prime Minister himself on 7th March of this year when he said: "What country in Europe today if threatened by a larger Power can rely upon the League for protection? None." It was at once an invitation to Herr Hitler and a confession of the failure of the Government. The invitation was accepted a few days later by the Anschluss in Austria. Then our Government and the French Government could have faced the consequences. They could have told Czechoslovakia "We cannot any longer defend you. You had better now make the best terms you can with Germany, enter her political orbit and give her anything to escape before the wrath comes upon you." But they did nothing of the sort. Czechoslovakia continued under the supposed shelter of these treaties. True, it was urged that something should be done for the Sudeten Germans but there was no attempt made to take early steps to prevent this aggression....

I heard a suggestion from the benches opposite. "What about the U.S.S.R.?" Throughout the whole of these proceedings the U.S.S.R. has stood by its pledges and its declarations and there has been some pretty hard lying about it, too. There have been lies told, and people knew they were lies, about alleged conversations between M. Litvinoff and the French Foreign Minister. At no time has there been any difficulty in knowing where the U.S.S.R. stood. At no time has there been any consultation. I am aware that the Prime Minister may say that we were not the prime factor in this problem and that we were only concerned after France had been brought into it. But we have had very close collaboration with France, and in the order of commitment the U.S.S.R. comes before this country, and it has been a very great weakness that throughout there has been this cold-shouldering of the U.S.S.R....

When the National Government overthrew the whole policy of collective security and abandoned it and the League, we told this House over and over again that we were entering on a very dangerous course. We realised that we were back in 1914 with all its dangers, and we knew that sooner or later a challenge would come to this country; and that is what has happened. The real pith of it is that, having decided to leave the League system which we practised and in which we believed, and to embark on a policy of alliances and power politics, instead of strengthening the people whose natural interests were with ours, we have had nothing but constant flirtations with this and that dictator. The Prime Minister has been the dupe of the dictators, and I say that to-day we are in a dangerous position.

WINSTON CHURCHILL, HOUSE OF COMMONS, OCTOBER 5, 1938.

Having thus fortified myself by the example of others, I will proceed to emulate them. I will, therefore, begin by saying the most unpopular and most unwelcome thing. I will begin by saying what everybody would like to ignore or forget but which must nevertheless be stated, namely, that we have sustained a total and unmitigated defeat, and that France has suffered even more than we have.

VISCOUNTESS ASTOR: Nonsense.

MR. CHURCHILL: When the Noble Lady cries "Nonsense," she could not have heard the Chancellor of the Exchequer [Sir John Simon] admit in his illuminating and comprehensive speech just now that Herr Hitler had gained in this particular leap forward in substance all he set out to gain. The utmost my right hon. Friend the Prime Minister has been able to secure by all his immense exertions, by all the great efforts and mobilisation which took place in this country, and by all the anguish and strain through which we have passed in this country, the utmost he has been able to gain--[HON. MEMBERS: "Is peace."]. I thought I might be allowed to make that point in its due place, and I propose to deal with it. The utmost he has been able to gain for Czechoslovakia and in the matters which were in dispute has been that the German dictator, instead of snatching his victuals from the table, has been content to have them served to him course by course.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer said it was the first time Herr Hitler had been made to retract-I think that was the word-in any degree. We really must not waste time, after all this long Debate, upon the difference between the positions reached at Berchtesgaden, at Godesberg and at Munich. They can be very simply epitomised, if the House will permit me to vary the metaphor. £1 was demanded at the pistol's point. When it was given, £2 were demanded at the pistol's point. Finally, the dictator consented to take £1 17s. 6d. and the rest in promises of good will for the future.

Now I come to the point, which was mentioned to me just now from some quarters of the House, about the saving of peace. No one has been a more resolute and uncompromising struggler for peace than the Prime Minister. Everyone knows that. Never has there been such intense and undaunted determination to maintain and to secure peace. That is quite true. Nevertheless, I am not quite clear why there was so much danger of Great Britain or France being involved in a war with Germany at this juncture if, in fact, they were ready all along to sacrifice Czechoslovakia. The terms which the Prime Minister brought back with him--I quite agree at the last moment; everything had got off the rails and nothing but his intervention could have saved the peace, but I am talking of the events of the summer--could easily have been agreed, I believe, through the ordinary diplomatic channels at any time during the summer. And I will say this, that I believe the Czechs, left to themselves and told they were going to get no help from the Western Powers, would have been able to make better terms than they have got--they could hardly have worse--after all this tremendous perturbation.

There never can be any absolute certainty that there will be a fight if one side is determined that it will give way completely. When one reads the Munich terms, when one sees what is happening in Czechoslovakia from hour to hour, when one is sure, I will not say of Parliamentary approval but of Parliamentary acquiescence, when the Chancellor of the Exchequer makes a speech which at any rate tries to put in a very powerful and persuasive manner the fact that, after all, it was inevitable and indeed righteous--right--when we saw all this, and everyone on this side of the House, including many Members of the Conservative Party who are supposed to be vigilant and careful guardians of the national interest, it is quite clear that nothing vitally affecting us was at stake, it seems to me that one must ask, What was all the trouble and fuss about? ...

We are asked to vote for this Motion which has been put upon the Paper, and it is certainly a Motion couched in very uncontroversial terms, as, indeed, is the Amendment moved from the Opposition side. I

cannot myself express my agreement with the steps which have been taken, and as the Chancellor of the Exchequer has put his side of the case with so much ability I will attempt, if I may be permitted, to put the case from a different angle. I have always held the view that the maintenance of peace depends upon the accumulation of deterrents against the aggressor, coupled with a sincere effort to redress grievances. Herr Hitler's victory, like so many of the famous struggles that have governed the fate of the world, was won upon the narrowest of margins. After the seizure of Austria in March we faced this problem in our Debates. I ventured to appeal to the Government to go a little further than the Prime Minister went, and to give a pledge that in conjunction with France and other Powers they would guarantee the security of Czechoslovakia while the Sudeten-Deutsch question was being examined either by a League of Nations Commission or some other impartial body, and I still believe that if that Course had been followed events would not have fallen into this disastrous state. I agree very much with my right hon. Friend the Member for Sparkbrook (Mr. Amery) when he said on that occasion--I cannot remember his actual words--"Do one thing or the other; either say you will disinterest yourself in the matter altogether or take the step of giving a guarantee which will have the greatest chance of securing protection for that country."

France and Great Britain together, especially if they had maintained a close contact with Russia, which certainly was not done, would have been able in those days in the summer, when they had the prestige, to influence many of the smaller States of Europe, and I believe they could have determined the attitude of Poland. Such a combination, prepared at a time when the German dictator was not deeply and irrevocably committed to his new adventure, would, I believe, have given strength to all those forces in Germany which resisted this departure, this new design. They were varying forces, those of a military character which declared that Germany was not ready to undertake a world war, and all that mass of moderate opinion and popular opinion which dreaded war, and some elements of which still have some influence upon the German Government. Such action would have given strength to all that intense desire for peace which the helpless German masses share with their British and French fellow men, and which, as we have been reminded, found a passionate and rarely permitted vent in the joyous manifestations with which the Prime Minister was acclaimed in Munich.

All these forces, added to the other deterrents which combinations of Powers, great and small, ready to stand firm upon the front of law and for the ordered remedy of grievances, would have formed, might well have been effective. Of course you cannot say for certain that they would. [Interruption.] I try to argue fairly with the House. At the same time I do not think it is fair to charge those who wished to see this course followed, and followed consistently and resolutely, with having wished for an immediate war. Between submission and immediate war there was this third alternative, which gave a hope not only of peace but of justice. It is quite true that such a policy in order to succeed demanded that Britain should declare straight out and a long time beforehand that she would, with others, join to defend Czechoslovakia against an unprovoked aggression. His Majesty's Government refused to give that guarantee when it would have saved the situation, yet in the end they gave it when it was too late, and now, for the future, they renew it when they have not the slightest power to make it good.

All is over. Silent, mournful, abandoned, broken, Czechoslovakia recedes into the darkness. . . . No one has a right to say that the plebiscite which is to be taken in areas under Saar conditions, and the clean-cut of the 50 per cent. areas--that those two operations together amount in the slightest degree to a verdict of self-determination. It is a fraud and a farce to invoke that name....

We in this country, as in other Liberal and democratic countries, have a perfect right to exalt the principle of self-determination, but it comes ill out of the mouths of those in totalitarian States who deny even the smallest element of toleration to every section and creed within their bounds. But, however you put it, this particular block of land, this mass of human beings to be handed over, has never expressed the desire to go into the Nazi rule. I do not believe that even now--if their opinion could be asked, they would exercise such an option....

I venture to think that in future the Czechoslovak State cannot be maintained as an independent entity. You will find that in a period of time which may be measured by years, but may be measured only by months, Czechoslovakia will be engulfed in the Nazi regime. Perhaps they may join it in despair or in revenge. At any rate, that story is over and told. But we cannot consider the abandonment and ruin of Czechoslovakia in the light only of what happened only last month. It is the most grievous consequence which we have yet experienced of what we have done and of what we have left undone in the last five years--five years of futile good intention, five years of eager search for the line of least resistance, five years of uninterrupted retreat of British power, five years of neglect of our air defences. Those are the features which I stand here to declare and which marked an improvident stewardship for which Great Britain and France have dearly to pay. We have been reduced in those five years from a position of security so overwhelming and so unchallengeable that we never cared to think about it. We have been reduced from a position where the very word "war" was considered one which would be used only by persons qualifying for a lunatic asylum. We have been reduced from a position of safety and power--power to do good, power to be generous to a beaten foe, power to make terms with Germany, power to give her proper redress for her grievances, power to stop her arming if we chose, power to take any step in strength or mercy or justice which we thought right--reduced in five years from a position safe and unchallenged to where we stand now...

We are in the presence of a disaster of the first magnitude which has befallen Great Britain and France. Do not let us blind ourselves to that. It must now be accepted that all the countries of Central and Eastern Europe will make the best terms they can with the triumphant Nazi Power. The system of alliances in Central Europe upon which France has relied for her safety has been swept away, and I can see no means by which it can be reconstituted. The road down the Danube Valley to the Black Sea, the resources of corn and oil, the road which leads as far as Turkey, has been opened. In fact, if not in form, it seems to me that all those countries of Middle Europe, all those Danubian countries, will, one after another, be drawn into this vast system of power politics--not only power military politics but power economic politics--radiating from Berlin, and I believe this can be achieved quite smoothly and swiftly and will not necessarily entail the firing of a single shot. If you wish to survey the havoc of the foreign policy of Britain and France, look at what is happening and is recorded each day in the columns of the "Times..."

We are talking about countries which are a long way off and of which, as the Prime Minister might say, we know nothing. [Interruption.] The noble Lady says that that very harmless allusion is--

VISCOUNTESS ASTOR: Rude.

MR. CHURCHILL: She must very recently have been receiving her finishing course in manners. What will be the position, I want to know, of France and England this year and the year afterwards? What will be the position of that Western front of which we are in full authority the guarantors? The German army at the present time is more numerous than that of France, though not nearly so matured or perfected. Next year it will grow much larger, and its maturity will be more complete. Relieved from all anxiety in the East, and having secured resources which will greatly diminish, if not entirely remove, the deterrent of a naval blockade, the rulers of Nazi Germany will have a free choice open to them in what direction they will turn their eyes. If the Nazi dictator should choose to look westward, as he may, bitterly will France and England regret the loss of that fine army of ancient Bohemia which was estimated last week to require not fewer than 30 German divisions for its destruction.

Can we blind ourselves to the great change which has taken place in the military situation, and to the dangers we have to meet?.

This is only the beginning of the reckoning. This is only the first sip, the first foretaste of a bitter cup which will be proffered to us year by year unless by a supreme recovery of moral health and martial vigour, we arise again and take our stand for freedom as in the olden time.

**PRIME MINISTER CHAMBERLAIN, HOUSE OF COMMONS,
OCTOBER 5, 1938**

As regards future policy, it seems to me that there are really only two possible alternatives. One of them is to base yourself upon the view that any sort of friendly relation, or possible relations, shall I say, with totalitarian States are impossible, that the assurances which have been given to me personally are worthless, that they have sinister designs and that they are bent upon the domination of Europe and the gradual destruction of democracies. Of course, on that hypothesis, war has got to come, and that is the view--a perfectly intelligible view--of a certain number of hon. and right hon. Gentlemen in this House....

If that is hon. Members' conviction, there is no future hope for civilisation or for any of the things that make life worth living. Does the experience of the Great War and of the years that followed it give us reasonable hope that if some new war started that would end war any more than the last one did? No. I do not believe that war is inevitable. Someone put into my hand a remark made by the great Pitt about 1787, when he said:

To suppose that any nation can be unalterably the enemy of another is weak and childish and has its foundations neither in the experience of nations nor in the history of man.

It seems to me that the strongest argument against the inevitability of war is to be found in something that everyone has recognized in every part of the House. That is the universal aversion from war of the people, their hatred of the notion of starting to kill one another again....

What is the alternative to this bleak and barren policy of the inevitability of war? In my view it is that we should seek by all means in our power to avoid war, by analysing possible causes, by trying to remove them, by discussion in a spirit of collaboration and good will. I cannot believe that such a programme would be rejected by the people of this country, even if it does mean the establishment of personal contact with dictators, and of talks man to man on the basis that each, while maintaining his own ideas of the internal government of his country, is willing to allow that other systems may suit better other peoples. The party opposite surely have the same idea in mind even if they put it in a different way. They want a world conference. Well, I have had some experiences of conferences, and one thing I do feel certain of is that it is better to have no conference at all than a conference which is a failure. The corollary to that is that before you enter a conference you must have laid out very clearly the lines on which you are going to proceed, if you are at least to have in front of you a reasonable prospect that you may obtain success. I am not saying that a conference would not have its place in due course. But I say it is no use to call a conference of the world, including these totalitarian Powers, until you are sure they are going to attend, and not only that they are going to attend, but that they are going to attend with the intention of aiding you in the policy on which you have set your heart.

I am told that the policy which I have tried to describe is inconsistent with the continuance, and much more inconsistent with the acceleration of our present programme of arms. I am asked how I can reconcile an appeal to the country to support the continuance of this programme with the words which I used when I came back from Munich the other day and spoke of my belief that we might have peace in our time. I hope hon. Members will not be disposed to read into words used in a moment of some emotion, after a long and exhausting day, after I had driven through miles of excited, enthusiastic, cheering people--I hope they will not read into those words more than they were intended to convey.

I do indeed believe that we may yet secure peace for our time, but I never meant to suggest that we should do that by disarmament, until we can induce others to disarm too. Our past experience has shown us only too clearly that weakness in armed strength means weakness in diplomacy, and if we want to secure a

lasting peace, I realise that diplomacy cannot be effective unless the Consciousness exists, not here alone, but elsewhere, that behind the diplomacy is the strength to give effect

I cannot help feeling that if, after all, war had come upon us, the people of this Country would have lost their spiritual faith altogether. As it turned out the other way, I think we have all seen something like a new spiritual revival, and I know that everywhere there is a strong desire among the people to record their readiness to serve their Country, where-ever or however their services could be most useful. I would like to take advantage of that strong feeling if it is possible, and although I must frankly say that at this moment I do not myself clearly see my way to any particular scheme, yet I want also to say that I am ready to consider any suggestion that may be made to me, in a very sympathetic spirit.

Finally, I would like to repeat what my right hon. Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer said yesterday in his great speech. Our policy of appeasement does not mean that we are going to seek new friends at the expense of old ones, or, in-deed, at the expense of any other nations at all. I do not think that at any time there has been a more complete identity of views between the French Government and ourselves than there is at the present time. Their objective is the same as ours--to obtain the collaboration of all nations, not excluding the totalitarian States, in building up a lasting peace for Europe. That seems to me to be a policy which would answer my hon. Friends' appeal, a policy which should command the support of all who believe in the power of human will to control human destiny. If we cannot here this afternoon emulate the patriotic unanimity of the French Chamber, this House can by a decisive majority show its approval of the Government's determination to pursue it.

[The vote which followed supported the government 369 to 150.]

From Parliamentary Debates, 5th series, vol.339 (1938), cols 30, 31-34, 39, 40, 47-52, 54, 56-58, 62-63, 150-154, 162, 360-369, 373, 548-553.

“Peace for Our Time,” September 30, 1938

The following statement was made by British Prime Minister, Neville Chamberlain, in front of #10 Downing Street, London, after his arrival home from the Munich Conference of 1938

“We, the German Fuhrer and Chancellor, and the British Prime Minister, have had a further meeting today and are agreed in recognizing that the question of Anglo-German relations is of the first importance for our two countries and for Europe.

We regard the agreement signed last night and the Anglo-German Naval Agreement as symbolic of the desire of our two peoples never to go to war with one another again.

We are resolved that the method of consultation shall be the method adopted to deal with any other questions that may concern our two countries, and we are determined to continue our efforts to remove possible sources of difference, and thus to contribute to assure the peace of Europe.

My good friends, for the second time in our history, a British Prime Minister has returned from Germany bringing peace with honor. I believe it is “peace for our time.” Go home and get a nice quiet sleep.”