

EUROPE GETS TOGETHER

BY LUDWIG QUESSEL

From *Sozialistische Monatshefte*, September 30
(CONSERVATIVE-SOCIALIST MONTHLY)

[THE author is a prominent Socialist editor and member of the Reichstag.]

GERMANY has watched with astonishment, during this September, Europe's effort to give herself a Constitution. At last our continent seriously proposes to substitute a reign of law and order for the reign of brute force that has hitherto held sway. What even Liberals and Social Democrats have smiled at tolerantly, as naïve dreams of imaginative idealists and enthusiasts, is actually on the way to be realized. Continental Europe is visibly taking on form and substance as a supernational political entity. Even England, who regards this new development with secret dislike, is compelled to proclaim through the mouth of her Prime Minister that the first duty of the League of Nations is to create a united Europe.

This announcement is, to be sure, slightly misleading, in so far as the foundations of a united Europe have already been laid, not only without England's help, but against England's will. When France created a system of defensive alliances with Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Rumania, and Poland, to guarantee the new order of the continent, she thereby started a transition from anarchy to law. For four years England has fought with all the resources of her shrewd diplomacy this inconvenient innovation, which relegated her balance-of-power policy to the rubbish heap of history. Now she bows before an accomplished and in-

evitable fact. Of course she does not intend forthwith to leave unhampered a political development she cannot altogether prevent. Her purpose is rather to cabin and confine an evolutionary process that is marching forward of its own motion and volition against her will. With this in view she turns her eyes to Germany and Russia. She looks to these two Powers to delay, even though they cannot stop entirely, this evolution, which will ultimately emancipate Europe from Anglo-Saxon tutelage.

What has occurred at Geneva since the fourth of September removes the last shadow of doubt regarding this. Before the League took the recent measures that have set Continental Europe on the road toward unity and freedom under French guidance, a mysterious breakfast occurred in London, at the home of Lord Parmoor, where Marx and Stresemann expected to receive a hint as to the attitude they should adopt toward that body. Stresemann left that breakfast with the impression that England did not want Germany to join the League, even though a section of the British press, in order to save the Government's face at Geneva and Paris, was encouraging our country to take that step.

We all know, to be sure, that Lord Parmoor and Murray later published to the world, through the Social-Democratic Parliamentary Service, that they had urgently advised Stresemann and Marx at the Henley breakfast to apply for Germany's admission to the League,

but did not find these gentlemen prepared to do so.

Most assuredly not one word of this eloquent appeal ever reached the ears of the German delegates.

The history of the breakfast at the home of Lord Parmoor, and of events at the Genoa Conference immediately preceding Germany's publication of her Rapallo Treaty with Russia, presents such striking parallels that it is easy to conjecture what lies behind the Henley misunderstanding. On September 4 Premier MacDonald delivered his great speech at Geneva, in which he exhorted Germany to enter the League. He declared that Germany must not remain outside that body; that, if he might be permitted to use the expression without being misunderstood, the rest of the world would not permit Germany to remain outside; that the London Conference had created new relations between Germany and the other European Powers; that a seal should be set upon those relations by the League Assembly; that the first task of the League was to erect a European system, and such a system could never thrive until the former enemies of the Allies ceased to be enemies; and much more of the same sort.

It is well known, however, that the men who control the policies of the British Foreign Office are past masters of the art of keeping from a Prime Minister information that might embarrass him in a particular emergency. Lloyd George at Genoa knew absolutely nothing of the Rapallo Treaty, although the Foreign Office both knew of its existence and knew that Germany proposed to make it public. In the same way, when MacDonald pointed in Geneva to the 'threatening empty chair' he may very well have been ignorant of the fact that a few weeks earlier, at the home of the British delegate to the League of Nations, Ger-

many's representatives at the London Conference were tacitly given to understand that the people of England would like to see the chair at Geneva remain empty for a considerable time longer.

So Ramsay MacDonald, who without question meant personally just what he said, could cordially invite Germany to join the League, and point with a deploring gesture to the 'empty chair,' while his Foreign Office was carefully providing that Germany should not want to occupy that chair. Furthermore, as most public men know, a measure that cannot be prevented altogether can often be effectively postponed by pretending to be its eager champions.

This misunderstanding at Henley is of course but a slight diversion in the larger strategy of our time, but it is one that throws much light on the attitude of England toward the creation of a united Europe. Naturally England cannot openly oppose the honest effort of France to cooperate with Germany — including, of course, working together with her in the economic field. But the London Foreign Office is doing all in its power to postpone that consummation, while making the rest of the world believe that the France of Herriot and Painlevé is the evil genius that is excluding Germany from the League. The memorandum which the Foreign Office delivered to Stresemann through Lord D'Abernon on September 22, just before the first session of the Reichstag after the vacation, was conceived in this sense. The English Ambassador, while professing a platonic desire to remove Germany's objections to joining the League, took pains to declare that the British Government could not assure her a permanent seat in the League Council, because only the League itself was authorized to create a new place in that body. This declaration, as *Kölnische Zeitung* said, was like

'a cold douche' on Germany's desire to join. The decision that the Cabinet took the next day shows that our Ship of State, faithful to its traditions, still responds sensitively to every movement of the British compass.

What is this new political constitution of Europe like, which Geneva is trying to enact and British imperialism is trying to postpone and nullify? What France and her allies want is clear and definite. Beneš, who appeared at Geneva as an official protagonist of the new European solidarity that is to rescue the continent from a reign of force, outlined a programme designed to realize the aspiration of 300,000,000 Europeans for an enduring peace enforced by adequate authority. Hereafter the twenty-five nations of Continental Europe shall be permitted to resort to military measures only for two objects: to defend themselves against armed attack, or to overpower, with the assistance of their colleague nations, any country that wantonly breaks the peace. When it came to defining what should constitute a breach of peace, Geneva adopted the French proposal that any State shall be declared an aggressor that refuses to submit a controversy to arbitration or to comply with the regulations of the League Council while a controversy is under adjudication. The regulations of the Council are designed to prevent secret arming and mobilizing while a dispute is pending. If a Government refuses to accept the decree of an arbitrator, all the naval, air, and land forces of Europe may be called upon to enforce the judgment and to bring the recalcitrant State to reason; and naturally the offender must pay the entire cost of its own disciplining.

We must emphasize that, in spite of the skillful manœuvring of the British Foreign Office at Geneva, the conflict between the views of the British Em-

pire and of Continental Europe came sharply to the surface during the discussion of the peace guaranties just mentioned. First of all, English delegates made it very plain that the British fleet would not be employed to keep peace on the Continent. Britain in general opposed the idea of backing up law by force, because law without force is a shadow, and force without law is tyranny. While Continental Europe refuses to trust the edicts of the League Council and the decisions of the International Tribunal set up by the League precisely because no guaranties exist for their enforcement, England advocates a legal procedure without any police power behind it. She regards the alliances that France has made with Czechoslovakia, Belgium, Yugoslavia, Rumania, and Poland, for the purpose of maintaining peace, as a serious threat to peace. MacDonalld warned the smaller Powers, which have appeared again upon the world stage after a long period without a history, that they would be trampled underfoot and obliterated in the next European war; that if they trusted their safety to treaties and alliances they would find themselves the victims of a dangerous illusion.

France's allies answered this appeal to give up their alliances with each other and with France, to disarm and to trust to the power of justice without force, by refusing to surrender these alliances, which were made to protect them from the military spirit still vigorous and powerful among their enemies. They declared: 'We shall disarm only when England and America guarantee our safety, for he who lays down his arms in the face of enemies who recognize no right except the right of force merely encourages violence and injustice.'

The Protocol adopted by the League Assembly shows us that the French

view won. The League will try to enforce peace. The alliances between France and the smaller Powers that have warded off Bolshevik aggression and preserved the peace of Europe remain as they are, but the naval, air, and land forces of these allies shall henceforth be used only to preserve peace and to bring to reason any Government that breaks the peace. This marks the inauguration of a new system of international law, a system under which nations can actually obtain justice — justice guaranteed by an organized continent consciously striving to attain its solidarity and determined to enforce what it considers right.

It is now for Germany to decide whether she will honorably and unreservedly commit herself to this new continental system of justice, or else join the League of Nations as a tool of British imperialism committed to opposing this new Europe, which in any case is coming, because it must come. The question is not whether Germany shall join the League, but in what spirit she shall join it. If she joins it converted to the spirit of force disguised by empty appeals to morality and justice championed by British imperialism, she will not benefit humanity by her step. But if she joins in the spirit of Kant, who pleaded with Europe more than one hundred years ago to 'rise above the

lawless condition of the brute and enter a league of peoples where each State, even the smallest, enjoys safety and justice, not by virtue of its own power or its own arbitrary will, but under a great league of nations, a united power, and in accordance with laws and judgments expressing that united will' — then she will be furthering both her own welfare and that of Europe.

What has happened at Geneva proves that the people of Europe do at length wish to escape from the reign of force which British imperialism, with its professed attachment to right without might, seeks to perpetuate, that they are no longer willing to let England, who insists that her fleet shall rule the seas but would have the continent disarm by land and by air, remain the arbiter of the world's destinies; that they have at length decided to set up an international constitution that shall substitute justice in place of force and reason in place of nationalist phantoms. A union of peoples is forming that will assure every nation the right of self-determination, and the right to its own cultural life under the effective protection of all. May Germany listen to the bidding of the hour, and do her part to create a new Europe where humanity may pursue its highest aims in safety under the protection of a peace guaranteed by force.

PETROPOLIS, BRAZIL'S VERSAILLES

BY M. E. G.

From *Nuova Antologia*, October 1
(ROME LIBERAL LITERARY SEMIMONTHLY)

'A LITTLE Versailles' many foreigners are wont to call Petropolis, the summer capital of the Rio de Janeiro Government. Petropolis is also referred to as 'a watering-place,' perhaps because it rains here every day.

Until a few years ago this resort was to all intents and purposes the permanent diplomatic capital, because foreign representatives shunned Rio de Janeiro on account of the yellow fever. Since the fever has been banished from that city, Petropolis has lost some of its former prominence, although most embassy and legation staffs still reside here from December to May.

At first glance Petropolis suggests a German community more than it does a town in tropical Brazil, for its people are largely of German descent. Both the men and the women have the ruddy complexion, the blue eyes, the fair hair, and the robust physiques of that northern race. Local names bear out this impression: Rhineland, Westphalia, Bohemia, Nassau, Darmstadt, Worms, Moselle, Pfalz, and so on. A mere chance caused this district to be settled by German colonists. In 1828, Emperor Pedro I resided for a time on a ranch in the vicinity, while one of his daughters was recovering her health. Charmed by the climate, he returned the following year, and eventually purchased an estate on the site of the present town. Political changes later recalled him to Portugal. Eight years afterward a British ship put into Rio with several hundred mutinous German colonists aboard.

They had taken passage for Australia, but had rebelled against the scantiness and the poor quality of the food upon the vessel. A German engineer in the Brazilian service, who was building a state highway in the vicinity of the future summer capital, gladly gave work to his fellow countrymen. Other immigrants followed, and when a new town was laid out on the Emperor's estate, in 1843, it was settled largely by them.

Petropolis preserves few vestiges of the time when it was the residence of the Emperor. The old Imperial Palace, of plain but correct design, in its broad park, and the villa of Princess Isabella, remain. A cathedral begun under the Empire is still in process of construction. When the monarchy was overthrown, in 1889, the Republican Government hastened to rename the streets and parks that commemorated the old régime.

But if the Empire has left few physical evidences of its existence, its memory survives more vividly here than elsewhere in Brazil. Many people still recall seeing Don Pedro II riding or walking through the streets and the surrounding country, and relate pleasant anecdotes of Empress Theresa Christina, who was called *La Mae dos Brasileiros* — 'The Mother of the Brazilians.' The royal family always spent part of the year at Petropolis, living very simply with their children and grandchildren, two of whom were born here.

It is natural, therefore, that mem-