

Confidential.

Bk of C L 70 (Eden) says Allies  
re R<sup>n</sup> Free Germans (must make  
rival appeal to f

Memorandum on the "National Committee of Free Germany"

The creation of the "National Committee of Free Germany" in Moscow is bound to be the subject of close study by the Foreign Office. I simply wish to offer certain observations of a general character. I wish to show briefly why it is attractive to the Germans failing any alternative programme from Britain and U.S.A., and also why its policy is contrary to the interests of Britain and Europe. My purpose is to press the need of a counter programme set out in some detail by Britain and U.S.A. at the earliest possible moment.

A. Why attractive to Germans ?

1. The Manifesto differs from the general terms of the Atlantic Charter by its concrete application to the present situation in which Germany now stands. There is a complete gulf between it and the Anglo-American policy of "unconditional surrender". It is the only policy which is now offered to Germany with any definite hope and plan for the future.



2. The timing of the Manifesto cannot be without significance. It appeared before the fall of Mussolini, but when it was obvious that British and American troops were about to invade Sicily. Mussolini's fall makes it even more relevant to the whole European situation.
3. The composition of the Committee is very carefully designed. Weinert, the Chairman, is author of the best known International (Communist) song, sung everywhere in the Spanish Revolution. Five ex-Communist members of the Reichstag are its mainstay. Associated with these are military figures and Catholic and other personalities.
4. The whole Manifesto is based on Stalin's distinction between Germany and the Hitlerite State. It concentrates on the destruction of the Hitlerite regime.
5. The contents of the Manifesto are of a liberal and democratic character. The Communist members are in control, but the programme is so worded as to provide a platform which will draw all those holding liberal views, even anti-Nazi views, together. This



is a much better way of Communist penetration than the way of force tried after the last war.

6. The Manifesto asks for a genuine German National Government to be set up which will overthrow Hitler, and disarm him and his patrons and accomplices; and states that this Government must "immediately cease military hostilities, withdraw the German troops from the frontiers, and enter into negotiations for peace, relinquishing all conquered territory."
7. It is an appeal to the German people, and it offers them as a whole "a free Germany", viz. "a strong democratic power which will have nothing in common with the overthrown German regime"; and its aim includes the complete abolition of all the laws imposed by the Hitlerite regime, the restoration of political rights, freedom of economy, the release of victims, a just and merciless trial of those guilty of the war and their accomplices, but "an amnesty for all those adherents of Hitler who recant in time and join in the movement for a free Germany".
8. It says that the Germany army must play the decisive role. It appeals to German soldiers and officers on all fronts to return to the fatherland with "their arms in their hands."



All this, failing an alternative programme, is highly attractive to the Germans in Germany, and the German soldier now fighting. Further, as a substantial guarantee against bad faith on Russia's part, the German army after return to Germany will be based on German territory, fully armed, and so in a position to resist military aggression from Russia. It would also appear that though this policy is highly independent of the Allies, in fact it could be defended as consistent with the form of the Anglo-Soviet Treaty, with its insistence on "Hitlerite Germany".

B. Why bad for Europe, Britain and U.S.A. ?

At the same time it is very bad for the other Allies, and for the European outlook.

1. It means that on the present footing Russia would enter a welcoming Germany from the east, with its National Committee of Free Germany. It would be likely, in default of a counter programme, so to appeal to the German army that the whole German people would surrender to Russia, and that Britain and U.S.A., with their Angot would never arrive. This would mean Russia and Communism supreme in Germany,



and over all Eastern Europe. (The Comintern would in fact be redivivus in a far more subversive form).

2. Unless the Allies issue an alternative programme, all anti-Nazis, refugees and those in Germany, will be obliged to fall in with the new National Committee, and so with Russia's Communist policy. It will be the only public way in which they can prove that they are anti-Nazi.

3. But

(a) It cannot be to the interests of Britain and U.S.A., or Europe, that Russia should be dominant over Germany and all Eastern Europe.

(b) It would be a tremendous break from the whole European tradition, which would have vast consequences for the whole of Europe, neutral countries as well as others.

(c) It would be profoundly unwelcome and disappointing to countless anti-Nazi Germans.

4. It would thus seem to be a matter of first-class urgency and importance that the Allies should at once come out into the open with a programme which will show



- (a) the Germans as a whole, particularly the vast majority who are not Communist, that there is an alternative other than Communism to the Hitlerite system - the traditional liberal European way; and
  - (b) all other European nations that there is a new order for Europe which is neither the New Order of the Nazis nor the Communist system, but a liberal and democratic system.
5. Such an alternative programme should insist on guarantees for international security, and on the relinquishment of all conquered territory; the withdrawal of German troops from the frontier back to Germany; the complete overthrow of the Hitlerite regime; the abolition of all the Hitlerite laws; the restoration of freedom of speech, of the press, and religious faith; compensation, the just and merciless trial of the war criminals, exchange of commodities with other countries as a natural condition for guaranteeing national welfare; and generally the principles of a liberal and democratic system.
6. Unless action of this kind is taken and taken with the utmost urgency, it is to be feared that Russia will have



all Germany under its power, and will soon, with German aid, control the whole of Europe, while Britain will gradually decline into a small power with the function of a buffer state between Russia-cum-Germany and America.

July 30th, 1943.

Chichester.



A x Yes. 6 wht form.  
of Cecil. L.H.U. & Arch.  
L.H.U.

THE PALACE,  
CHICHESTER.

28th November, 1936.

Dear Lord Noel Buxton,

Many thanks for your letter about the German Refugees. I am not at present in the House of Lords, so I am afraid I am not myself in a position to raise the question there, though it is very good of you to have suggested supporting ~~in~~ such a move. Some little time ago, after a talk with Sir Neill Malcolm, I wrote to Lord Cranborne to see whether it was possible to get the British Government to make a grant of £5000 towards the final solution of the settlement of non-Jewish refugees. He has promised to look into the matter, but I have not yet heard from him. I do not quite know whether it would be a good thing to raise that particular matter in the House of Lords, but I think that a letter from you to Mr. Eden or Lord Cranborne, asking whether the Government would be able to make a grant provided other Governments took similar action, would be a real stimulus at the present time. It would show that there is considerable interest in the subject, and I know General Malcolm welcomes the idea of the British Government making such a grant - or rather giving a lead by offering such a grant, if other Governments will pay up.

Yours sincerely,

George Cicester:

X Why not Jewish, Rumanian

X



11  
Thank

THE PALACE.

CHICHESTER.

21st April, 1937.

My dear Lord Buxton,

I enclose a letter from Mr. David Glick, the American who spent a year in Germany in 1936. He is a Jew and came to help the Jews in Germany and to find out about them. He was a most vital man. He came to see me in Chichester to tell me about the unhappy case of the non-Aryan Christians. That was in October. We have kept in touch ever since. It was because of his visit really that I went to Berlin to see the non-Aryan Christians in January. I enclose a copy of a letter just received from him now. I am sending a copy also to Sir Wyndham Deedes, and to Lord Bessborough and Mr. Adam.

Yours ever,

George Curzon



Letter to P.M.

WAR-TIME ADDRESS:

ST. MARTIN'S VICARAGE

(22 FRANKLIN ROAD).

BRIGHTON.

TEL. BRIGHTON 1984.

~~THE PALACE,~~

~~CHICHESTER.~~

18 Dec. 1939

Dear Lord Noel Buxton

Many thanks. I sigh  
gladly; we shall be interested to  
see the full list of signatures, in  
due course, and to hear what the  
P.M. says in reply.

I have been much surprised by the  
very large number of letters (their names  
appearing on my sheet, with only a few  
few objecting. Yrns sincerely  
George Christie.



FROM THE BISHOP OF CHICHESTER.

WAR-TIME ADDRESS:

ST. MARTIN'S VICARAGE  
(22 FRANKLIN ROAD)  
BRIGHTON.

TEL. BRIGHTON 1984.

THE PALACE,  
CHICHESTER.

22nd January, 1940.

Dear Lord Noel Buxton,

I am very glad to have your Brother's <sup>plan</sup> ~~last~~ for an early Peace, which he had kindly let me see in an earlier form. It is certainly most interesting and a real help.

I am very glad you saw the Bishop of Oslo. Her certainly enjoyed his talk with you, for I saw him afterwards, and saw him again in Holland. The point which I think wants making very strongly with the Government is the importance of going much further than either the Primeminister or Lord Halifax have yet gone, in defining what kind of a new order in Europe it is that we are seeking to establish. So far the references have been guarded and somewhat negative, to over-throw Hitlerism etc. I know that Lord Halifax on December 5th said

"That the United Kingdom would lay down her arms when she could treat with a Government whose signature could be trusted," i.e., "when the wrongs caused to weaker Nations could be righted, and lasting security established."

*rejected* The Primeminister has spoken of the necessity of avoiding blood-shed if possible, but in any case of over-throwing Hitlerism. The Primeminister ~~reiterated~~ the idea of describing with reasonable detail the conditions of a new order to a distant future, as something more connected with Utopia than with present circumstances.

*Cave* I have been much pleased by the insistence of defining War aims with reasonable detail in King Hall's news letter, the last number but one. I am sure that the Scandinavians do want this greater definition, and I believe the Americans also. But above all I believe that the Evangelical, and Catholics in Germany are terribly handicapped and puzzled by the absence of a constructive and positive plan coming from the Allies.

I am sure that it would make a real difference to their attitude, a difference which would become more and more important as the full implications went home, if only the British Government would not only say as they have said, that the idea of wishing to destroy Germany is fantastic, but that they have constructive views as to how the new order, especially in central Europe and Poland, is to be shaped.

ICRB



Yes they  
should  
be  
concluded

I understand the difficulties of coming to an agreement on such a matter with the French. But what the French say in their newspapers about destroying Germany, and dismembering it is allowed to go unanswered in any detail by British Spokesmen. The reason why the Evangelical Churchmen of the Niemoller school support Hitler is, I feel sure, fundamentally because they feel that it is a life and death struggle, and that Hitler alone stands between them and catastrophe.

?  
If the Allies can say that, not only is there no question of humiliation and dismemberment, but that a new system in which Czechia and Slovakia, and Austria, and Germany, with all their home places, as well as Poland; and that while wrongs must be righted, Germany's independence, and integrity, shall be preserved, it would take a very great deal away from the arguments on which Hitler now relies for claiming and gaining the support of the Churches in Germany, and of course the opposition generally.

Yours ever,

George Litch:

(an office fortnight's  
holiday)



FROM THE BISHOP OF CHICHESTER

ST. MARTIN'S VICARAGE,  
BRIGHTON.

13/2/40

Dear Lord Noel Buxton

I am in general agreement  
with the Draft Memo. But I  
believe it would be strengthened considerably  
if paragraph 2 on page 1 as to the  
possibility of abstract terms being sewed,  
could be expanded: both as to (a) evidence  
and (b) nature of terms. The latter is  
particularly important. If the advocates of  
negotiation could state their precise aims,  
in such a memorandum, I believe it would help.

People I talk to constantly ask what  
one means by the terms which could be



hoped for a month of negotiation. The  
② He agrees re no cond. <sup>(i.e. public)</sup>  
point about pre-conditions is a valuable  
does not arise  
one; it is the terms he aimed at in the

end that need (I think) some clearer statement.

I agree to par (2) or page 2<sup>1</sup> if all the  
reasonable proposals but

more useful (I think) suggestions as to what  
constitutes

"Success in negotiation".

It is not worth while bringing out the plea of  
the President of the Finnish Republic (a Jew!)

for peace in the West? OY

Yours sincerely

George Lestr.



24/2/1940  
FROM THE BISHOP OF CHICHESTER

ST. MARTIN'S VICARAGE,  
BRIGHTON.

*Memo*  
y  
Dear Lord Noel Buxton

I am in general  
agreement with the Memo,  
and readily give my name.

Yours sincerely

George Herbert:



June '60

Realism ✓

Heroic  
Bravado  
Quixotism  
Romance  
Gallantry

Realism  
Duty to / world  
- is max service

B Preserve / race  
~~Holland &~~  
~~European~~  
Duty to natives.  
- Real of risks  
to risk loss of fleet.

✓ work with Stou  
Problem of Ch<sup>h</sup>  
(in will of food - perish)

(let capt attend to be USA)

Q. Don't risk loss of fleet. &  
for sake of empire pride in dearly at

Q. If down don't sacrifice Ch<sup>h</sup>  
to our pride.

Provision to Poles. Best service  
is to keep indep  
To save Ch<sup>h</sup> willing = no looks  
wd risk situ<sup>n</sup> in ch. subjug<sup>n</sup> or managem<sup>t</sup>

To Lf. They be y were right.  
- y sd. real c. sd. tal risks.



Answered  
2 hotels

FROM THE BISHOP OF CHICHESTER

2 hand

ST. MARTIN'S VICARAGE,  
BRIGHTON.

Dear Lord Noel Buxton

Dr. Rodhe

Bishop of Lund

a distinguished Swedish Bishop

has just arrived in England, and is

staying at the <sup>Wol</sup> Grosvenor Hotel.

He has come about Finland, which

he regards as the key to the whole war,

and has important suggestions

offering peace. He sends the Archbishop



of Canterbury tomorrow (Sunday).

He would work like the charm if  
talk with you (and any others you  
think useful and available). He can  
be reached at his hotel. He speaks  
English - and is an old friend of mine.

Yours sincerely

George Lyster:



FROM THE BISHOP OF CHICHESTER.

WAR-TIME ADDRESS:

ST. MARTIN'S VICARAGE  
(22 FRANKLIN ROAD),  
BRIGHTON.

TEL. BRIGHTON 1984.

~~THE PALACE,  
CHICHESTER.~~

GC/NP

*Motion*

11th March, 1940.

My dear Lord Noel Buxton,

Many thanks for your letter, and also for seeing the Bishop of Lund. He much enjoyed his talk with you.

I have had a letter from Lord Ponsonby to whom I wrote when his motion was withdrawn, and he thinks, and I gather you share his view, that it would be a pity to draw a severe speech from Halifax at the present moment. The door would be closed when it is very desirable to keep it ajar.

It is very kind of you to invite me to come to the Group which meets at Jules's Restaurant on Wednesdays. If I am free and am in Town I should like to turn up, but I am afraid I am not often in Town except when I am absolutely obliged to go for duties, and pressure is pretty heavy here.

Once more many thanks,

Yours sincerely,

*George Lister*

The Rt. Hon. Lord Noel Buxton,  
18, Cowley Street,  
Westminster, S.W. 1.



Group ~~Churches~~ re group.  
FROM THE BISHOP OF CHICHESTER.

WAR-TIME ADDRESS:  
ST. MARTIN'S VICARAGE  
(22 FRANKLIN ROAD),  
BRIGHTON.  
TEL.: BRIGHTON 1982.

THE BISHOP'S LODGING,  
22 THE DROVEWAY,  
HOVE, SUSSEX

prefs declar on Pope.  
to sign + can be counted as ready  
to act in group.

X no good

30th January 1941

(ans to my draft  
proposing group)

Dear Lord Noel Buxton,

Agree verbally  
mine  
proposing  
a group

I am much interested in your letter, and in the draft enclosed. Obviously, what you say is much to the point in calling attention to the missed opportunities of 1916 and 1917, and Lord Grey's reflection. That last is a most powerful warning.

(goes off  
to urging  
declar  
on Pope)

It so happens that I had lunch on Tuesday with R.R. Stokes who tells me that he is in touch with you and with other Peers and M.P.'s. He is exceedingly anxious to see whether ways can be devised for getting the Government to declare their attitude on the Pope's Five Peace Points, pointing out that we should be in a very strong position in relation to the millions of Catholics in Germany and Italy if our Government, the Government of a Protestant country, could say "We are ready to make peace on the basis of the Pope's Peace Terms. What more can you want? Will Hitler and Mussolini prevent a peace on the lines which the Pope himself has proclaimed?"

I have urged Stokes to see the Cardinal with a view to a possible approach by him to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and a joint approach to the Government. I have also written to the Archbishop, in general terms, to tell him what Stokes has said, to see if I can get contact between him and Stokes and Co.

to have  
written  
1. Lanchester  
1st.

I tell you this because it has a bearing on your draft. I wonder whether you might not perhaps, after having a word with Stokes, introduce into your draft a reference to the Pope's Five Peace Points and circulate that to whichever people, in either House, you think most likely to be responsive. Of course, if you have fairly clear evidence



FROM THE BISHOP OF CHESTER.

WAR-TIME ADDRESS:

ST. MARTIN'S VICARAGE  
(22 TRAFALGAR ROAD)  
BRIGHTON.

TEL. BRIGHTON 1284

THE BISHOP'S LODGING,

22 THE DROVEWAY,

HOVE, SUSSEX

30th January 1941

Dear Lord Noel Buxton,

that Hitler may be driven to propose terms, that is a  
strong basis on which to circulate friendly people.  
But the omens, so far as Hitler's attitude are  
concerned, and I rather fancy from a letter I have had  
from Ponsonby that he agrees with me, are not very  
favourable.

It so happens that I had lunch on Tuesday with  
R.R. Stokes who tells me that he is in touch with you and  
with other peers, and is exceedingly anxious to  
see whether any can be devised for getting the Government  
to declare their attitude on the Pope's Five Peace Points,  
pointing out that we are in a very strong position in  
relation to the millions of Catholics in Germany and Italy,  
if our Government, the Government of a Protestant country,  
could say "We are ready to make peace on the basis of the  
Pope's Peace Terms. What more can you want? Will Hitler  
and Mussolini prevent a peace on the lines which the Pope  
himself has proclaimed?"

*George Liddell*

I have urged Stokes to see the Cardinal with a  
view to a possible approach by him to the Archbishop of  
Geneva, and a joint approach to the Government. I have  
also written to the Archbishop, in general terms, to tell  
him what Stokes has said, to see if I can get contact between  
him and Stokes and Co.

I tell you this because it has a bearing on your  
draft. I wonder whether you might not refer, after having  
a word with Stokes, introduce into your draft a reference to  
the Pope's Five Peace Points and circulate that to whichever  
people, in either House, you think most likely to be  
responsive. Of course, if you have fairly clear evidence

*Dear Lord Noel Buxton*

*Praston 2518*



FROM THE BISHOP OF CHICHESTER.

~~THE BISHOP'S LODGING.~~

~~22, THE DROVEWAY.~~

~~HOVE, SUSSEX.~~

The Palace,  
Chichester.

16 August 1941

My dear Lord Noel Buxton,

I was very glad to have your letter of August 5, and the most interesting confidential memorandum. I don't know who quoted my "strong opinion" against any possible discussion of terms with Hitler. I have expressed my grave doubts, from the point of view of practical politics, as to it being possible to contemplate our Government negotiating with Hitler. I have also, no doubt, said that I should find it extremely difficult to contemplate Hitler as a person with whom negotiations could be conducted, because of his record. But, though I should judge such a possibility of negotiation extremely doubtful, I should not go so far as to say that no negotiations about peace could take place with Hitler, at any time, in any circumstances.

What you say has a great deal of force in it. But I believe that our wisest course is to press as strongly as we can the kind of peace aims which Roosevelt and Churchill have now, at last, issued; and to show that we mean business in putting them forward. If such peace aims were really to be carried through, it would surely mean that Hitler's victims outside Germany would be set free, and that the Hitler regime in Germany would be ended. For these terms pre-suppose the final destruction of Nazi tyranny, and that applies in and out of Germany. At the same time, we would have, in fairness, to admit in accordance with Point 3 of the Declaration, that, if Germany really freely chose (which is surely impossible!) Hitler, it could do so.

Yours very sincerely,

*George Herbert*

PRESTON 251B.



Thicketer

CHICHESTER 2161

THE PALACE,  
CHICHESTER.

g gort

24th March, 1943.

Dear Lord Noel-Buxton,

I was very glad that you wrote as you did to the Times, and I am in agreement with you. I have not written on the question of alternative Government. I think this is a very difficult question. But I am assured by those who know Germany and the opposition forces within it, that there are outsanding men who would be able to take charge of things once the opportunity arose. These men are to be found are to be found in the old Trade Union movement, in the highest branches of the Civil Service, and in certain anti-Nazi circles connected with the Army, but not militarists.

Yours very sincerely,

George Lister:

Schutz "German Home Front" (Gollanz)  
10/6

put out in my good...



2 Gs. Bell  
a.  
CHICHESTER 2161

THE PALACE,  
CHICHESTER.

22nd January, 1943.

Dear Lord Noel-Buxton,

Cranborne has asked me to postpone my question from January 27th till after the Tenth Anniversary of the Hitler regime (January 30th). The Foreign Office thought that Hitler would have a very difficult speech to make, if he does speak on this occasion, and did not want to let him ride off on some violent remark that might have been made in the House of Lords Debate. But I trust that your readiness to speak will stand for February 10th.

Yours sincerely,

George Cleeve

The Archbishop of Canterbury, Addison.

Leitch, & Perth have de promised to speak, in addition to Greyson.

1. Sen Hankey, and Paul are sympathetic - but he was not certain about speaking.



a

CHICHESTER 2161

Bb of C.  
May 7

THE PALACE,  
CHICHESTER.

7th May, 1943.

Dear Lord Noel Buxton,

I am much interested in your letter and proposal. There are two points about which I should just like to ask you: first, I wonder whether it is necessary to mention Communism? It is so easy to get into a misunderstanding here. What about substituting "anarchy". Then the other point is, do you make it sufficiently clear that the military incapacitation of Hitler and Nazi Germany is recognised as indispensable?

Have you shown the draft to Lord Cecil, I wonder? What other Peers had you in mind to approach?

Yours sincerely,

George Curzon

Cecil



THE PALACE,  
 CHICHESTER.

24th May, 1943.

Dear Lord Noel Buxton,

Many thanks for your letter of the 14th May. Forgive my delay in replying. I think your revision is a great improvement. I have only one further suggestion to make in the text, bearing in mind the critical eyes with which it will be scanned. I suggest the insertion of the word "democratic" before "anti-Nazi Government" at the end of the second paragraph; and the insertion of the same word, "democratic" before "anti-Hitler Government" in the revised paragraph at the end of the first page.

I still should rather like to know what Cecil thought about it before the others are approached. His association with such a letter would be of great importance. And ought we not to try to get Davies? Some of those who are in your list are, I suppose, persons who were not anti-Nazi or anti-German before the war. I have never been anti-German myself, but I have always been anti-Nazi; and one has got to be a little careful, I think. But I say this for your own private eye (and perhaps Cecil's) alone. I do not really know most of the other members of the party personally, except Astor, Buccleugh, Holden and Sempill.

Yours sincerely,

George Acheson

T.  
 gy names



CHICHESTER 2161

THE PALACE,  
CHICHESTER.

29th May, 1943.

Dear Lord Noel-Buxton,

Many thanks for your letter. I should go ahead with the list that you proposed. I was only anxious to draw as wide a field as we could.

Yours sincerely,

*George Llewellyn*



Bp of C  
CHICHESTER 2161

THE PALACE,  
CHICHESTER.

Asking Bishop?

17th June, 1943.

Dear Lord Noel-Buxton,

Many thanks for your letter of the 14th June enclosing the replies, which are rather disappointing. I am afraid that our first effort in getting signatures in the quarters which were deemed to be most sympathetic is a bad omen for further efforts. I am really very much inclined to wonder whether it is worth while going further with the matter.

I should be very glad of a talk if we could arrange it. But though I am up for the Church Assembly next week, I don't really know when it will be possible to come to the House of Lords, as there is an immense amount to be got through. If I do see a chance, I will let you know.

Yours <sup>very</sup> sincerely,

George Heath

Je  
Wait

i.e.  
will  
meet  
when poss



Chichester  
CHICHESTER 2161

THE PALACE,  
CHICHESTER.

14th July, 1943.

Dear Lord Noel Buxton,

Many thanks for your letter. I am glad you feel that in the circumstances it is better not to proceed further at present with the proposed letter. I think it is possible that a more favourable situation may arise when there are signs of a German collapse.

I have had some talk with the Bishop of Lichfield on these and similar matters. But I did not feel that an episcopal appeal to the Prime Minister would cut much ice. So till you were able to report about the temporal Peers' willingness to sign such a letter, I have not taken steps with regard to the Bishops.

I had a talk with Captain Liddell Hart last week. He tells me that he has had some correspondence with you, but not a great deal of contact otherwise. I told him in confidence about our letter to the P.M. but he thought that the P.M. was very stiff, and was not likely to be affected for the better by a letter thus signed.

When I am next at the Club I shall hope to get hold of the Contemporary and study your article. I did write an article myself for the International Round Table Conference of Christian leaders which has just been meeting at Princeton, U.S.A. Unfortunately I have no spare copy. I sent it off by air some little time ago, and I know that it reached its destination, for I was rung up on Saturday by the Sunday Express to know whether what I was reported to have said in it was true. They had something about it last Sunday. In it I tried to distinguish between three alternative policies towards a defeated Germany, (1) the policy of appeasement, which I dismissed, (2) the policy of repression, which I also dismissed, and (3) the policy of discrimination, for which I gave various arguments. I drew out what seemed to me the implications of the third policy, both with regard to the military situation after the armistice and permanently, as well as with regard to the economic and political. But I am waiting to hear repercussions



THE PALACE  
CHICHESTER

- 2 -

from the U.S.A., and I think it likely that I shall some  
time publish it.

You are quite right in saying that when I  
first put down my motion I asked the Government whether  
it agreed with Stalin's distinction between Hitler's army  
and all organised military force in Germany, and Stalin's  
statement that while it was necessary to destroy the former,  
it was not desirable to destroy the latter.

With regard to the last part of your letter,  
which you have written in your own hand, I am afraid I do  
not think it would be a good plan for the letter to go to  
the P.M. signed just by our two selves.

Yours <sup>47</sup> sincerely,

*George Lister*



CHICHESTER 2161

THE PALACE,  
CHICHESTER.

X He only ed Rum.  
He is believed!

11th April, 1944.

Dear Lord Noel Buxton,

I was very sorry about the Government's action on the Atlantic Charter debate. But I do hope that Roosevelt did not like Churchill's statement of February 22nd, and that discussion with the Allies has been hastened.

No

As to a debate on the crucial point of annexation soon. Did not Churchill give an intimation that there would be shortly a debate on the international situation in the House of Commons, quite apart from the Atlantic Charter as such? I should be very much in favour of a debate on the international situation in general, in the course of which the crucial point of annexation could be raised. But I wonder how you could get a debate on the specific point of annexation just now; how would it be for you to put down a motion calling attention to ~~Stalin's~~ Molotov's proclamation, so warmly welcomed by Churchill, on the moment of entering Roumania? He made it about a week or ten days ago. Could you not call attention to that statement and ask whether His Majesty's Government was in agreement with it as a statement of policy generally, in connection with the impending entry of forces belonging to the United Nations into enemy countries? I think that by that means you could say anything you liked on the subject of annexation, and challenge the

91



THE PALACE  
CHICHESTER

Government specifically about annexation in your  
speech.

Yours very sincerely,

George Lister



J  
CHICHESTER 2161

Bell

THE PALACE,  
CHICHESTER.

30th September, 1944.

Dear Lord Noel Buxton,

Ever so many thanks for your letter. I also thought that Vansittart seemed to be losing ground, and I am very glad you thought that I had gained.

Cranborne, I think, was reading from a typed manuscript, and did not really deal with my speech at all. He came up to me afterwards and said that he had not meant to misrepresent me as saying that the German people were not responsible; but I told him that I really thought he had missed that point. I was so glad about what you said in the debate too.

Yours very sincerely,

George Vickers



CHICHESTER 2161

THE PALACE,  
CHICHESTER.

23rd November, 1945.

Dear Lord Noel Buxton,

Very many thanks for your letter, and for the copy of the letter from Sir Ben Smith. It is an unsatisfactory sort of letter. The question of distress in Central Europe is being raised by the Archbishop of Canterbury in the House of Lords on December 5th. I shall probably say something on that aspect of foreign affairs, as well as other aspects, in the debate on foreign affairs next week.

I wonder if you have read Voigt's article in the November Nineteenth century?

Yours very sincerely,

*George Lethbridge*