## Should the UK have stayed neutral during WW2?

10 June 2024 On Monday 10 June 2024 <u>@PoliticsUK</u> posted:

"Reform UK's spokesperson has told the BBC that it is "probably true' that the UK should've stayed neutral during WW2" with the following screenshot:

A Reform UK spokesman said: "Through offence archaeology the BBC has found that Mr Gribbin has made a series of comments about a number of subjects.

"They were written with an eye to inconvenient perspectives and truths. That doesn't make them endorsements, just arguing points in long distance debates.

"His historical perspective of what the UK could have done in the 30s was shared by the vast majority of the British establishment including the BBC of its day, and is probably true.

"Again no endorsement, just pointing out conveniently forgotten truths.

Raising the several questions, this article attempts to clarify the situation at the time in the 1930's with particular regard to Hitler's true war intentions.

### Before we get into the discussion, we thought you'd enjoy this:-

Maybe we should have let the Nazis win?

- [@DominicFrisby] pic.twitter.com/2O4zaMsGSa
- Comedy Unleashed (@UnleashedComedy) June 12, 2024

Did Hitler make an offer of "neutrality"? If so,

#### ere there any conditions applied?

During World War II, Adolf Hitler did not make a broad offer of neutrality to any country in the conventional sense of proposing a peace settlement or a broad-based neutral stance that would involve halting German expansion or aggression. However, there were specific instances and contexts where Hitler made strategic diplomatic overtures that could be interpreted as seeking a form of neutrality or non-aggression, often with conditions attached. Here are some notable examples:

- 1. **Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact (1939):** This was a non-aggression pact between Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union. The pact ensured that the two countries would not attack each other and included secret protocols dividing Eastern Europe into spheres of influence. This agreement effectively ensured Soviet neutrality during Germany's initial invasions of Poland and Western Europe.
- 2. **Proposals to Britain (1940):** After the fall of France, Hitler made several peace overtures to Britain. In a speech on July 19, 1940, he proposed ending the war with Britain, suggesting that Germany had no territorial ambitions in Western Europe. However, these offers were not taken seriously by the British government, especially under Prime Minister Winston Churchill, who was committed to continuing the fight against Nazi aggression.
- 3. **Relations with Neutral Countries:** Throughout the war, Nazi Germany sought to maintain favorable relations with officially neutral countries like Spain, Sweden, and Switzerland. These countries were allowed to remain neutral under various conditions, such as providing economic support to the Axis powers or ensuring that their territories were not used by the Allies.
- 4. Winter War (1939-1940): During the Winter War between Finland and the Soviet Union, Germany maintained a form of neutrality while indirectly supporting Finland by allowing arms shipments through Sweden. However, after the war, Germany invaded Denmark and Norway in April 1940 to secure strategic positions, showing that its "neutrality" was always subject to strategic interests.
- 5. **Vichy France:** After France's defeat, Hitler allowed the establishment of the Vichy regime, which was officially neutral but collaborated with Germany in various ways. This arrangement was designed to stabilize the

Western front and ensure that French colonies did not become bases for Allied operations.

In summary, while Hitler made certain strategic overtures that could be seen as seeking neutrality or non-aggression, these were always conditional and aimed at furthering Nazi Germany's strategic goals. There was never a comprehensive, unconditional offer of neutrality from Hitler that involved ending the war or halting German expansion.

### Were Hitler's suggestions that Germany had no territorial ambitions in Western Europe genuine?

This seems a rhetorical question since they invaded Western Europe in the first place.

Hitler's claims that Nazi Germany had no territorial ambitions in Western Europe should be viewed with skepticism and understood within the broader context of his strategic goals and diplomatic tactics.

- 1. **Initial Expansion and Strategic Aims:** Hitler's initial military campaigns, including the invasions of Poland, Denmark, Norway, the Netherlands, Belgium, and France, were driven by a combination of strategic, economic, and ideological motivations. These invasions were part of a broader plan to secure Germany's borders, obtain vital resources, and create a platform for further expansion.
- 2. **Peace Overtures to Britain:** After the rapid fall of France in 1940, Hitler made several overtures to Britain suggesting that Germany had no further territorial ambitions in Western Europe and proposing peace. However, these offers were strategic in nature. Hitler aimed to neutralize Britain as a military threat, thereby freeing Germany to focus on its primary objective: the conquest of the Soviet Union. Hitler hoped to avoid a prolonged two-front war, which had been disastrous for Germany in World War I.
- 3. **Ideological Goals:** Despite his claims, Hitler's long-term ideological goals, as outlined in "Mein Kampf" and other Nazi documents, included the establishment of a German-dominated Europe. His vision entailed not

only the annexation of territories but also the subjugation of various peoples to create a new order based on racial hierarchy. This ambition was not limited to Eastern Europe but was a comprehensive plan for European domination.

- 4. **Tactical Diplomacy:** Hitler's claims of having no further territorial ambitions in Western Europe can be seen as tactical diplomacy designed to mislead and pacify potential adversaries. By projecting a stance of limited ambitions, Hitler sought to reduce resistance, gain time, and consolidate his gains. This tactic was part of a broader pattern of deceit and manipulation that characterized Nazi diplomatic efforts.
- 5. **Subsequent Actions:** The subsequent actions of Nazi Germany further underscore the insincerity of Hitler's claims. After the Battle of Britain, Germany continued its aggressive policies in Europe, including the occupation of Greece and Yugoslavia and the continued military build-up for Operation Barbarossa, the invasion of the Soviet Union. Moreover, plans like the "Generalplan Ost" revealed the extensive and brutal nature of Nazi territorial ambitions.

In conclusion, Hitler's suggestions that Germany had no territorial ambitions in Western Europe were not genuine. They were part of a strategic maneuver aimed at securing temporary advantages and misleading potential opponents. The overall evidence from Nazi policies, ideology, and subsequent actions clearly indicates a broader and more aggressive ambition for European domination.

# Had Britain accepted Hitler's offer of neutrality in light of his real ambitions, what would this have meant for Britain?

Had Britain accepted Hitler's offer of neutrality in 1940, the implications for Britain and the broader course of World War II could have been profound and multifaceted:

 Temporary Peace for Britain: Initially, accepting neutrality would have meant a cessation of hostilities between Britain and Germany. This could have spared Britain the devastation of the Blitz and other wartime hardships.

- 2. **Consolidation of Nazi Control in Europe:** With Britain out of the war, Hitler would have been free to consolidate and expand his control over occupied Europe without the threat of British interference. This would have allowed Germany to focus resources and military efforts on the Eastern Front against the Soviet Union.
- 3. **Isolation of the Soviet Union:** A neutral Britain would have left the Soviet Union more isolated in its struggle against Nazi Germany. Without the pressure of a Western Front, Germany could have committed even more resources to Operation Barbarossa, potentially altering the dynamics of the Eastern Front.
- 4. **Impact on British Empire:** Britain's global influence and colonial possessions might have come under threat. Without active participation in the war, Britain's ability to defend its far-flung empire would have been weakened. Axis powers or nationalist movements within the colonies might have taken advantage of this vulnerability.
- 5. **Economic and Political Consequences:** Britain's economy, heavily geared towards the war effort, would have faced significant adjustments. Politically, the decision to accept neutrality could have led to internal strife and a potential crisis of leadership, especially given Winston Churchill's staunch opposition to any form of compromise with Nazi Germany.
- 6. **Altered U.S. Involvement:** American support for Britain, which was crucial in the form of Lend-Lease and later full military involvement, might have been less decisive or delayed if Britain had accepted neutrality. The dynamics of U.S. entry into the war and its strategic priorities could have shifted significantly.
- 7. **Moral and Ideological Ramifications:** Accepting neutrality would have meant tacit acceptance of Nazi aggression and occupation policies, which could have severely damaged Britain's moral standing. The horrors of the Holocaust and other Nazi atrocities might have continued unimpeded and unchallenged for a longer period.
- 8. **Long-term Security Risks:** In the long run, a Europe dominated by Nazi Germany would pose a continuous threat to British security and interests. A triumphant Nazi regime could eventually turn its attention back to Britain, seeking to impose terms more favorable to German dominance.

Overall, while short-term peace might have seemed attractive, the long-term consequences for Britain accepting neutrality would likely have been detrimental, compromising Britain's security, global standing, and moral integrity. The decision to continue fighting, despite the hardships, ultimately contributed to the eventual defeat of Nazi Germany and the preservation of democratic values.