

VI

Appeasement as a nihilistic policy

Looking at the reference below one can read that there is an argument that Hitler was apparently upset that there had been no war with Czechoslovakia as he had wanted to test out the military capability of his forces and give them their 'baptism of fire'. Yet, Chamberlain's peace proposal which displayed a strong willingness to meet Hitler's demands in regards to the German populous in Sudetenland (which was merely a diplomatic pretext for war) diffused the possibility of a major conflict. Yet when the rest of Czechoslovakia was taken and nothing happened just as nothing happened when the Rhineland happened Hitler saw fit to invade Poland thinking nothing would happen again to thus give him a free hand to militarily look only eastwards without worrying having to fight a two front war.

Yet from the Allied point of view when it seemed that it was becoming ever clearer that due to Hitler's insatiable appetite for extra territory that war would become inevitable Czechoslovakia was sacrificed to gain extra time before there was no choice but to go to war with Nazi Germany.

Another point of interest is that it has even been mentioned that if a war with Czechoslovakia had occurred three German military leaders - two generals: Beck and Halder; one admiral: Canaris would attempt to arrest Hitler. I am not sure how feasible this would have actually been but one does also learn that Beck and Canaris were implicated in the July 20 1944 plot to assassinate Hitler and that Beck would've replaced Hitler if the assassination of him had been successful.

Why wasn't Czechoslovakia enough for Hitler? Did he think that the Allies would try to take it back once they got stronger? QUORA.

<https://www.quora.com/Why-wasnt-Czechoslovakia-enough-for-Hitler-Did-he-think-that-the-Allies-would-try-to-take-it-back-once-they-got-stronger>

As an aside, I suppose one could argue a similar case in 2022 that the West should have thoroughly faced up to Putin's Russia over the illegal occupation of Crimea in 2014 which may have diplomatically signalled to Putin that in his ultranationalist quest to renew the Russian Empire the fully unprovoked February 28, 2022 imperial invasion of Ukraine would not at all be tolerated as well as resisted in every way - to at least put sufficient doubt in his mind that along with sanctions etcetera there clearly may also be a measured, non-nuclear military response to directly aid Ukrainians to remove invading Russian troops from Ukraine. *

**Furthermore, one admits to using the term 'unprovoked' deliberately as those apologist commentators for Russian imperialism - especially the many who reside comfortably in the 'far West' (i.e. not next to a country that borders Russia) would - 'armed' with literal and visual disinformation and their bourgeois ideological delusionism - strenuously claim otherwise to large global audiences not intimately familiar with the intricate historicity of the region; yet for knowing populations in small nations such as the Baltics who stoically daily reside beside such an overbearing authoritarian modern power and who only recently had militarily occupied their lands for many decades would simply perceive such apologia as 'ideological hallucination'. It is wildly extraordinary that vocal critics of the U.S.'s Monroe Doctrine do not unequivocally criticize other 'largesse nations' with equivalent exceptional imperial outlooks towards smaller nations (especially in what it is territorially determined to be a so called 'sphere of influence').*

