

ADDITIONS, INTEGRATIONS, CORRECTIONS AND SUPPLEMENTS  
TO THE BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ARNOLD JOSEPH TOYNBEE\*

by Teodoro Tagliaferri (University of Naples Federico II)

No. 176  
(January 15<sup>th</sup>, 2023)

Additions to Part I, Works by Arnold J. Toynbee

1936

*Unsatisfied Nations. Professor Toynbee on Peaceful Revision*, in «The Times», February 29<sup>th</sup>, 1936, p. 11. Signed «From our own Correspondent, Berlin, February 28».

PEACEFUL REVISION

---

\* *A Bibliography of Arnold J. Toynbee*, compiled by S. Fiona Morton, with a Foreword by Veronica M. Toynbee, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1980.

By Arnold J. Toynbee,

Professor Arnold Toynbee, Director of Studies in the Royal Institute of International Affairs, gave an address on "Peaceful Revision" to the Academy of German Law in Berlin to-day.

He said the question was whether the relations between States were to be governed by law or by might and violence, as hitherto had been almost exclusively the case. He distinguished between the repressive side of law, which sought to prevent violent alterations of the *status quo*, and the constructive side, which envisaged peaceful alteration of the existing condition of things. Those Powers which were wealthy and satisfied with their present position concerned themselves more with the repressive side of law, that was, with collective security; the poorer and unsatisfied Powers with peaceful revision.

Great Britain and the other satisfied countries – for example, France, the United States, Canada, and Russia – must attempt to meet the demands of the unsatisfied countries – Italy, Japan, Hungary, and Bulgaria – by the method of peaceful revision. Unless the law provided for change by orderly, peaceable means, the law would sooner or later be set aside by alterations of a violent, revolutionary character, which, in view of modern technical developments, would be the destruction of civilization.

Professor Toynbee referred to German demands for the "liberation" of the districts outside the Reich in which there were populations whose language and political character were German. He thought that some kind of territorial revision in this apparently important and difficult field must be sought.

On the colonial question, he said there were only dim, limited, and diminishing possibilities of white settlement in Africa and the German requirements in tropical raw materials far exceeded the productive capacity of her former colonies. But there was more than that in the colonial question. He could easily understand why the return of her colonies was a question of honour with Germany. The majority of English people understood that standpoint and sympathized with it, but the question of the return of the German colonies also raised a question of honour for Great Britain. The British felt that it would not be honourable to transfer native peoples to another sovereignty without regard for their

wellbeing, as if they were not human beings but goods. The British did not say: «We know the Germans would treat the natives worse than we do». What they said was: «Before we transfer a native anywhere from British rule to that of another Power, honour demands that we ascertain in advance that the natives will suffer no injury from the change of sovereignty». He felt that it was possible to harmonize the German and English standpoints on the question of honour.