

9MAY1940

OF POLITICAL AND
ECONOMIC SCIENCE

S108

HEADWAY

IN WAR-TIME

The Journal of the League of Nations Union

No. 8

MAY 1940

PRICE 3d.

EDITORIAL

THE DOUBLE CHALLENGE

THESE are discouraging days for supporters of the League idea. To the long disheartening rearguard action in defence of the receding ideal of collective security and the peaceful attainment of international justice there has succeeded, first, the catastrophe of war—the very catastrophe against which the League was framed—and then the extension of that war by brutal disregard of international law and of the rights of neutrals, and by the further disregard, by belligerents and neutrals both, of the provisions of the Covenant. Chaos is come again with the momentarily triumphant challenge of uncurbed national force. Needless to say, the ideas embodied in this challenge must be resisted and the force which expresses it put down by force. That struggle passed wholly out of our hands last autumn; it is in those of the armed forces of the Allies. Whether by conviction—as we hope—or by mere coincidence—as some fear or believe—the Allies are fighting for the League idea of a law between nations overriding individual national ambitions. At the very least, they are fighting against a system whose central tenet is the utter negation of that law.

But this, the more obvious, is not the only challenge. It comes from enemies we have always known: from the allied powers of obscurantism and nationalistic aggression. There is another challenge to which another attitude is necessary, which comes from friends and fellow-workers in the cause of peace and social progress, which threatens to divide the forces of international co-operation from within, as militarism threatens to crush them from without; which decries the League idea not in the name of an obsolete nationalism, but in that of an internationalism more radically and ambitiously conceived; the challenge of Federal Union. To this challenge our response must be entirely different.

Barren Responses

There is danger in the impact of this new gospel—for it is hardly less—on the minds of League supporters. On the one hand, it may be greeted with an uncritical and unreasoning optimism, which is nothing more than the counterpart of the uncritical and unreasoning dejection generated by the League's setbacks. Man must have hope; one hope has been eclipsed; here is another. Away with the old idea, away with the difficulties and controversies surrounding it, away, too, with any difficulties and controversies arising in connection with its successor. This is not a rational

mental process at all; it is the irrational search for a psychological funk-hole in time of trouble. There are plenty of analogous processes outside the field of international affairs; and Nazism itself may partly be regarded as the expression of one of them.

Another danger is precisely opposite. Because the new federalism underrates and rejects the League, League supporters may underrate and reject the federal idea, tit for tat. Any fresh project is a disturbance to intellectual vested interests and arouses corresponding defence mechanisms. But such retaliatory processes get nowhere; certainly no nearer to peace and justice. All they do is to raise up a false opposition; to divide a power for good which can ill afford division; and to put at loggerheads in theory two ideas which are potentially complementary in practice.

The League Remains Essential

For the League would be necessary—as necessary as ever—in the most optimistically imagined event of federalism. It would not be superseded by a federation of all Europe, nor by a federation of Atlantic democracies; let alone by the less Utopian regional union which it is not impossible to envisage as emerging from war-time co-operation between Great Britain and France. There must be law, there must be co-ordination, there must be the machinery of peaceful settlement and change, between the best of federal units and the rest of the world, as there must be now between the rest of the world and existing federations.

Federation is not a magic word, an Open Sesame to the New Jerusalem; it is a well-known constitutional device which, when accepted, has been found to work reasonably well in circumstances where other constitutional devices were unsatisfactory. As applied to the nations of Europe, or to the Atlantic Democracies, it carries the possibilities of enormous advantage, the certainty of very considerable and as yet inadequately explored difficulties, and a considerable unlikelihood of acceptance within this generation. On a smaller scale, its prospects are more promising, but its potentialities are correspondingly limited. It is, above all, a field for close and dispassionate study. In successive issues of HEADWAY we hope to examine various aspects of the relationship between the federal and the League approach to certain world problems, and also to discuss the place within the League of certain widely canvassed federations, such as the Anglo-French.

IMMEDIATE BACKGROUND OF SCANDINAVIAN POLICIES

By BJARNE BRAATØY

THE main lesson of the spread of war to Northern Europe so far is that no amount of agreement of any kind could overcome or wipe out the essential strategic features of the theatre of war.

If Article 16 of the League Covenant had been a workable instrument, which the Abyssinian war finally proved that it was not, Finland would nevertheless have been at the other end of weak and difficult lines of communication with the western world. The invasion which overwhelmed that small nation but large country on November 30 of last year would still have been expected by its authors to overcome resistance before any appreciable support could have reached Finland from the outside.

No Adequate Defences

Sweden would have had to consider her own defences if a military alliance, or the operations of an effective Article 16, had automatically placed Sweden in a state of war with the aggressor, Soviet Russia. No amount of military preparations by a nation of a little over six millions could have made the defences of a country twice the size of the United Kingdom adequate for action at home as well as abroad, in this case in Finland. Sweden at war would not have been able to deplete her own arsenals, to send without stint arms and munitions, to release mechanics not only to mount but to work the anti-aircraft guns which Finland got from Sweden, or to deplete her own stocks of medical supplies. Similar considerations apply with even greater force to Norway, whose provision of humanitarian and material aid for Finland went so far that, e.g., Bergen after the Finnish war was ended had no stocks of bandages and certain other vital medical supplies.

The situation was complicated still further by the diplomatic strategy of the aggressor. The pact between Moscow and Berlin on August 24 of last year was followed by action in the Baltic States which clearly showed that the Third Reich had by that pact surrendered its political interests in those countries to the Soviet Union, which secured strategic vantage points against Sweden all along the Baltic. The invitation from Moscow to Helsinki to discuss "certain political and economic questions" coincided in date with a Reichstag speech by Hitler, in which Finland was clearly abandoned in the "Nordic" policies of the Reich. In consequence not only Finland but also Sweden and the other Northern nations knew that they would be aiding Finland not only at the risk of war with the Soviet Union but of war with Nazi Germany, a consideration which naturally reinforces still further the above point of view. It was confirmed by a campaign against Scandinavian help for Finland, in the Nazi as well as in the Soviet Press.

Dangerous Possibilities

The Finnish war therefore confronted every one of the Northern Nations, including Finland herself, with the possibility of war with two great military powers at once.

The geographical position made any offer of help from other Great Powers of secondary interest, once war had in fact broken out. Finland was not in the possession of any guarantee from any Power. No Power in the world was bound by Article 16 any longer, if any Power had ever been. And a military alliance would, in the circumstances, have been qualified by the historical situation.

The Western Democracies had for three months been at war with Hitler Germany. A British or French Expeditionary force on Finnish soil would have occupied an advance position against Germany as well as acting in support of the Finnish resistance to the Soviet forces. An appeal from Finland to the Western Democracies would in consequence have been equivalent to a declaration of war on Germany. No such appeal was ever made.

Certainty of War

The expeditionary force would have had to pass through Norway and Sweden. Both of them would therefore also have been faced with the certainty of war with two great military Powers at one and the same time. This was as clear to the Finns as it was to the Norwegians and the Swedes.

At no time was this implication recognised authoritatively by either of the Western Democracies. At no time were the Northern Nations assured that the Western Democracies were considering operations in Northern Europe in that light. It is true that massive forces were being assembled in the Eastern Mediterranean. But the Alliance with Turkey does not include the risk of war with the Soviet Union. The Allied concentration of forces was sufficiently accounted for by the possible plans in South-Eastern Europe of Hitler Germany, with whom the Western Democracies were already at war, and against whom the Alliance with Turkey is eventually directed.

The Lesson of Events

The invasion of Norway by Hitler Germany on April 9 has turned the further consideration of these problems into a fully practical instead of a partly theoretical matter. The time lag between the act of invasion and the actual landing of an allied expeditionary force on Norwegian soil, the astounding scope of apparently unhampered German naval operations on the Norwegian coast, the devastation which the Germans have already accomplished on Norwegian soil, all this shows that the despatch of forces to Finland was a much more complicated and hazardous matter than was ever recognised in the discussions carried on in the British and French Press.

Events have, on the other hand, shown that the policy of the Northern Nations was not determined by any weakness in spirit. The Norwegians have proved stubborn as the Swedes will prove to be if put to the test. But their policy was determined by a hardheaded and cool calculation of all the elements in the situation with which they were confronted. While making the best of a bad situation they were preparing for the worst.

A TONIC FOR PESSIMISTS

By HUGH LYON (*Head Master of Rugby School*)

IF anyone is unduly perturbed about the effect of the war on the younger generation, it would have done him a world of good to look in at the conference for senior boys and girls which was held from April 8 to 11 at Badminton School, Westbury-on-Trym, Bristol. That such a conference was possible at all was due largely to the devotion of Miss Baker, the headmistress. Her services to the cause of the League of Nations Union are already widely known; but even she has never done more for the cause than she did in arranging and presiding at this conference, which was the first organised by the new Council for Education in World Citizenship, the title under which a more representative and more independent Education Committee of the L.N.U. is now to be known.

The conference was attended by some 200 girls and boys from the senior forms of secondary schools all over the country. Not only was this a larger number than anyone had anticipated, but everyone concerned agreed that the standard, both of interest and knowledge, shown in the discussion groups and in the questions asked at lectures was higher than ever before. I am sometimes asked what the eighteen-year-olds are thinking and saying about the war. It is, of course, not possible to generalise; but my impression is that they are intensely interested, fully alive to the issues involved, and far more concerned about moral and political problems than they are about their individual chances of survival. This impression was reinforced by all I heard and saw at Badminton.

In the first place the Council had been successful in securing a splendid team of lecturers. The tone of the conference was from the first set high by an opening address from the Bishop of Bristol on the Monday evening. This was followed next morning by one of Professor Gilbert Murray's admirable presentations of the fundamental issues at stake. After an interesting talk by Mr. A. S. May on "Science and Politics," the political and moral situation was examined in a very clear discussion of "The Causes of the War," by Mr. A. C. F. Beales. Professor Roxby, in

his turn, reminded us, in his talk on China and Japan, that a world settlement must look further than Europe. On the last night a certain liveliness was introduced by a discussion between Mr. Arnold-Forster and Mr. W. B. Curry on the merits of Federal Union as compared with an attempt to revitalise the League. The points of agreement between the speakers were, however (on their own showing), far more fundamental than those of difference; and Mr. Arnold-Forster swept the whole question out of the sphere of controversy into one of deep emotion by his last passionate appeal to us to dedicate ourselves to the cause of world peace and world federation.

But the life of a conference, though it is stimulated by addresses, runs most vigorously in the work of the discussion groups. And it was in this important respect that the conference was, in the opinion of competent judges, exceptionally fruitful. The seven groups held long and animated meetings at all available times; and there was in all that was said a refreshing combination of a realisation of the difficulties and a refusal to be daunted by them. It was suggested, not without diffidence, that some of the members of the school might care to wind up their group discussions after the final address on the Thursday morning. As a result each group leader was immediately besieged by those members who had not to hurry away by train, and the discussions went merrily on for the rest of the morning.

I believe that the spirit shown by these girls and boys is typical of that of the great majority of the educated youth of Great Britain to-day. It is valuable to have the reassurance such conferences can give to the faint-hearted; but it is still more valuable to the young people themselves to have the opportunities which the new Council for Education in World Citizenship can give them of hearing facts, theories, and ideals presented to them in an atmosphere of impartiality and fair-mindedness. A multiplication of such conferences would be all to the good, and might help as much as any other practical endeavour to steer us through the troubled waters which lie ahead.

THE OXFORD CONFERENCE

By NOWELL C. SMITH (*Chairman of the Management Committee*)

THE National Conference of Teachers and Educational Administrators, held at Oxford from April 11 to 15, was a very good send-off for the new Council for Education in World Citizenship, which, after long and careful preparation, has grown into a better defined autonomy out of the Education Committee of the L.N.U. The Council's Committee of Management were anxious to lose no time in renewing, consolidating, and extending the educational work, whose importance needs no underlining. The first business of the Council was to adopt its constitution and plan such immediate activities—camp, summer schools, etc.—as war conditions allow. In this it was greatly encouraged by the success, recorded by Mr. Hugh Lyon above, of the conference of senior girls and boys, held a few days previously by that most courageous and clear-sighted of leaders, both inside the Council and outside, Miss Baker, headmistress of Badminton School. But the Committee had dared, not without some anxiety due to financial stringency, difficulties of travel, black-out, and rationing, to project a public inauguration of the Council, and also a conference of teachers and educational administrators and representatives of those numerous educational

authorities and associations of which the Council is itself composed. The success of the venture far exceeded the hopes of its promoters, and, incidentally, involved those most actively concerned in extraordinary efforts to cope, at the shortest notice, with problems of accommodation. They had banked on a minimum attendance of fifty, and secured accommodation for a possible hundred or so at Somerville College. In the event the meetings were attended by over three hundred. The meetings themselves, by the kind permission of the Warden, were held at Rhodes House—in itself an ideal place for a conference if it were not for the difficult acoustics of the Milner Hall. These seriously impaired the audibility of the addresses of Mr. H. G. Wells and Mr. Joad and of Dr. Gilbert Murray, whose inaugural address on "World Citizenship" was of the finest quality. It was disappointing that Lord Cecil was unable to come and speak with his unrivalled personal knowledge on "The League of Nations: What Next?" but ample compensation was given by Mr. Noel-Baker, who at the shortest notice made the most brilliant contribution to the whole conference, combining complete knowledge with perfect clarity

(Continued on page 7)

THE DEEPER ISSUE

By DR. GILBERT MURRAY

(This article consists of extracts from Dr. Murray's lecture for the London School of Economics in the series "Approaches to Peace." It is printed in this form in response to requests.)

A FEW years ago I was taking part in an international conference of writers and savants drawn from many different countries. Our subject was the future of literature, but it soon began to range over the future of civilisation in general; and the general outlook was of the gloomiest, at any rate among the Europeans. War, impoverishment, civil strife, persecution, the deadening of intellectual and artistic life, torture in prisons and concentration camps, the spectacle of human beings by the hundred thousand flying outcast from their countries, had made the same kind of impression upon every speaker, until we came to the Italian. He was a young fascist with a pugnacious chin; and he maintained that the outlook was most hopeful and encouraging. A completely new civilisation was being introduced by Italy and Germany over the rotting corpse of Liberalism and democracy; as for the troubles we complained about, foolish rebels had to be exterminated if Fascismo was to triumph. The soft bourgeois ideology had shown itself to be worthless.

Our Italian fascist was alone. Our German members had been withdrawn some years before; our one Russian Communist had, for some unknown reason, been liquidated. But I felt then the presence of that profound division which lies, deeper than any precise *casus belli* or statement of war aims, at the root of the war of France and Britain against Nazi Germany. We are fighting for something deeper than any mere national interest or any particular form of political constitution; deeper than any mere issue between "Left" and "Right," between democracy and aristocracy. I think M. Girandoux comes near the truth when he says we are fighting for our lives; that is, for everything that we care about; our country, our conscience and our freedom and—most important of all—for that great historical achievement in human progress that we call Western Civilisation.

Why We are Fighting

"Fighting then," an opponent will say, "merely for the existing social order? Fighting to preserve a *status quo*, and a very faulty one at that, against vigorous change?" Not in the least. The thing we are fighting to preserve is not our civilisation as it stands, but our civilisation with its hopes and ideals, its ethical scruples and its ever-advancing social conscience, because the enemy who seeks to destroy our material power is even more bitterly determined to destroy those.

Our formal ground of war was, of course, Germany's external aggression. A nation's home policy is its own affair, and not a just ground for foreign intervention. That is the accepted rule. Yet it is the home policy of a Government that raises the deepest issues, because in its home policy the Government is most free to do what it likes and thus show its true nature. We could not without dangerous folly make war on the Nazis because of their crimes at home. Yet surely it is these crimes at home—the concentration camps; the reign of terror; the robbery and torture of Jews, Liberals,

Socialists and Pacifists; the omnipresence of spies, informers and blackmailers; the systematic corruption of youth by Nazi education—that shows us best what things we are fighting against: massed forces of evil which would destroy not merely the British and French Empires, but all the hopes we have cherished of building up what Aristotle calls a good life for man.

Shocking the Moral Sense

If we do not allow ourselves to be swayed by our party sympathies and antipathies towards the Left or the Right, we can see that all the despotic countries—Russia, Germany, Spain, Italy and even Japan—shock our moral sense in much the same way. Certainly cruelties and crimes on a vaster scale and of deeper intensity than were known before 1914 have now become almost the commonplaces of international and civil strife; and always, I think, they are committed by the nations which have rejected our Western civilisation and its standards. We think them both wicked and benighted; they think of themselves as the pioneers of a grand new era of civilisation.

It is worth while considering the historical circumstances in which these systems are alike and to which they chiefly owe their prestige. They are all generated by war. They are all revolutionary, at least in origin; when once established, of course, they are intensely authoritarian. They are all usurpations based on the overthrow of a legitimate Government. They all claim to have led their nation—or at least their party—from weakness and defeat to confidence and victory, and have triumphed over all who stood in their way. They admit gladly that they have violated the law; their methods are not mere legal methods. They have broken with ordinary considerations of morality; morality is only an invention of the *bourgeois*, the mere citizen who fulfils his civic duties, the creature of timid custom, with no daring and no dreams.

War and the Dictator

War is the centre of the system and the key to its deviations. The glory of the conqueror is the Dictator's dream, to rank not with ordinary kings but with Julius Caesar, Alexander and Napoleon. Peace is dangerous to any usurper, the imminence of war makes them safe. They all pile up armaments to the very limit of their country's powers; the commander of ten million well-armed men cuts a great figure where bourgeois nations hesitate about affording a million. War is a clue to their methods. It has been pointed out by German critics that, whereas in normal countries, war-fever only arises at specially critical times, and is regarded as a dangerous and misleading state of mind, the Nazi method of Government is to keep war-fever always on the boil. Every speech of Hitler, whether meant for home consumption or foreign, is both in substance and manner a threat or exhortation of war. And the same is clearly true of Mussolini, with his repeated assertions that Italy was not only a military nation but a militarist nation.

More than this, I believe that both the permanent

hatred they have inspired and the temporary success they have undoubtedly achieved are due to their habitual use of the methods of war in the time of peace, when their opponents did not think of such things.

War the aim! War the method! And what does War mean? *Inter arma silent leges*. In war the Law cannot speak; not the law of the State, nor the law of conscience, nor of reason, nor of right and wrong. It is because the Fascist-Nazi-Bolshevik system means the bringing of the methods of war into the midst of peace, and paying homage to violence and fraud instead of right and truth, that it is and must be the eternal enemy of civilisation.

The Product of War

It is a defeat for civilisation that the enemy has forced us to war, to the method which to us is an abomination and to him the very centre of his dream. . . . I still believe that this war is a war to end war; I even believe that it may succeed. That is not to forget that war itself is an evil thing: that every day of war means a large sum of loss, suffering and danger. The whole of our present trouble is a war product. Hitler's success is a war product. Bolshevism and Fascism are both war products. Germany has been bedevilled by a long history of war after war, from the long torture of the Thirty Years War to the series of successful Prussian aggressions and the final defeat. There is the possibility, the real danger, that we may be bedevilled also, though I see little sign of it so far. I read dozens of proposals for a peace settlement, not one of them militarist or vindictive; all of them anxious for a friendly settlement with Germany on terms of co-operation and equality. The weakness of most of them is not vindictiveness but wishful thinking.

I will not deal now with the actual terms of a peace settlement. My own views on the subject can be seen in the published statement of the League of Nations Union. We can all see the main difficulty which any peace settlement has to face and if possible solve. The settlement must leave Germany lastingly disarmed or in some way made incapable of renewed aggression. At the same time, the settlement must not leave the 70 or 80 million German-speaking inhabitants of Central Europe in a position of permanent inferiority or exclusion. That is the problem, hard enough in itself, but likely to be doubly hard in the atmosphere of hatred and revenge left in Europe by the appalling cruelties of the Nazis; and trebly hard because we shall have waiting on our flank two great powers, Italy and Russia, both anxious to prevent the success of any peace settlement which would stabilise a democratic regime in Europe.

An Inner Circle

Roughly I think we must keep the League of Nations with lighter obligations as a universal, or universally open, organisation; with an inner circle inside of States with definite obligations and adequate military and economic powers, for keeping the peace in specific areas. I doubt greatly the possibility of establishing any voting system, whether based on population or nationality. The League system by which nations are definitely bound by certain specific covenants but otherwise free causes far less friction and has not proved hampering in practice. I greatly doubt the possibility of any Federation in the

full sense of the word, except where there is a greater degree of internal cohesion, as well as external pressure, than can be found in Europe. The existing Federations in Canada, Australia, the United States, with their common language, history, interests, law, methods of life and geographical continuity, afford no adequate precedents. The British Dominions have always refused to federate with the Mother Country for fear Britain should have power to interfere with their tariffs or native policy or immigration laws; it is hardly likely they would be willing to give that power to a mixed European congress. It is hardly likely that Britain or France would consent to give a controlling voice in their whole foreign policy to a body in which Germany and Italy might have the deciding power. Let us form the closest and most effective co-operation we can, not on policy in general where the national interests of different nations are different, and where the problems of one nation are often not at all understood by others; but on the specific points where the interests of all peoples are really the same: the avoidance of war, economic co-operation, the peaceful settlement of disputes, and—by far the most difficult—the organisation of collective defence against any aggressor. The accompanying necessity, provision of adequate means for the peaceful change of existing conditions where in the opinion of disinterested judges such change was clearly desirable, will not, I think, become easily effective until Europe is relieved of the constant threat of war. Then it can be attained.

Co-operation to this extent, if achieved, will rid us of war; and experience of the successes and failures of the League suffice to show us how it can be achieved. The continued co-operation between Britain and France, made closer and more intimate in the fields where it works well and gradually extended further, will probably form the nucleus of that inner circle and may, with good fortune, attract other nations into its orbit.

THE UNION'S HEAVY LOSS

In the past few weeks the League of Nations Union has lost by death five good friends who had given the League cause long and effective service.

The Right Hon. G. N. BARNES, who at one time served on the Executive Committee, was a Vice-President of the Union and President of its Industrial Advisory Committee. His name will always be associated with the creation of the International Labour Organisation after the last war. In fact, he was virtually the author of the British draft which was taken as the basis of discussion at the Peace Conference.

The Right Hon. H. A. L. FISHER, Warden of New College, Oxford, was also one of the Union's Vice-Presidents and a former member of the Executive.

Sir GILBERT BURLING, the eminent surgeon and late Pro-Chancellor of the University of Birmingham, was a Vice-President from very early days.

Major-General A. C. TEMPERLEY, one of the foremost of military experts, was a more recent member of the Union's Executive. Up to the time of his death he was always ready to give the Executive the benefit of his technical advice and experience.

As we go to press, we learn of the sudden death of Sir JOHN HARRIS, from early years one of the Executive's most active members.

BOOKS OF THE MONTH

A FEDERATION FOR WESTERN EUROPE. By W. Ivor Jennings. Cambridge University Press. 3s. 6d.

Dr. Jennings himself has described his purpose in this short and interesting book. "I have tried to produce a scheme," he says, "which could, I think, be achieved and which, when achieved, could be worked . . . a document prepared to form a basis for discussion . . . All I have attempted to do is to show that there are answers, and to suggest the lines along which they might be found." It would be improper and unfair to treat this scheme as though its central thesis must stand or fall by the acceptance of every detail. Dr. Jennings's is a valiant and useful effort to show that a scheme which might conceivably work in practice can be put forward in complete form. As such it is necessarily the work rather of a constitutional lawyer than of a political scientist.

We start from the assumption that Europe must federate or resign itself to a war every generation, and we deal with the next question: what kind of federation shall we have and what does federalism involve? It must be a union of democracies, Dr. Jennings believes, and his argument is convincing. A beaten and converted Germany is to be included. Apart from Germany, these democracies have not been at war with one another for more than a century. It is unlikely that they will be at war in the future. Thus, it may be argued that they are the more likely to see the advantages of union, and so to be willing to federate. But it must not be forgotten that in 1919 this same view of the essentially peaceful disposition of democracies dominated the Peace Conference; it was held then, and it may be held in the future, to justify the conclusion that for the establishment of a peaceful world democracy is enough—provided, of course, some common meeting place for discussion and co-operation is set up, and we have this already in the League of Nations. It is a disadvantage of the limitations which Dr. Jennings has set himself that this kind of preliminary problem is precluded. We may perhaps agree with that conclusion, but we are not entitled to assume that it is an inevitable one. Indeed, one of the most interesting problems of to-day lies in this field of the preliminary requirements for the building of an effective peace system.

Space does not allow anything like an adequate treatment here of the many interesting points he raises; this book should be read by everyone who is concerned with this urgent question of the day. We can only mention some, and naturally those we choose are ones that suggest further discussion. The geographic extent of the proposed federation is one of the most difficult, and like most of the others it cannot be solved now for a future in which the map may have considerably changed. Czechoslovakia Dr. Jennings regards as a marginal case, but surely it can claim to have been one of the most progressive democracies of modern Europe. Nor must it be forgotten in including Germany and excluding Italy, that the latter has an experience nearly fifty years longer of parliamentary government than has Germany.

We might wish that Dr. Jennings had devoted more attention to the problem of taxation as a federal function. It is quite possible that a control of customs would provide sufficient supplies, as it did for long in Switzerland, but it would be interesting to have the views of Dr. Jennings. The absence of a federal power to undertake public works is rather striking, for surely this is one of the strongest arguments for union. Of the British Commonwealth Dr. Jennings tells us that "unity depends on sentiment and not on commercial advantage." But he seems to regard the latter as a requirement of a European federation.

H. R. G. GREAVES.

A FEDERATION FOR WESTERN EUROPE

By W. IVOR JENNINGS

Author of Cabinet Government and Parliament.

A really concrete contribution to the problem of Federation. Dr Jennings, the well-known constitutional lawyer, discusses in detail a Draft Constitution for a Federation of Western Europe which he thinks will work; he invites his readers to consider it, criticise it, and, if necessary to improve upon it.

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS 3/6 NET

THE CONDITIONS OF ECONOMIC PROGRESS. Colin Clark. Macmillan. 25s.

Up to the outbreak of war, during war, after war and particularly on account of war, the protection and improvement of standards of living is a vital concern of national and international authorities. It has always been recognised, from the earliest days, as one of the most important functions of the League to co-ordinate, direct and assist this process; and the recent steps towards the establishment of a still wider *ad hoc* organisation in which non-League members should co-operate gives an extra appositeness to this most valuable book. Any serious and positive effort towards post-war reconstruction (and such an effort must be international in scope, outlook and personnel) will work blindfold if it lacks data; the sort of data which "Conditions of Economic Progress" provides.

With all the ingenuity and almost detective skill which his previous statistical researches have displayed, Mr. Clark has collated and reduced to a comparable basis the scattered data—from official publications, industrial and commercial bureaux and such, and the works of other historians and statisticians—regarding standards of living, the tempo of progress and the economic conditions associated with it. Some of his results are necessarily no more than rough indications of orders of magnitude; others, based on fuller material, may soberly be taken as correct to within a comparatively small margin of error. His book covers, besides the estimates of standards of living which are its most striking feature to the general reader, a variety of organically related topics; the relation between production and productive capacity (where he makes short work of the fallacy of "potential plenty"); the varied productivity of primary, secondary and "tertiary" (i.e., commercial, etc.) economic enterprise; the problem of mobility and maladjustment; the rôle of capital; economic inequality; the evidence for the Keynesian theory of investment and employment; and the relation between international trade and cyclical fluctuations. Some of this—though surprisingly little—demands too high a standard of economic or mathematical attainments for the general reader. Some is controversial, either in theoretical structure or in statistical procedure, and should accordingly be read with caution; but Mr. Clark generally makes clear the extent to which he agrees with or differs from other authorities, so that the reader is warned.

Conditions of Economic Progress is an important contribution to the equipment of world citizenship. But it is no disparagement of Mr. Clark's brilliant and sustained pioneer work to say that much of the ground ought to be gone over again, its doubtful points elucidated, its standards of comparison tested, and its gaps made good, by a re-

search organisation backed by all the authority and resources which the League could provide. H. M. C.

WHERE STANDS DEMOCRACY? Essays prepared for the Fabian Society by Harold Laski, R. H. S. Crossman, G. D. H. Cole, K. Zilliacus, Leonard Barnes, Hamilton Fyfe. Macmillan. 3s. 6d.

To the question "Where Stands Democracy?" the authors of the six essays comprised in this little book answer in various tones, but with virtual unanimity, "On very shaky ground." But none of them despair, and they are quite as much constructive as critical. Professor Laski contributes an essay, masterly in its combination of concrete solidity and clear presentation of principle, on Government in War-time, comparing the organisation of the Lloyd George and Chamberlain War Cabinets. He much prefers the latter—questions of personnel being left aside—because, in spite of several outstanding defects, for which he suggests remedies, it does not ignore Sir Henry Taylor's maxim that "he who has in his hands the execution of measures is in truth the very master of them." (One can find much evidence bearing out this generalisation in the record of the League.) Mr. Hamilton Fyfe entertainingly and sensibly discusses propaganda and repression, and leaves the reader with the impression of a sketch for the background of one of Mr. Hilaire Belloc's satirical novels. Mr. Leonard Barnes, under the title of "The Uprising of Indian and

Colonial Peoples," combines some shrewd analysis of given facts with a medley of bad economics, facile generalisations and wild imputations of bad faith, which is regrettably far below the standards of the rest of the book. Mr. R. H. S. Crossman provides a distinguished plea, which will arouse some rational and more irrational opposition, for clearer thinking about internationalism and its divorce from "anti-nationalism." "The same people," he says, "who shudder at the Union Jack grow ecstatic when they see the flags of China, Spain, Abyssinia, and, above all, of Soviet Russia. Having disowned their own country, they adopt another. . . . This is not world-mindedness: it is inverted Jingoism." Mr. G. D. H. Cole stimulatingly, but not altogether convincingly, analyses the contesting systems opposed to one another in the present war: in the foreground, the "relatively free and liberal," but "obsolete and uncreative," capitalism of Western Europe, and the purely militarist racialism of the Nazis; in the background totalitarian Communism and democratic Socialism. Mr. Zilliacus, examining the conditions for a durable peace, speaks out of nineteen years' experience of the League of Nations Secretariat, to put the blame for the League's failure to preserve peace by limiting sovereignty on the economic self-interest of "international Toryism and plutocracy—that is, the Right in politics." He illustrates his thesis fully and his constructive suggestions to ensure better results from the next Peace Conference deserve attention—in France as well as here.

H. M. C.

THE OXFORD CONFERENCE

(Continued from page 3)

and instantaneous readiness to deal with any question or challenge. The most exciting session was that devoted to a series of short addresses by nationals of France (M. Maheu), Poland (Count Balinski), Czechoslovakia (M. Jan Masaryk), pre-Hitler Germany (Dr. Olden), speakers for the Roman Catholic Church (Mr. Beales) and for Communism (Mr. Ivor Montagu), prefaced by an admirable introduction by Señor de Madariaga, and summed up, with a view to guiding principles for any real peace settlement, by Mr. Arnold-Forster. On the Sunday evening the Headmaster of Rugby gave an eloquent exhortation to view the ideal of international harmony from a definitely Christian standpoint. Two of the most valuable sessions were those devoted to "The Work of the Council," led by a clear exposition of its genesis by Miss Charlesworth, and to the summing-up of the conference by Mr. Henshall, Mr. Walmsley, and Miss Baker. The recent shuffle of the Cabinet robbed us of the promised presence of Lord de la Warr, who had already shown the friendliest interest in the Council. The new President of the Board was naturally unable to make time to come, and the Parliamentary Secretary, who deputised for him, was not very well aware of the character either of the conference or of the Council. We were fortunate in having the Senior Chief Inspector of the Board, Mr. Savage, present as a member of the conference and taking a leading part in a session on the effects of the war on the minds of children, for which Miss Dymond, principal of the Portsmouth Training College, had prepared a valuable report. For the last twenty years the co-operation of the Education Committee of the L.N.U. with the Board of Education has borne good fruit, as both bodies have testified; and it is to be hoped that school authorities of all sorts, from education committees to the heads of every kind of school, will support and make the fullest use of the new Council in guiding the very necessary education of our youth for their responsibilities in our torn but indivisible world.

YOUNG WALES CALLS THE WORLD

The Message of Goodwill from the Youth of Wales to the Youth of the World was first sent out in 1922. It will be broadcast again on "Goodwill Day," May 18, 1940, for the nineteenth successive year. Here is the text of the Nineteenth Annual Message:—

"This is Wales calling! The boys and girls of Wales are calling the boys and girls of all the world!

"We rejoice to think that, above the tumult, on this one day of the year, we can greet each other as members of one great family, the family of the nations of the future.

"The world is full of suffering, cruelty, and strife, and we are told that civilisation may perish. Let us tell the world that civilisation shall not perish.

"More than ever the world will need what we alone can give—the confidence and the comradeship of youth.

"May we, then, on this Goodwill Day, dedicate ourselves afresh to the service of our fellows in ever-widening circles, to the service of our home, of our neighbourhood, of our country, so that our country may better serve the world to which we all belong?

"So shall we, millions of us, grow up to be the friends of all and the enemies of none."

ONE OF OUR AIMS IS A
FREE CZECHOSLOVAKIA
THE CENTRAL EUROPEAN
OBSERVER is an Authoritative Fortnightly
Review of Czechoslovak and Central
European Affairs
YOU who read "HEADWAY" should read it

2d. per copy. 2/6 for 6 Months. 5/- for One Year post free.
From 27, GWENDOLEN AVENUE, S.W.15

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

HEADWAY READERS DISCUSS PLANS FOR PEACE

Elimination of War

Sir,—Colonel Mozley suggests that the Executive runs counter to British opinion and risks the influence of the Union in the country in stating that lasting peace would not be secured by weakening Germany in order to make her powerless.

I believe and hope he is mistaken, for if we really want to eliminate war as an instrument of national policy we have to learn not only to be magnanimous, but to treat other countries as we would ourselves wish to be dealt with. Any other policy is doomed to failure from the start and because of this I regret to see in the Council's statement the assumption that reparations would necessarily find a place in the peace settlement. After the experience of the last war I should have thought no one would have desired to see reparations again and would like to suggest that the war damage might be repaired by all nations co-operating in a constructive effort to which all would contribute both finance and labour. The more men experience brotherhood in working together for the common good, the less likely will they be to fight one another.

Colonel Mozley's comments on the possibilities of a permanent inspectorate to ensure disarmament are very encouraging, for it is obvious that to secure a permanent limitation of armaments some such system of inspection must be loyally accepted by all nations. One of the great tasks facing the Union is to secure a public opinion in this country which will ensure acceptance of this important principle by our Government. Otherwise the prospects for an enduring peace will be no better than after the last war.

It is vital also to recognise that such an inspectorate must work under conditions which will guarantee full publicity for any attempt at evasion; it must therefore have the freedom of radio and press in all countries as well as rapid access to a tribunal which would be immediately available to deal with all disputes arising from its operations.

The importance of free access to press and wireless is so great that any changes made in the Covenant after this war should include the addition of a clause ensuring adequate facilities for all League organisations to explain in every country, from a truly international standpoint, any matters becoming a concern of the League.

W. L. KENT.

Penketh, Warrington.

An International Force

Sir,—Many members of the L.N.U. will be disappointed that the statement adopted at the Anglo-French L.N.U. Conference recommended that the members of the organisation should bind themselves only "to undertake a share of responsibility for preventing and resisting aggression." Such an undertaking carries no security that it will be honoured in time of crisis. It must perpetuate the scheming for alliances which has been the undoing of Europe since Versailles. Is there not yet a majority in the L.N.U. in favour of the establishment of an international force under the sole control of the League? If not, it is not surprising that the L.N.U. loses members to the New Commonwealth group. The L.N.U. should now be discussing the limits to be set to the powers of an international force. This is more useful work for us than merely to pass resolutions confirming the government in its insistence on national sovereignty.

HENRY MEULEN.

London, W.12.

(The preliminary statement, as Lord Lytton emphasised last month, must not be taken as final. Discussions will be continued at the meeting of the two Societies in Paris.—ED.)

Headway and the Empire

HEADWAY readers will be interested in the two letters printed below. They show how copies of the paper can do excellent work after they have been read by subscribers at home:—

Dear Miss Courtney,—

To-day I have received my third parcel of HEADWAYS and, having intended to write and thank the unknown person who was sending them to me, I am writing this letter to you to-night. They have proved very helpful, and the articles have helped me to understand a little better what is going on in the world. Next year I intend raising my subscription to our League of Nations Union in Victoria to include a copy of HEADWAY each month. If you care, you can still send me extra copies if there are any to spare. I belong to the Presbyterian Fellowship of Australia and have passed on copies to members of that Association.

I just wonder how you celebrated Christmas. I saw the report of the King's Speech in the paper to-day—he was speaking at midnight last night (Australian time), and so I didn't hear him. We had a lovely day for our Christmas day—lovely for holiday-makers—and to-day has been even better. We did not go away for the holidays as we milk cows, and they do not allow you to have a few days off now and again. I am the eldest of a family of eleven children. Two are

married, three are in Melbourne learning different professions, and the rest are all at home. My mother is a widow, our father having died four years ago.

Thank you so much, dear unknown friend, for your interest and help to me by sending me HEADWAY.

Sincerely yours,

Victoria, NORMA CHRISTIAN.
December 26.

Dear Professor Murray,—

Another year sees many copies of HEADWAY finding their way to me in Toronto! A great satisfaction and pleasure to me now is to send these on to various people who appreciate them thoroughly. One friend who is working very earnestly says they are "like gold" to her and a very large committee which she convenes.

For my part, for some years I have not been actively engaged in League of Nations work—not since I resigned as secretary of the Toronto Branch and later as convener of the L. of N. Committee of the Toronto Local Council of Women—but my interest remains, and I am very grateful to the friends who so kindly send on their copies from England. I should much appreciate your letting readers of HEADWAY know how very much appreciated the paper is by many Canadians, and that I will see that any which are sent to me will be given out to friends here and even mailed far and wide.

Our thoughts and prayers are ever with you in the wonderful "Old Country."—Very sincerely, MINNIE E. THOMSON
Toronto.

(We receive many more letters than can be printed under present conditions. Correspondents are reminded that, for publication in a HEADWAY reduced to eight pages, brevity is essential.)

INTERNATIONAL YOUTH CENTRE

The International Youth Centre will hold its sixth Summer Holiday Centre at Croft School, Stratford-on-Avon, from August 3 to 31, 1940.

The Centre is open to young people of all nations. International friendships of permanent value are built. Informal discussions on international problems of cultural, social, and political importance add greatly to the interest of such a gathering.

The cost will be 37s. 6d. per week or, for shorter periods, 6s. 6d. per day. This charge does not include excursions and visits to the theatre. The Shakespeare Memorial Theatre will be open for the annual repertory of Shakespearean plays. Further information from the Hon. Secretary, Mrs. Elsie A. Sheldon-Walton, 16, Girton Road, Cambridge.