

HEADWAY

IN WAR-TIME

The Journal of the League of Nations Union

No. 9

JUNE 1940

PRICE 3d.

EDITORIAL

NEW LEADERSHIP

HEADWAY welcomes the formation of the new Government. By constitution and tradition the League of Nations Union is non-partisan; it neither supports nor opposes any Government except in so far as that Government's policy furthers or hinders the cause of collective security and internationalism. But it is no breach of that tradition to rejoice that to-day, in the testing time which much decide whether the ideals for which we stand shall survive or perish, in the gravest danger which has ever faced this country, a united Government, truly National now, should stand at the head of a people united as never before in its history. That satisfaction is one which can be shared by all League supporters of whatever shade of political opinion. Absolute agreement in detail about the personnel of the new Government is not, of course, to be attained. Some may wish that change had been still more drastic. Others will feel, perhaps, a certain anxiety about what may be expected, in view of past utterances and performances, from the strong men of the Right now at the helm in the Colonial and India Offices—Lord Lloyd and Mr. Amery. Others may not feel entirely comfortable on other scores.

New Men and Collective Security

But we can all unite in rejoicing that the head of the new Government, and his two new colleagues of the War Cabinet, are whole-hearted supporters of the League policy. Not only in the primary task of winning the war, but in that of framing a just peace and banishing international anarchy for ever, we can feel a heartening trust in their capacity and vision. We have collected, from earlier declarations by members of the new Government, some quotations on the subject of League policy which should prove both interesting and encouraging to our readers. Circumstances change, never more rapidly than to-day, and it is not suggested that every one of these utterances represents a word-for-word canon to which their authors regard themselves as unalterably bound. But they may serve to indicate the spirit and temper of our new rulers, and to show the angle from which they

will approach the immense problem of winning the peace. Their keynote is struck by Mr. Churchill's words, spoken in the House of Commons five years ago: "On the rock of the Covenant of the League of Nations alone can we build high and enduring the temple and the towers of peace."

The Union's Part

Let us League supporters, then, take heart; and let us not only take heart but take action. Many members of the Union's branch organisations have continued, in spite of all discouragement, to do sterling work in keeping alive the ideals of internationalism and the activities by which those ideals are set before the public. But from too many sources come confessions of at least temporary failure; of branches suspended for the duration, programmes cancelled, membership lapsed. Sometimes, no doubt, this must be inevitable, but not always. Over and above the share which, in common with all others, Union members are taking in the work of defence, the Union itself has a great work to do. In the mass of public opinion it has to provide a leaven of reason and far-sightedness; the leaven which must prevent those high qualities which war has once again called forth—patriotic devotion, dogged determination, the passionate desire to right intolerable wrongs—from degenerating into their ugly counterparts of jingoism and vindictiveness. It would be idle to deny that there is a danger of such degeneration; it has happened before, and that is one reason—not the least important—why we stand to-day where we stood twenty-five years ago. On land, on sea, in the air, in mines and factories, offices and fields, there goes on the hour-by-hour struggle for present victory over the enemy. Parallel with that struggle there must go on, for the sake of all future generations, the work for the most enduring victory of all—the victory over war itself. The Empire's cause is a just and lasting peace; and, to quote the words of our new Prime Minister, "That cause and the cause of the League are one."

ON RECORD

WHAT MEMBERS OF THE NEW GOVERNMENT HAVE SAID ABOUT THE LEAGUE

THE PRIME MINISTER:

"On the rock of the Covenant of the League of Nations alone can we build high and enduring the temple and the towers of peace."

"There can be no future for the world except along the road laid down by the League."

"We submit ourselves wholeheartedly, nay, proudly, to the Covenant of the League of Nations. We desire faithfully and fairly to bear our own part in building up a true collective security which shall not only lighten the burden of the toiling millions, but also provide the means by which the grievances of great dissatisfied nations, if well founded, can be peaceably adjusted."

"If ever the British Empire is called upon to defend itself, that cause and the cause of the League are one."

—(House of Commons, October 24, 1935.)

"I urge His Majesty's Government to proclaim a renewed, revived, unflinching adherence to the Covenant of the League of Nations. What is there ridiculous about Collective Security? The only thing that is ridiculous is that we have not got it."—(April, 1938.)

"We are seeking to establish the reign of international law."—(House of Commons, April 11, 1940.)

LORD HALIFAX:

"His Majesty's Government maintain their full interest in all the activities which the League can carry on in present circumstances." He went on to refer to the Government's "sympathetic interest in the work of the I.L.O. and the importance they attach to seeing its work carried on as effectively as possible."—(House of Lords, November 23, 1939.)

"British policy, I said, rested upon twin foundations. One was determination to resist force. The other was our recognition of the world's desire to get on with the constructive work of building peace. The implication of those words holds good to-day."—(Oxford, February 27, 1940.)

MR. EDEN:

"Were we to lose the League, we should lose the greatest gain of the battlefields."—(January, 1934.)

"By co-operation we can achieve much: in conflict we shall lose all."—(September, 1937.)

"There is in our judgment no dispute between nations which cannot be settled by peaceful means."—(Eighteenth Assembly, 1937.)

"When at the close of the Great War we joined the League of Nations and sought to set up a new international order, it was not only from love of peace, but from a conviction that aggression did not

pay. We can see no reason to modify that conviction."—(Eighteenth Assembly, 1937.)

SIR ARTHUR SALTER:

"The British Empire cannot be made safe without a system of collective assistance, which we need as much as the system needs us. Geneva is a mutual insurance club, not a charitable society."—(May 17, 1937.)

"A cause worthy of Britain must be more than Britain's cause."—(*Collective Security*, 1939.)

"For myself, I remain convinced that to secure more than a precarious peace we shall need to re-establish a system based upon the essential principles of the League of Nations—collective defence and, what is equally important, revision of treaties where needed by agreement and third-party judgment; until, indeed, we can proceed still further to a federation in which national sovereignties will be subordinated to a wider and effective political authority comprising them all."—(October 14, 1938.)

MR. ATTLEE:

"The true British interests are the preservation of peace, the support of international law and of democracy. The British Empire can survive in the world only in so far as it serves interests greater than its own."—(April, 1938.)

"The scope and authority of the I.L.O. should be enlarged . . . for peace depends upon social justice within States no less than on political justice between States."—(*Labour's Peace Aims*.)

MR. HUGH DALTON:

"To win either peace or plenty there must be associations of States, a higher unity of nations."—(See *Hitler's War*, "Penguin," pp. 158-160.)

(Mr. Dalton advocates minimum obligations of as universal a League as possible, and more serious obligations of a narrower regional association.)

MR. HERBERT MORRISON:

"The League must be no less determined in the perfection of the mechanism to preserve peace than warlike States are in their passion for efficiency in the organisation for war."—(February, 1936.)

SIR ARCHIBALD SINCLAIR:

"If we cannot rally against aggression all the forces of the potential victims, they will be sacrificed one by one till it comes to our turn."—(April, 1938.)

"We must resolve to apply with firmness and tenacity to the future ordering of the world the principles of the Covenant—the rule of law, third-party judgments in all disputes, including those which may involve some surrender of national rights, the co-operation of law-abiding nations to resist aggression."—(Oxford, November 22, 1939.)

LORD CRANBORNE:

"The conception of the League was one calculated to appeal in particular to the British people. . . . We should make a great mistake to underestimate what the League has achieved in the twenty years of its existence. Apart altogether from its great work of a non-political character in the social, economic and humanitarian spheres, it found a peaceful solution for many issues which without its intervention might easily have flared into war."—(*In Foreign Affairs*, January, 1940.)

MR. M. MACDONALD:

"What mankind most needs just now is a practicable and workable internationalism."—(May 12, 1937.)

"The main purpose of the foreign policy of all the Dominions and Great Britain is to uphold the League and to endow it with an authority which shall ultimately be the guarantee of universal peace."—(Geneva, 1936.)

MR. BUTLER:

"We still remain guardians of the principles of the Covenant."—(Twentieth Assembly, December 14, 1939.)

"The principles of the Covenant remain and their observance is in the best interests of international society. We adhere to them because they are the best and only inspiration."—(League Council, 107th Session, December, 1939.)

LORD LLOYD:

"The majority of Englishmen still think that the League of Nations . . . would help to preserve peace by binding nations in advance to resist aggression, but the answer will depend not on the wording of any new Covenant, but on the continued willingness of European nations in the future to remain loyal and effective parties to such a Covenant."—(*The British Case*, p. 59, 1939.)

LEGACIES

The late VISCOUNTESS BRYCE, a Vice-President of the Union, £200.

The late CHARLES WRIGHT, J.P., well-known member of the City of London Branch and a strong supporter of the Union from the beginning, £500.

WORK OF INTERNATIONAL IMPORTANCE

The Welfare Department, Central Office for Refugees (Refugees from Nazi Oppression), BLOOMSBURY HOUSE, BLOOMSBURY STREET, W.1, helps all creeds. More than ever to-day it needs welfare visitors, hospitality, help in making contacts. All offers of help should be sent to the above address.

HAS HITLER KILLED NEUTRALITY?

By WICKHAM STEED

FOR ten years I have seen one thing quite clearly. It is that unless peace-makers kill neutrality, neutrality must kill peace.

Eleven years earlier, that is to say, in 1919, I had seen this truth dimly, as a kind of logical conclusion that had not yet become a settled conviction. In March, 1925, the process of transforming intellectual acceptance into firm persuasion began consciously in my mind. It began when I read the statement made to the League Council by Austen Chamberlain on behalf of the second Baldwin Government. This statement, which had been written by Lord Balfour, rejected the Geneva Protocol for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes on the ground that the proposal to organise collective security against war was paradoxical because it would amount to an attempt to keep the peace by organising war on the largest scale.

This sort of reasoning was characteristic of the late Lord Balfour's approach to any problem of which the practical urgency was not clear to him. In this instance it struck me as sophistry, naked and unashamed. Against it I revolted instinctively, and went my own way in search of a cure for war.

As I have explained in my book, "Vital Peace," I did not know until much later, not indeed until the early months of 1936, that the cure I was seeking had been defined and proclaimed by the late Lord Parker of Waddington in the House of Lords on March 19, 1918, two days before Ludendorff's terrific offensive on the Western Front. My ignorance was pardonable because I had left England on that very morning to fulfil a mission which had been entrusted to me on the Italian front. So through the following years I groped my way towards the saving truth without knowing that others had found it long before.

American Neutrality

Meanwhile, between 1925 and 1927, it had become quite plain that the reason for the British rejection of collective security—and therefore of non-neutrality—both as foreshadowed by Article 16 of the League Covenant and by the Geneva Protocol, was, largely though not entirely, inspired by fear lest British participation in collective action against a Covenant-breaker involve this country in a clash with the United States over the rights of neutral seaborne trade. The United States had helped to draft and had subscribed to Article 16 which, by implication if not explicitly, abolished neutrality. But when the Washington Senate refused to ratify the League Covenant and the Treaty of Versailles, the United States reverted to a policy of potential if not actual neutrality, even towards the League. And this policy threatened to raise the old bogey of "the freedom of the seas" over which Great Britain and the United States had nearly come to blows in 1915 and 1916, and had strained their relations on the eve of the Armistice in October, 1918.

So, in the autumn of 1927, during a visit to the United States, I suggested publicly that an American "Peace Doctrine" should be proclaimed with the object of telling the world that if any country should violate its treaty obligations to settle by peaceful means its disputes with

other nations, that country must not count upon the United States as a friendly neutral. On hearing of this suggestion President Coolidge sent for me. He promised me that he would carry it out if constitutional means could be found to make it binding upon the United States. A few weeks later he authorised the Kellogg proposals for the renunciation of war. In June, 1928, he let me know that he thought the Briand-Kellogg Pact would be "the constitutional way out." He meant that if any signatory to this pact should break it, the United States could not be neutral towards a country that would have violated an American treaty.

Killing the Kellogg Pact

So far so good. Less easy was it to persuade American and British public men that unless the renunciation of war should carry with it an express renunciation of neutrality the renunciation of war would have no practical meaning. Mr. Stimson, the American Secretary of State, was ready to draw this conclusion after Japan had invaded Manchuria in the autumn of 1931; but Great Britain, in the person of Sir John Simon, then Foreign Secretary, declined to work with him on this basis. From that moment the Kellogg Pact was dead, and neutrality triumphant. The path to war lay open.

Hitler was quick to see this and to seize his advantage after he gained power in January, 1933. He strove to break up the League of Nations by getting Mussolini to propose to Great Britain and France in March, 1933, a Four-Power Pact for "the revision of treaties." Then he withdrew from the League, declaimed against collective pacts and in favour of bilateral pacts. With most, if not all of his neighbours he was ready to make, or actually made, pacts of non-aggression. His object was to secure their neutrality while he struck them down in turn.

The Fate of Neutrals

Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Denmark, Norway, Holland and Belgium, one after the other, felt the weight of his hand. Among them, only Czechoslovakia was not neutral. We and France "appeased" Hitler to her undoing. Hitler's other victims pinned their faith to "neutrality." Now they know what it means. They, and we, are beginning to learn in 1940 the true significance of the war of 1914-1918, which was that peace and neutrality are incompatible. I hope we shall not have to wait another 25 years before we learn the significance of this war.

As I read it, the lesson of this war is that neutrality must be treated as an international misdemeanour if not as behaviour accessory to crime. For nations to affirm their sovereign right to be neutral is to affirm the lawfulness of war as an instrument of aggressive national policy. Such war is piracy. The practice of piracy has never been regarded as giving rise to any rights whatever, least of all to a right to be neutral towards piratical crime. Unless this war drives that lesson home it will have been fought in vain. Peace can only triumph on the ruins of neutrality.

As Lord Parker of Waddington, one of the greatest of modern English lawyers, said on March 19, 1918: "The

(Continued at foot of col. 2, page 4)

TYPES OF UNION

An authority on international law discusses what constitutes Federation and what other kinds of machinery for joint action exist.

IN much of the recent discussion about plans for inter-state co-operation both between the Allies during the war and also between some wider group of States after the war, there has been frequent use of the term "federation." It seems to be employed to describe any scheme whose distinguishing characteristic is the preservation, in any system of co-operation between States, of some measure, usually substantial, of State sovereignty, combined with the handing over to some single authority of power to deal with certain matters of common concern such as foreign policy, defence, tariffs and the like. This is a vague use of the term and it seems worth while to give it more precision and at the same time to expose clearly some of the vital differences between federation and other forms of co-operation between States.

What is Federation?

Nobody can claim a monopoly in determining the right meaning of words. It is suggested, however, that federation means a system in which the functions of government are divided between one authority which has exclusive control over certain matters for the whole territory and regional authorities which have exclusive control over certain other matters for their respective regions. It is the division of the functions of government between *co-ordinate* authorities, that is, between authorities which are in no way subordinate one to another, which is the distinguishing characteristic, in my view, of federal government. It is not enough that the functions should be merely divided. That is done in almost all States. There must always be some system of decentralisation, of distribution of functions between central and regional authorities. But this distribution may be, and often is, a division of powers between a central government and various *subordinate* local authorities. In the United Kingdom itself we have many examples of this kind of division, the most striking of which is the devolution to the Parliament of Northern Ireland of power to make laws for the peace, order and good government of Northern Ireland subject to the reservation of certain specified matters for the control of the United Kingdom Parliament. This is not federalism. It is *devolution*.

If it follows from my definition of federalism that it is incorrect to describe as federal a system of government where the regional authorities are subordinate, either in the extent of their powers or in the exercise of their powers, to the government of the entire territory, it must follow also that it is incorrect to describe as federal a system where the government of the entire territory is subordinate to the regional authorities. For this reason the League of Nations could not be called a federation. For this reason also the old Austro-Hungarian government was not a federation. Although it had a joint government which alone could decide questions of foreign policy and defence, that government was composed of representatives of the separate Austrian and Hungarian governments and no decision could be taken without their consent. There was a similar dependence of the central government upon the regional governments in the German constitutions of 1867 and 1871, and in the first constitution of the United States. These were not federations. They were and are sometimes called confederations, but as this word is used very loosely, it is probably only confusing to use it to mark the distinction we have made. But that there is such a distinction is clear and it is a distinction of substance.

The Conditions for Federation

The distinction may be emphasised and illustrated in another way. If States are determined to surrender to a single authority the exclusive control of certain matters of common concern, but if at the same time they are equally determined to retain certain other matters under their own exclusive control, then federalism is the proper form of government for them to adopt. But if a group of States do not wish to hand over the exclusive control of any matters to a single authority; if they desire to do no more than consult or discuss these matters with the other States, while retaining the last word in their own hands; then federalism is not the right form of government for them. They will be suited better by some form of league or alliance or confederation of which the distinguishing mark will be that the common government will be subordinate to a greater or less degree to the separate State governments. Finally, if States wish to hand over the exclusive control of some matters to a single authority and at the same time do not feel that they have any special interests so vital or so vulnerable that they desire to retain exclusive control over them, then some form of devolution will provide a suitable form of government for them. They will be free to regulate their own peculiar affairs themselves if they wish to do so, but they cannot do so exclusively; they will share the power of regulation with the central government. Such a system of devolution exists, as has been said, in Northern Ireland, and it was adopted by the colonies in South Africa when they formed the Union in 1909.

Not the only way

From what has been said it follows that federation is by no means the only, or the best, form of government open to States which propose to co-operate. Federation may demand too much of some States; it may not go far enough for others. It will depend entirely whether and how far the States are prepared to give up exclusive control of their affairs. Nor should it be thought that the adoption of the federal principle in respect of some matters means that it must be adopted for all. Federal government is not necessarily good government; it may require an admixture of unitary government or of the confederate system here and there to make it effective in the given circumstances.

Has Hitler Killed Neutrality?

(Continued from page 3)

true line of development lies, not in regulating the hateful thing (war) but in bringing about conditions under which it becomes increasingly difficult and ultimately impossible, not in consulting the welfare or selfish interests of neutrals but in abolishing neutrality. Murders would increase if the murderer could count upon the neutrality of bystanders, and it is the same with war. The neutral, in fact, shirks his share of the burden of humanity."

After this war and, maybe, before this war is won, there will be no room in the world for shirkers. If war be not destroyed, freedom will perish; and freedom is the soul of civilisation. Those who would save freedom and peace must kill neutrality.

WICKHAM STEED.

DRUG TRAFFIC IN WAR-TIME

By LESLIE R. ALDOUS

MORE than sixty per cent. of the League's budget—*vide* the Bruce Report—is spent on social, humanitarian and other constructive activities. It is vital to maintain these services in war-time. Anybody who doubts this should study the latest evidence supplied to the League by Sir Thomas Russell Pasha, Director of the Central Narcotics Intelligence Bureau at Cairo.

Egypt is the "half-way house" in the illicit drug trade between East and West. The Suez Canal lies along one of the main smuggling routes not only to Europe, but to the United States and Canada. Egypt, in short, offers unrivalled opportunities for feeling the pulse of the world-wide drug traffic; and Russell Pasha's vivid annual reports have always been uncannily accurate in their diagnosis of the situation.

From cover to cover his last report is a blunt warning against self-complacency and against any slackening off in preventive effort. The desire for narcotic drugs in Egypt—and this is true of other countries—has not been exorcised. After the last Great War had brought white drugs to Egypt, it took the best part of ten years to bring the evil effects under control. "You may be sure that in this new war, which has hardly yet begun, every drug trafficker in the world is gleefully looking forward to profits on a far vaster scale." As if in preparation for the present opportunity, mass production of morphine and heroin in the Far East has been going on unchecked under the baleful influence of Japan. Other danger spots are Turkey for opium and Syria for hashish.

Syria Drug Scandal

What may be expected if the vested interests behind the drug traffic have their way is shown by the large-scale drug scandal recently brought to light in Syria. After several years of conformity to the laws, landlords of the Lebanon broke out into "what seemed to be almost a national revolt against authority." Hashish crops to the extent of 1,633,500 square metres were discovered in the course of an official inquiry. Many of the governing classes, it was evident, were deliberately defying the mandatory authorities. Thus, among the 300 landowners implicated were a Cabinet Minister, five of his relatives, two former Ministers, priests and other notables.

Not unnaturally, the smaller landowners had jumped to the conclusion that they, too, could now grow hashish with impunity. One of the peasant proprietors, in his defence, said that he and

his neighbours had assumed that the ban had been lifted, and hastened to follow the example of Government officials, "in the hope of making a small profit in these hard times."

"I do not believe," asserted a writer in a leading Syrian newspaper, "that the breaking of the regulations of the League of Nations constitutes a crime when one considers the numerous infringements by the most civilised European countries of the basic laws of the League. So far as harm to humanity goes, I do not think that one could charge with crime a feeble and poor people who, not willing to die of starvation, allow the foreigner to die by the slow and joyful method of hashish."

In the teeth of strong local opposition, the French authorities acted promptly and vigorously. All the cultivated areas were torn up and large stocks of prepared hashish were confiscated and destroyed. The whole crop would have been worth, in Egypt, about £E 65,780,000. And its destination, since Syria consumes little or no hashish, must have been Egypt and Egypt alone.

Camel Smugglers

The League of Nations, in its *Monthly Summary*, has already given some details of an audacious plot to smuggle dangerous drugs from Palestine through the Sinai Peninsula to the Nile Valley—enough to whet the appetite for Russell Pasha's full story. Hundreds of little zinc cylinders filled with opium and hashish were pushed down the throats of camels into their stomachs, the intention being to drive the animals to the Nile Valley, where they could be slaughtered and the drugs recovered. Clever intelligence work forewarned the police.

Some 35,000 camels, many of them destined for the meat markets, pass through Sinai into Egypt each year. To detect those with contraband concealed inside them might seem a task as difficult as looking for the proverbial needle in a haystack. But the Sinai police, it is said, can "almost smell narcotics through a brick wall." Picking upon an innocent-

looking caravan that arrived at Kantara, one of the regular quarantine stations close to the Suez Canal, a police agent in disguise confirmed suspicion by offering £10 for a beast that was worth no more than £3. The owner gave himself away by his emphatic refusal. From the camel's stomach the police recovered twenty-seven cylinders of opium, worth at a moderate estimate £120. Eighteen camels detained at Kantara and at El Arish yielded in all a precious cargo of opium and hashish to the value of £2,200.

Investigations proved that a gang at Khan Younis in Palestine had organised the scheme. Fifteen of the criminals were brought to trial. Profiting from their experience, the Egyptian authorities are equipping the quarantine stations at Kantara and elsewhere with X-ray apparatus, and it will in future be part of the routine to submit camels to its searching beam.

The Importance of the League

These two cases illustrate the lengths to which drug traffickers will go in pitting their brains against law and order, especially when, under the stress and strain of war conditions, their victims and potential victims are more prone to seek artificial relief from the worries of everyday life. One danger is that the authorities, with so much else to think about, may relax normal preventive measures. Even in Egypt, where the suppression of the traffic is taken so seriously, the war has deprived the police of the co-operation of Camel Corps units now engaged upon military duties, and of the Air Force, which used aerial photography to detect opium plantations hidden away among other crops.

No one can doubt that the heartening successes which have been scored against the drug traffic in the past ten years have been due mainly to the League. Those gains must be preserved to-day. And, as the United States Government has put it, "the entire fabric of international drug control" depends upon the League's machinery functioning "adequately, effectively, and without interruption."

WOMEN'S LAND ARMY SEASONAL WORKERS NEEDED

THE Women's Land Army is appealing for volunteers able to give four weeks' or more continuous service during the summer and autumn, to help farmers with seasonal work. The cultivation and harvesting of the crops is of urgent importance and many additional helpers are needed. Wages for women over 18 will be from 28/- a week, with return rail fare to the place of employment.

Offers of assistance should be sent to:—

THE LADY DENMAN, D.B.E., Hon. Director, Women's Land Army Headquarters, Balcombe Place, Balcombe, Sussex.

THE LATE SIR JOHN HARRIS

AN APPRECIATION BY LORD LYTTON

It is customary when someone dies whom we have known and loved to say: "his death is an irreparable loss," but those of whom this can be truly said in any but a personal sense are actually few. Sir John Harris was one of those few. His death at this moment is a real tragedy. No man, perhaps, is indispensable, and the greater a man's work the more certain is it that it will survive his death. The work to which Sir John Harris devoted his life will go on, but those who shared it, and who will carry it on, will find it much more difficult without him.

Sir John was the champion of a cause which, though it commanded great popular sympathy, involved opposition to many powerful vested interests and roused strong national susceptibilities in many countries. Thanks to the work of many who had preceded him, slavery has no friend in the world to-day, but Sir John was not one to be misled by words. It was the thing slavery, not merely the word which he worked to abolish. He knew that the evil thing was still to be found in many parts of the world, and those who were responsible for maintaining forced labour in various forms vehemently protested against the charge that they were supporting slavery. Governments resented the interference of a private Pro-

SIR JOHN HARRIS

LORD NOEL-BUXTON writes of Sir John Harris:—I leave it to others to view his life in general. Those who had never met him, and had only heard of his zealous work in the cause of the weaker races, might well have imagined him as typical of the intense philanthropist. He was far from typical, for he had in him, in addition, the stuff of which successful careerists are made. He often recalled to my mind the saying that to be successful in Parliament a man needs chiefly a stout heart, a hard head and a thick neck. If he had not been a Christian altruist, he could have used his powers to get ahead of other men and make a position either in politics or in business. Constituted as he was, with an intense desire to benefit the natives whose interests he knew from personal experience as an erstwhile missionary in Africa, he brought to bear such a combination of persuasiveness with drive as made him a propagandist of perhaps unique force. He somehow avoided the impression of heaviness which attaches to moral effort. However difficult the object in view, and however dry the subject under discussion, he never allowed it to be boring. Yet his gift of anecdote and social liveliness was such that perhaps the earnest effort in which he was engaged was often boring to himself. He could entertain his friends so easily that the rôle of raconteur—a rôle so attractive to some frequenters of clubs—might even have supplied him with an adequate spice for life, if he had not been consumed with zeal for public welfare.

I would regard as his chief characteristic a combination of the qualities I have named with an unusual width of interests. My contacts with him were concerned with native questions, but one could see that he was equally absorbed in all that the League of Nations Union stands for, and that he always felt the necessity of reconciling

paganda Society in the sphere of their administration, or the criticism of their statistics. The Anti-Slavery Society had to proceed with discretion as well as with zeal.

Sir John Harris possessed to an exceptional degree all the qualities necessary for a successful secretary of such a Propaganda Society. With an uncompromising loyalty to the cause he had taken up, he combined great tact and infinite patience. He always knew his subject thoroughly and took great pains to sift all his information. He never overstated his case. The men whom he briefed, whether in Parliament or at the League of Nations, could always rely on the accuracy of the facts with which he supplied them, and those whom he criticised knew that he could not be put off with specious arguments. Government Departments respected him, his Society could rely on his untiring vigilance, and the native races in all parts of the world looked to him as a friend who could be trusted at all times to promote their interests.

On the League of Nations Union Executive we valued him as a most reliable expert on all matters connected with Colonial administration, and he will be sorely missed when the subject of World Settlement comes to be discussed after the war is over.

the cause of weaker races with that of international harmony. And I was sometimes surprised by quite different enthusiasms. I remember his intense interest in the movement for promoting gardening in the working quarters of London, and his expressing the wish that it were his own chief work. This width of interests helped to give expression to his great gift of originality.

When we think of his driving power, we must not forget his deep appreciation of the more patient work of other types of men. No doubt he enjoyed his efficiency in lobbying, in Press work, in pushing matters at Geneva, and in obtaining the interest of Ministers of State, but he admired equally the industrious workers who supplied him with facts.

He will long be missed whenever a difficult effort for native welfare has to be made.

SUMMER SCHOOLS

1. The response to the suggestion in HEADWAY that the Union should hold a Summer School in August has been so encouraging that the Executive has decided to hold such a School if conditions permit. Provisional dates: Friday evening, August 2, to Tuesday afternoon, August 6. Full particulars in July HEADWAY.

2. The Council for Education in World Citizenship proposes to hold a Conference for Teachers from August 1 to 9, including attendance at Union's Summer School.

3. For boys and girls over fourteen years of age the Council is also arranging a Summer School at Taunton School, Somerset, from August 10 to 20. Fee (to cover board, lectures and discussions): £4 for members of L.N.U. Junior Branches and of societies associated to the Council; £4 5s. for non-members.

4. A Nansen Pioneer Camp for boys and girls who were over fourteen years of age on January 1 will be held at Holne on Dartmoor from July 30 to August 12. Fee, £2 5s.

5. A Summer School on International Affairs is being arranged by the British Universities League of Nations Society at the Normal College, Bangor, from August 19 to 26.

Full particulars of all these activities from Head Office.

A BOOK OF THE MONTH

"A LASTING PEACE." By Maxwell Garnett. With chapters on the basis of German co-operation by H. F. Koeppler. (Allen and Unwin, 7s. 6d.)

At this crisis men and women must bring clear thinking and frank discussion to bear on this failure, after twenty years, to avert war. Readers of all kinds will find in Dr. Garnett's book, with its fine dedication to all who have had a share in the great adventure of the League of Nations Union, lucid explanation of the facts, constructive help for to-morrow, and a high inspiration. We see in review the causes of the last war, the mixed origins of the League of Nations, the defection of America, which yet did not prevent ten years of increasing success for the League. But in 1931 the tide turned. How and why did this happen? Dr. Garnett is quite clear about the bed-rock reason. Not flaws in the Covenant. The trouble was there was never that firm intention on the part of governments to make the League work—that intention to which, Lord Balfour used to say, the British Empire owes its success in spite of all difficulties. They lacked the necessary collective sentiment to defend peace against bold, deliberate attacks, or to build it up in time and so strongly that attack would lose its initial impetus.

Shortsightedness in a democracy can only be remedied by education. This was left almost entirely in voluntary hands. And, in spite of heroic efforts, catastrophe beat education in the race. That must never happen again. Dr. Garnett outlines peace aims to ensure this end.

Anarchy can only be prevented by some kind of international organisation. Let it be called a Commonwealth, a revitalised League of Nations maybe, yet owing something to the federal idea and even more to the model of the British Commonwealth of Nations. This Commonwealth must regulate matters of common concern such as the use of force, third party judgment, limitation and control of armaments. It must have full power to promote co-operation on a wide range of international problems.

Only the Peace Conference can decide the precise details of this Commonwealth. But its real authority—this is the dominant note of Dr. Garnett's book—must derive from the sentiments and loyalties of independent men and women, as well as the promises of governments. It is a psychological, educational, religious problem, as well as political. Men and women of good will can all help in this great task of education towards a world loyalty which must go with a Commonwealth on a world scale. Our quest to-day is for values more than facts. No one should despair now of creating—there has been a noble beginning—an international Commonwealth where lasting values—liberty, justice, truth, friendship—do count more than so-called realism of 'sacred selfishness' and international anarchy. "It all depends on me."

Germany must be a member of the Commonwealth. But what kind of Germany? In the closing chapters of his book Dr. Koeppler gives an authoritative answer.

There are two basic facts to start with. French security is vital both for France and Great Britain. German unity has come to stay. This unity is of key importance. It was largely built up by Prussian Junkers and the Nazis of to-day, whose policy is in essentials the same. Junker policy has always been one of belief in sheer force, coupled with abhorrence of all forms of international co-operation. Whether the Nazis have really swallowed the Junkers no one knows. What matters is this—Nazi policies and attitude to international affairs are a coarse copy of Junkerism. Unless the Germany of to-morrow is to go the way of the Weimar Republic, she must set her own house in order drastically when the fighting is done. Three steps, Dr. Koeppler warns us, are needed. And she must be able to count on sympathetic support from the Allies. They are a thorough land reform in the East, close supervision over the key industries, and insistence that Germany's new army is a real people's army. Then and not till then can the baleful influence of Junker-Nazism be killed and a Germany come into being whose readiness for international collaboration can be trusted.

MAURICE FANSHAWE.

BUDGETS

The Government has announced its plans for raising and spending £2,300,000,000 during the present financial year. This means more than £6,000,000 a day. If every man, woman and child in the United Kingdom had to subscribe equally towards this vast sum, each would have to make a regular payment of approximately £1 per head per week for 50 out of the 52 weeks in the year.

This country's share of the cost of the League (together with the I.L.O. and the Permanent Court) is £120,000; if every member of the population shared equally, the cost would be approximately ½d. a head per annum.

This year, Union headquarters is working to a Budget of some £11,500; before the war it was more than three times as much. The higher postal charges will cost more than another £1,000—mostly on account of HEADWAY.

How can the money be obtained to carry out the task that lies before the Union?

Only by the continued support of our old and tried members; in many cases it will mean sacrifice, but as we are prepared to make great sacrifices to win the war, ought we not to be ready to make further sacrifices to make sure that we win the peace?

Here are two simple ways in which members can help: by undertaking to adopt either method, members inform Headquarters in advance how much it can count on.

1. Guarantee to give a regular quarterly donation for a period of three years.

2. Pay an annual subscription of £1 or more under Deed. There is a provision in the Finance Acts which enables the Union to recover Income Tax on annual donations or subscriptions (provided Income Tax is paid at the full standard rate) where members enter into a legal agreement to continue their donations for not less than seven years. The agreement is terminable by death, so that an estate will not be liable for subsequent payments.

"The best soldier is the soldier who knows what he is fighting for and loves what he knows."

In a totalitarian war all our people are soldiers to some extent.

The more clearly they can be got to realise that the things they cherish—freedom, justice, peace—are the very things they are fighting for; and the better it can be made plain to our people how, victory won, those cherished things can be preserved for them and for those who come after them, the more likely will we be to secure a sane and lasting peace.

This is the great task of the Union.

Many serving in the Forces are helping in this task by paying contributions under deed or guarantee. They and all other members of the Union who are already doing the same thing are setting the example.

Will you follow it?

Additional information will be gladly supplied by Head Office on request.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

MORE READERS' VIEWS ON PEACE TERMS

Our Conference with the French

Sir,—I am sure that most members of the L.N.U. will feel that the meeting of the French and British League of Nations Societies at this time is a thrilling occurrence, full of good augury, and that the statement issued shows the meeting to have achieved remarkable success in reaching agreement on policy and in thinking out the peace aims of the Allies in concrete terms. Also I feel that we must all welcome the prompt publication of the preliminary report with Lord Lytton's heartening commentary.

Now, as comment is invited, I should like to know what the Executive Committee has to say about one obvious difficulty, namely, *how to create the necessary conditions for a freely negotiated Peace Treaty.* None of us want another "Diktat." But for a genuine Treaty, is it not essential that there be genuine good will on both sides? This may not be impossible, since we know that Germans such as Stresemann and Brüning have existed and still exist. But were it not well to have clear in our minds how these may be approached, and what guarantees may be had that they will represent the opinion of their people? For this, ought not some sort of regulation to be established for the post-war constitution of Germany *before* the Peace Treaty takes place—some guarantee that the German Government then shall truly stand for the nation?

Meanwhile, has the Executive Committee any plans whereby the allied League of Nations Societies can sound as well as inform German opinion whether coming from outside Germany or even from behind the Goebbels front?

K. C. OLDFIELD.

(The Lady Kathleen Oldfield.)

Cambridge.

Sir,—The April issue of "Headway" contains a valuable summing up of the British and French League of Nations Societies' peace aims. The three victims of German aggression—Austria, Poland, and Czecho-Slovakia—are to be restored to independence, and the foundations of a durable peace are to be well and truly laid. The vision is indeed rosy and idealistic, but one wonders why the most pathetic and defenceless of Hitler's victims—the Jews—are completely left out of the picture of better things to come? Is Israel's tragedy so insignificant to all who pass by that they even refrain from alluding to it? And can a brave new world be built up while there is intolerance and persecution of minorities? Can the principle of the interdependence of humanity be realised while the unparallelled persecution and destruction of innocent millions is utterly ignored? Just as Jew-baiting has been made by the militarists the most prominent of their weapons, even so should the relief

and solution of the acute Jewish tragedy be featured prominently in the plans of the friends of peace and the architects of a new, better and juster world. It was a Jew who was the first to catch a glimpse of the glorious future when "nation shall not lift up sword against nation nor will there be war any more." When the bright day dawns, let Israel also in common with the rest of humanity, pass out of horrible darkness into the realm of light, justice, and peace.

A. SOLOMONS.

Manchester.

(The L.N.U. certainly does not ignore Israel's tragedy. The Statement of Policy, December, 1939, emphasised the urgency of dealing with it.—Ed.)

Sir,—Mr. W. A. Payne, in his letter in the April "Headway," states his opinion that the League should co-operate with all societies working for peace, in order to prevent the continuation of this war, which he believes will be "collective suicide," rather than spending its time speculating on future peace terms, as even should the League fail in the former task it will at least have borne witness of its principles.

I wish I could believe that there were some means of obtaining a just and lasting peace without having to continue our efforts to conquer Germany. But it seems to me that all attempts to secure a just and lasting peace—excepting the League of Nations policy—were unsuccessfully made before war was declared. Germany's actions in Europe had advanced to such a stage of internal interference in the affairs of, and with the freedom of, sovereign States that the British and French Governments decided that they could no longer allow Germany to continue them with impunity. It was a choice of two evils, and what was believed to be the lesser was accepted. (Had a League policy been pursued the necessity of making this choice may never have arisen.)

I will agree with Mr. Payne in deprecating attempts to "draw up peace terms," but nevertheless it seems that the French and British Societies cannot be justly accused of such futile efforts, though individual members and branches may be. Judging by the report of the Conference in March of the L.N.U. and the French L.N.S. a great deal of hard realistic thought has been spent in the attempt to discover the broad principles essential to prevent Germany repeating her past aggressive policies should she be successfully beaten by the Allies now at war with her.

S. M. SCOTT.

Liverpool, 18.

A League Bank

Sir,—As one who has raised the question of an International or League Bank for the past sixteen years, I have read "Headway's" review of Mr. Meade's book with

great interest. Perhaps something may be *done* before another sixteen have elapsed!

I would urge in the interests of peace and justice among all the nations that:—

1. A League Bank be formed.
2. That all nations who are members of the League be invited to join, and that these shall have the power to elect non-members—if the latter desire to enter.
3. That a real attempt be made to correlate all the currencies of such nations, based on their hours of labour and standards of living; and that such paper money as the League Bank shall issue shall be accounted legal tender by them.
4. That each nation on joining shall deposit an agreed proportion of its gold reserve with the League Bank.
5. Each of the said nations could then make an inventory of the needs of their people with a view to raising the standards of living, and enable both credit and money to be created at something like the same rate as we can grow food and make goods and services.

J. LESLIE CHOWN (REV.).

Wolverhampton.

Hold the Council

Sir,—I write to urge that the L.N.U. National Executive should on no account cancel the meeting of the General Council. Such a move would set a very bad example to the branches which are in any case always too ready to believe that the time is not opportune for activity of any sort. That way lies death, which we must avoid at all cost. If we wish to keep the magnificent organisation of the L.N.U. in being, ready to seize the great opportunity which (assuming victory) will occur at the end of the war, then we must do nothing to dishearten our branches and dissipate our workers now. I recently attended the L.R.F. Executive and the Streatham Executive, also a drawing-room meeting at Southfields. In all three cases there was a shortage of chairs! May it be the same at the General Council.—Yours sincerely,

Tooting.

G. E. LEE.

(Arrangements for the Council are going ahead.—Ed.)

Useful War-time Economy

Sir,—Postage on "Headway" is now doubled and at the present time the saving of paper is important. In homes where several copies of this journal are still delivered a useful war-time economy could be effected by "sharing" copies and thus cutting down the number received at one address.

A postcard to headquarters cancelling the delivery of "Headway" in respect of certain members of the household is all that is necessary. The saving on postage alone for one year would be very considerable.

Highgate

DIGBY A. SMITH.