

# HEADWAY

## IN WAR-TIME

*The Journal of the League of Nations Union*

No. 20

MAY 1941

PRICE 3d.

### WORLD SETTLEMENT AFTER THE WAR

By LEONARD WOOLF

*(Two more articles of critical comment on "World Settlement after the War" continue the discussion in HEADWAY opened last month by Dr. Gilbert Murray and the Master of Balliol. Leonard Woolf is author of "International Government," "The War for Peace," etc. Professor Brodetsky, besides his interest in international affairs and Zionism is a distinguished mathematician. Both are members of the Union's Executive.)*

The statement issued by the Executive of the League of Nations Union with the provisional approval of the General Council is a longish one and deals with an extremely difficult and complicated problem. It would be too much to expect, therefore, that any one would agree with every word or detail in it. I certainly do not and I also think that there are important omissions in it. But I should like to state why in general I agree with it and, in doing so, perhaps to answer some of the criticisms which have been directed against it.

The statement draws the outlines of a post-war international or world policy for this country. It assumes the victory of the British Empire and the defeat of Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy. The assumption is necessary and reasonable. If we do not win this war, we need not think about post-war policy, for we shall have no choice: what we do will be imposed upon us by Nazi Germany. But we may, personally I believe that we shall, win. And it is necessary and

reasonable to think now what we are going to do after we have won.

#### Twofold Aim

There are two things which we must think about, and they are distinct: the settlement of the war and the settlement of the peace. The criticisms of the Master of Balliol seem to me, with all respect, to be due in part to a failure to distinguish between these two parts of the problem. Our aim in this war is twofold: to defeat Germany and the Nazi system and to establish a permanent international system based upon law, order, justice and peace.

Our first aim is to settle the war. When Germany is defeated, that aim will not have been completely attained. No one can say now what the conditions in Europe and the world will be when that moment comes. But for many months, perhaps for years, we shall be engaged upon settling the war. Part of that settlement must provide for making impossible a renewed attempt

by Germany or any other defeated Power to resort to force. The winning of the war is largely a question of power and force and this settlement of the war must inevitably be based largely upon power and force.

### The Mistake Last Time

But the settlement of the war is not a settlement of the peace, if that peace is to have any real chance of permanence. The history of the war of 1914, and of every modern war, proves that, and it will be the same of the war of 1939. The reason is simply that you cannot base an international peace system—a permanent European world settlement—on the power or force of this or that nation, because nothing is so impermanent and fluid in the international world as power. The mistake made in 1919 was the attempt to do that and to mix it up with the permanent system of the League, to confuse the settlement of the war with the settlement of the peace.

This time we must learn from that mistake. We are fighting, as I have said, not merely to defeat Germany and Nazism, but to establish a permanent international system of law, order, justice, and peace. *It is reasonable, it is essential, that we should consider now, in the light of the League experience, what the structure of that system must be which we shall try to establish. That, as I understand it, is what the Executive has attempted to do in its statement.*

### The Time Factor

Such a system involves the establishment of an international authority which will make law and maintain order and do justice and control power, I do not believe that the system itself can be established immediately after the

war; there must be a transition period between the settlement of the war and the settlement of the peace. But do not let us deceive ourselves. If we do not succeed in establishing it within five years of winning the war, we shall have won the war and lost the peace—just as we did in 1919.

## REFUGEES

A booklet of "Information relating to the General Welfare of Refugees from Nazi Oppression" has just been issued (free of charge to those interested) by the Central Welfare Department at Bloomsbury House, Bloomsbury Street, London, W.C.1.

Here, in the most convenient form for ready reference, may be found complete and up-to-date information about employment, national service, internment, emigration—in fact, almost every problem which is likely to arise in connection with the welfare of refugees.

L.N.U. PUTNEY BRANCH  
PUBLIC MEETING  
59 Putney Hill

Speaker: Mr. JAN MASARYK

"CZECHOSLOVAKIA  
TO-DAY"

In the Chair: LADY LAYTON

Tuesday, MAY 20, at 7-15 p.m.

Annual Business Meeting at 6-30 p.m.

# IMMEDIATE POST-WAR POLICY

By PROFESSOR S. BRODETSKY

The most important remark in Dr. Gilbert Murray's article is that the Executive's Statement represents "in principle the kind of settlement we are fighting for." If our single war aim is victory then our single peace aim must be a world settlement that will guarantee a lasting peace. I would oppose every suggestion that we are prepared to accept any other aim than that aggression must be made impossible by the combination of all Powers, to prevent it by persuasion if possible, and to stop it by force if necessary.

The difficulties arise in respect to the application of the principle to the situation immediately after the war. The Master of Balliol sets them out with commendable clarity, by showing that paragraphs 20-23 of the Executive's Statement on the one hand assume too much in suggesting an International Air Force as an immediate objective, and on the other hand concede too much in throwing back the responsibility for maintaining peace upon an Inner Ring.

### Ideal and Actuality

In my opinion the trouble with Articles 20-23 is that they attempt to lay down at the same time both an ideal and a mode of immediate realisation. The ideal is to have all-round disarmament and a universal international authority endowed with a monopoly of air-power for maintaining the peace of the world. The possible actuality is that not all States will be included in this international authority,

and that all-round disarmament with an International Air Force at the disposal of the international authority will not be immediately realisable.

I would, indeed, strongly object to reducing the British Commonwealth and the United States once again to their recent position of naked unpreparedness. Most people would rightly decline to hand over the British and United States navies to any international body, with the risk that within a short time this might mean an end to the freedom of the seas. Most people hope that the supremacy in the air of Britain and the United States will soon be unchallengeable, and, having led to victory, will be retained after the war for the purpose of guaranteeing peace in the world.

### After the War

The Inner Ring idea in relation to Europe is in fact a theoretical conception, which will most probably mean very little after the present war. Our victory must obviously involve the crippling of Germany and Italy. France will emerge from the war so weakened that it will need years, and perhaps even generations, before it will have recovered completely. All the other small States of Europe will be gasping for breath. Who, then, will constitute the Inner Ring, and supply such an overwhelming power as to make aggression in Europe impossible? The only Power other than Britain and Russia likely to emerge is the Slav federation of Poland and Czechoslovakia; but we

cannot say how strong this combination will be, and it will certainly need much, if not all, its energy for internal reconstruction for some time after the war.

We cannot foretell the situation after the war; indeed, I do not think that the war has yet developed in its main features, and the actual alignment of the Powers for and against civilisation is not yet complete. But we can do two things: we can judge the trend of events, and we can lay down an immediate policy which is realisable.

### Main Trends

If we examine the events of the past year and a half, we see the following main trends:—

(1) The rapid evolution of a common aim in the British Commonwealth of Nations and the United States, with the latter effectively in the war, although not yet in the sense of direct participation in hostilities.

(2) The overrunning by the Nazis of practically the whole of Europe west of the Russian frontier; the exceptions like Sweden and Switzerland represent in each case an uneasy local equilibrium, while Spain represents a possible additional line of emergence of German aggression.

(3) The growing up of an effective resistance to Nazi aggression under the leadership of Great Britain as representing the States actually at war, and of the United States as representing the States that are still non-belligerent but against the Nazis.

(4) The growing collaboration with Germany of Italy, Japan and a number of minor States in eastern and south-eastern Europe, all of which, with the exception of Japan, are already vassals

of Germany, Japan being saved for the present from this condition because of its distance from Germany.

(5) The unfolding of an enigmatic Soviet policy, which, whatever we may think of the ethics of its main features, is obviously directed towards self-preservation, and has lately shown signs of a certain nervousness of German expansion in directions affecting Russian interests.

(6) In the midst of a general impatience with, and disapproval of, fanciful structures like federal union, the evolution of a definite tendency of public opinion in this country and in the United States towards a permanent partnership between the British Commonwealth and the United States.

### The Only "Inner Ring"

These trends seem to me to suggest an immediate post-war policy, viz., the assumption by the British Commonwealth of Nations and the United States of immediate responsibility for maintaining the peace of the world. This is the only effective Inner Ring that I can imagine. It is practical; it can enjoy the confidence of the world, especially if we do not insist on always referring to it as the "English-speaking peoples." There is one weakness, Russia. If Russia will co-operate, then the security will be complete, and therefore an immediate task now, during the war, is to establish the most co-operative relations possible with the Soviets.

If this Anglo-American Inner Ring is secured as the result of the war, and can serve for maintaining peace immediately after the war, then we shall have a breathing-space in which to work out our single peace aim, namely, a universal international authority endowed with a monopoly power in the air to guarantee the peace of the world.

## THE CAUSES FOR WHICH WE STAND

By VISCOUNT CECIL

*(The first Joint Luncheon of the League of Nations Union and the New Europe Circle was held at the Criterion Restaurant on April 3. M. Jan Masaryk took the chair, and a company of 167 listened to an address from Lord Cecil, of which the following is a summary.)*

This luncheon is a luncheon given by the New Europe Circle and the League of Nations Union jointly—a very fortunate and agreeable conjunction. We hope that our joint efforts may be of great value to the causes for which we stand.

What are those causes? I think they may best be defined by the words of a very great man, General Smuts, who recently made an important speech in his own country in which he stressed the importance of keeping the League of Nations idea alive. Speaking for my own branch of the present assembly—the League of Nations Union—that is emphatically our business. And I will venture to say that the leading idea of the League of Nations was *peace through law*.

### Not a Truce

We want a peace resting on law. It won't be enough just to patch up a kind of truce, just a suspension of hostilities, while the exhausted nations are getting ready for another war. We want a solid peace, a real peace, something definite and something which is likely to last.

How is that to be obtained? If I may be so bold as to speak not only for my own countrymen, but for all the allied countries of which there are many representatives here, I am quite sure they want, in the first place, to carry out the policy for which we all went to war. The actual occasion was the invasion of Poland, but it had been led up to by a number of other events before that. Therefore, the first thing that we demand as a result of this war is that the conception that might is right—that a nation is morally entitled to do anything it likes if it is strong

enough to do it—should be definitely abandoned as a principle of international conduct. That is what I mean when I say "law," loyalty to some principles which are above and beyond the interests of any particular country. It is not a new idea at all. The great conception of Grotius, three hundred years ago, was undoubtedly loyalty to what he called the *jus gentium*, the law of nations. Rousseau, with his law of nature, was really following out the same idea or something like it. Long before either Grotius or Rousseau, the great principles of Christian morality, the law of love, were based on the same final conception.

### Order by Free Agreement

We claim the right and the duty to remedy the great international crimes that Germany has committed, and we do so because we say that aggression is in itself an international crime—the greatest offence against the law which I have tried to describe. Even the Germans have a kind of glimmering that there ought not to be complete chaos in the world. Their suggestion is that it should be replaced by a New Order, that is universal domination by Germany. That is perfectly hopeless from the point of view of progress and civilisation. I am quite sure there is only one way out—to establish an order in the world, not by the domination of a single nation, but by the free agreement of all nations. It is probable that the first beginning of this must be watched over and protected by those countries which are now Allies in the great effort to resist Germany. But that original grouping must be not a closed alliance, but open to all other nations as long as they can be really trusted to carry out the principal duty of protecting nations against lawless aggression.

We shall want a great deal more than that if we are really to help the world to recover from the terrific shock which

this war is bound to be. We must aim at a much wider agreement in order to bring all the nations into the great efforts for social, economic, humanitarian—yes, and even political—reform.

That is a big order; but look at the people who, fundamentally and essentially, are on our side. I believe that, if you could have a poll of the nations of the world, you would have an absolutely

overwhelming majority against the German idea.

Our victory is absolutely certain. It may be delayed. We may have great difficulties and hardships to go through. When we win, as win we must, we must see to it that we erect a real peace as the great object and the great triumph of our cause.

## A SUCCESSFUL EXPERIMENT

By GORDON DROMORE

The policy of transferring important sections of the Economic and Financial Organisation of the League of Nations to the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton, N.J., is proving its wisdom up to the hilt. So much so that a similar migration of sections of the Health Organisation at Geneva is expected soon. A few months' experience has shown that conditions at Princeton are markedly favourable for carrying on high class research work under fully responsible direction, in closer touch with realities than is possible at Geneva during the German nightmare control of Europe. Fresh and generous opportunities of co-operation are constantly available.

At Princeton all *non-European* intelligence is handled—a good deal of *European* intelligence still comes from Geneva. Expert summaries are published which will help people to realise that the economic world of to-day and to-morrow is different from that of 1939. That disastrous myopia over the parallel change in the world between 1914 and 1918 will not be repeated.

### Generous Help

For this forward-looking purpose America is an extremely good centre for information. The League, in its work along these lines, is receiving generous

help from all the Government departments of Washington. What is specially stimulating is that so many of the people who matter, and the people who are going to count in their country's service, are definitely interested in the League's work. Many of them come to Princeton to discuss economic problems, to exchange views, to offer advice from special expert angles. Not only academic people, but highly placed officials who are responsible for most important work, for example, in the Federal Reserve Board Research Organisation or the Department of Commerce.

The New York Banks are giving valuable help to the League. Further, information existing in America is showing itself of great value. American libraries enjoy a deservedly high reputation. From the League's point of view, Princeton University Library is remarkably good and the New York Public Library really first-class with statistics and other material not available elsewhere.

As a result the new *World Economic Survey* and the *Statistical Year-Book*, both of which are being published from the U.S.A. this year, as well as the *Statistical Bulletin* (from Geneva), are extraordinarily comprehensive; the first, indeed, will be found a more complete review than any which has yet appeared.

### Microfilming

Recently there have been articles in *The Times* describing the precautionary "microfilming" of past editions. It is worth noting that the League took similar precautions as regards its thousands of statistical cards. These are therefore available at Princeton *en gros et en détail*; and are constantly kept up to date. Without them the initial difficulties of continuing economic research work at Princeton would have been vastly more difficult.

### Guiding Principles

The broad guiding principles of the economic and financial work which the League aims at accomplishing in spite of, and even because of, the war are not tied to blue prints or detailed planning, but rather are fluid and adaptable.

(1) Of special importance are regarded the causes of failure in the past and the lessons which can wisely be drawn therefrom.

(2) Whatever happens during this war, it

must be realised that fundamental economic forces (as, for example, those arising out of *demographic pressure*, or those which go to cause *fluctuations* in various economic activities, or those which create *economic depressions*) are bound to manifest themselves again. Hence the paramount importance of ascertaining the best method or methods for adequate control of these forces in time, so that the world may not rush headlong into any repetition of the decade beginning with the financial collapse of 1929.

(3) All essential information bearing on this problem must be, and is being, collated.

At any post-war Conference this work by the League is certain to prove of the greatest value.

## ANGLO-AMERICAN UNION

Mr. Clarence Streit, the American "father" of Federal Union, has been compelled by the swift passage of European events to change his tune slightly. In "Union Now With Britain," his new book, which is shortly to be published in this country, he modifies the plan which he originally set out in "Union Now." The reason is not far to seek. Of the fifteen States which he selected to form a Federal Union, eight have been swallowed up by Germany; so he now urges that the United States should enter without delay into a union with the British Commonwealth.

At the time when extravagant hopes regarding the possibilities of federation were being entertained in some quarters, the League of Nations Union had the foresight to doubt whether a really comprehensive federation would be practicable at the end of this war. While favouring such developments in the direction of federalism as might prove possible, it urged that the substance of the League system should not be thrown away for a shadow of federation.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS UNION  
LONDON REGIONAL FEDERATION

ANNUAL  
GENERAL MEETING  
Wednesday, MAY 7, at 6 p.m.

AT THE  
SWEDENBORG HALL,  
21, Bloomsbury Way, Holborn

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS  
BY  
LADY VIOLET BONHAM-CARTER.

## THE CZECH ARMY IN BRITAIN

By PETER MATTHEWS

*(The Prime Minister, accompanied by Dr. Benes and Mr. Harriman, President Roosevelt's personal representative, recently visited the Czechoslovak troops in this country. Peter Matthews, from first-hand knowledge, here describes the real significance of these armies on British soil.)*

On a day in September, 1937, I watched, from a stand in a Prague street, a small body of men in the uniforms of the British Army marching behind the coffin of T. G. Masaryk, President-Liberator of Czechoslovakia. With them were others in the uniforms of the French, Italian and Russian armies. They were representatives of the Czechoslovak Legions from the World War, who had fought beside the great Allied Armies for the defeat of German domination and the liberation of their country from the Teutonic yoke.

### Arms and Arsenal

Those legionaries, who were so proud of their Allied uniforms and of the part which they had played in the Allied victory, formed the backbone of the Czechoslovak State. That State was defended by an army of forty divisions, as well trained and equipped as any in Europe. Czechoslovakia had inherited from the Austro-Hungarian Empire some of the greatest arsenals of Central Europe. The Skoda works, which had produced the big guns which battered the strong walls of Liège in 1914, were in the hands of Britain's friends. The Bren gun, built to a Czech design, had been adopted as the pattern for the equipment of the British Army. The Czechoslovak people felt justified in assuming that so invaluable an ally, with its vast resources and with its vital strategic position as guardian of the Bohemian Mountains, would never be sacrificed to

the potential enemy of France and Great Britain.

If anyone had prophesied then that within less than three years Czech tanks and guns would again be battering the defences of Belgium and France, he would have been considered a madman. The lesson of those 70-ton tanks, forged by the unwilling labour of Europe's most skilled ironworkers, for their hated German masters, is one which Great Britain cannot afford to forget a second time.

### What Dr. Benes Foresaw

To Dr. Benes belongs the credit of having warned the Western Powers whilst there was still time. In the years 1937 and 1938 he was pointing out to visitors from Great Britain and France the danger that, if Czechoslovakia was abandoned to her fate, Skoda guns might once more be used against the defences of Western Europe. He was warning us that we could not hope to "neutralise" a rump Czech state, to make of it a second Switzerland. He knew that the Nazi thought in terms of strategic advantage, and that, whatever they might promise, they would certainly possess themselves, at the first opportunity, of the powerful Czech arms industry. With the care-free optimism so characteristic of us, we ignored his warning. We paid the price of our mistake in May and June, 1940. We are paying it still.

When the rump State of Czecho-

slovakia was occupied by the Germans on March 15th, 1939, History repeated itself. For the second time in a generation, Czechs and Slovaks made their way to the territory of friendly Powers to form the nucleus of a Czechoslovak State and Army. Czech airmen escaped over the frontier to Poland, where one of them was to become the ace of the famous Koszkiuszko Squadron of the Polish Air Force, now No. 303 Squadron of the R.A.F. Czechoslovak squadrons were formed in the French Air Force, and they accounted for over a hundred German machines during the Battle of France. A new Czechoslovak army was formed on French soil. It was only a fraction of the great Czechoslovak army which Masaryk had built up, and only a part of this second army succeeded in escaping to British soil after the French collapse. More than 1,500 aeroplanes and the equipment of several armoured divisions had fallen into the hands of the Germans, together with the factories and the skilled workmen who had produced this magnificent equipment.

It is a strange and ironical fact that to-day, whilst a Czechoslovak army is training on British soil to participate in the liberation of Europe, the Czechoslovak people as a whole is compelled to play its part in arming and feeding its oppressors.

### Significance for Future

The Czechoslovak army of pre-Munich days prided itself on its artillery; that tradition is being kept alive by the army in Britain to-day. British officers have been very much impressed by the performance of Czech units on British ranges. But, though the small Czech formation in this country would give a good account of itself in

battle, the importance of its presence here is primarily political. Officers and men regard themselves as the nucleus of a future State which is itself destined to be part of a larger grouping in Central Europe.

The joint Polish-Czech Military Academy is one of the symbols of the far-reaching collaboration between two countries whose tragic differences in the past were the means of bringing upon their two peoples the terrible fate which they are suffering to-day. The two Governments and the two Armies are developing habits of consultation and collaboration which will have momentous consequences in the Post-War World. The fate of Poles, Czechs, Slovaks, Hungarians, Roumanians and Bulgarians to-day is the product of a failure to reach that unity of policy and purpose which alone could have preserved them from the Teutonic advance. To-day one finds, among Poles, Czechs and Slovaks, a very clear realisation that close unity, both political and economic, will be necessary in Central Europe after the War. That unity is being forged in Britain, by the Polish and Czechoslovak Governments. Their work is based on the belief that the unit which they are preparing will be joined by other peoples when the countries between Germany and Russia have been freed from the armies of the invader. Thus the importance of the presence in this country of the Allied armies is to be measured not merely in terms of their military and moral contribution, but also of the preparation which is going on of the Europe which will arise amid the ruins of Hitler's "New Order."

## UP AND DOWN THE COUNTRY

During April the demand for speakers continued, and Head Office supplied speakers for meetings at Birmingham, Blackheath, Bourton-on-the-Water, Carnforth, Crouch End, East Acton (Y.W.C.A.), Edinburgh, Ilkley, Kensington, Lambeth, Lancing, Leeds (Montague Burton), Leiston, Letchworth, Manchester (Rotary Club), Northampton, Princes Risborough, Settle, Teddington, and other places.

These speakers included Dr. Maxwell Garnett, the Dean of Chichester, the Provost of Portsmouth, Professor H. Darnley Naylor, Mrs. Corbett Ashby, Mrs. Corbett Fisher, Mr. H. H. Elvin, Mr. H. Walker, Dr. Vaclav Benes, M. L. E. Genissieux, M. Tilia, Mrs. K. L. MacCuaig, Miss Ethel Waite, Mr. T. C. Archer, Mr. Leslie Aldous, Mr. Edgar Prior, and others.

The Dean of Chichester's "repeat" visit to Lincoln has had a tonic effect on the local branch. Thanks largely to the W.E.A.'s discussion classes on League subjects, intelligent questions on world settlement were put to the speaker, who, we learn, was "at his very best" in dealing with them. Councillor A. Tuck, J.P., appeared at this meeting in a dual capacity. Being Mayor this year he took the chair as President; but he is also carrying on as Branch Secretary. There is a big demand for Union speakers from other organisations; for example, the Mayor recently addressed a meeting of the Lincoln Co-operative Men's Guild.

Addressing the Annual Meeting of the Wellingborough Branch, the Dean of Chichester described the present conflict as a battle of faiths—the religion of freedom versus servitude. He spoke of the passing of the Lease and Lend Bill as a great triumph for the cause for which the League of Nations stands.

Hopeful factors in the present situation—above all, the partnership between Britain and America—were stressed by Mr. Elliott Dodds, Editor of the *Hudders-*

*field Examiner*, at the annual meeting of the Gledholt Methodist Branch. "All these things," said the speaker, "confirm our faith that the League, perhaps in some new form, will rise again. It is indispensable to world peace, prosperity and social justice, and the day will come when it will prove the salvation of the nations."

Dr. Alington, the Dean of Durham, was the chief speaker at the Annual Meeting of the Sunderland Branch. This Branch does not rely solely upon meetings to keep the League and the Union in the public eye. Letters which it has sponsored have appeared in the *Spectator*, *Manchester Guardian*, *Sunderland Echo* and *Northern Echo*. Its efforts have resulted in Lord Cecil's Autobiography being made available to borrowers at the Public Library and also Boots' Library.

At the Newcastle Annual Meeting, an address by Mr. H. E. S. Marks, B.A., on "War and Peace Aims," stimulated one of the most lively discussions in the history of the Branch. Much of the comment was critical of the Executive's Statement of Policy; but questions were effectively answered, and it was the general verdict that much good had been done.

At Skipton's Annual Meeting Mr. George S. Green, the President, served the Branch well with a most comprehensive survey of the international situation which, we are glad to see, is being circulated locally in pamphlet form.

Oakham Branch has maintained its position, getting new members to replace those lost by death, evacuation and resignation. At the Annual Meeting, Mr. Guy Dixon, a barrister from Melton Mowbray, spoke on "World Settlement After the War."

Jesmond Branch, at its Annual Meeting, listened to a talk on "The Peace Aims of Norway" from the Rev. Ingebrigt Dahle, M.A., the local Norwegian pastor, who had recently met the men from the Lofoten Islands.

Recently we told how some useful

publicity in the "Londoner's Diary" of the *Evening Standard* had been stimulated by Union posters. Now the Holborn Branch has found that passers by do read posters, and notice boards. After its Sandwich Lunch, these paragraphs appeared in the *Time and Tide Diary*, April 5:—

"Last Thursday, when I was passing the Plane Tree restaurant in Great Russell Street, I saw that 'a member of General de Gaulle's staff in London' was going to talk there about France to-day. I went in to hear him talk. M. Hauck was introduced as General de Gaulle's 'labour adviser,' which was unexpected and interesting, but I hope his advisory work leaves him plenty of free time to go round talking. It was a clever speech because there was enough past history to put all the people wise who might have forgotten the facts, and there was enough new material to make the most industrious newspaper readers feel they were getting something fresh.

"On the whole, it was a most encouraging picture of the state of mind of the French in France. It's so pleasant to be assured that never in their history have they liked and admired the English so much, and that at least 95 per cent. of the population is only waiting for the day when it becomes possible to give us practical help. It is only fair to add that M. Hauck made it quite clear that in his opinion we had nothing good to hope from North Africa or General Weygand."

From Beddington, Carshalton and Wallington:—"Six meetings a season do not satisfy our members. We are to have three or four more in April and May."

Although the Blitzkrieg has stopped nearly all activities at the Leysian Mission, the Secretary of the L.N.U. Branch is making a great effort to reach last year's membership total. Writing for a fresh supply of receipt books, he adds: "Nearly seventy subs. have been paid this month, and I have only ten receipts left, so please send as soon as possible."

A grand job of work has been done by

our collectors in Bootle, which has suffered heavily from air raids and evacuations. Considering that the population, in the words of the Branch Secretary, "has been dispersed to all corners of the land," the collection of 222 subscriptions in 1940 against the 1939 total of 338 represents a fine achievement.

St. Austell Branch, in conjunction with the W.E.A., is starting a study group on the "Problem of Germany." In running this good use is being made of the L.N.U. Library, the County Library, and the W.E.A. organising tutor for Cornwall. Through members addressing meetings of outside bodies such as church guilds, ten new members have been secured.

The Chairman of the Bristol and District Council has purchased sixteen copies of Lord Cecil's book, "A Great Experiment," to lend round among local branches. The constant distraction of air raids has rendered big meetings almost impossible; but little study groups are finding plenty of inspiration and encouragement in what the Hon. Secretary describes as "this splendid book."

Norwich Branch has presented an autographed copy of "A Great Experiment" to Miss Tabor, who has resigned the secretaryship on taking up an appointment in London.

This declaration of faith from one of our most devoted Branch Secretaries who has had to give up on account of ill-health is worth recording:—"Am I going to lose contact with the L.N.U.? Is thy servant a dog that she should do such a thing? Don't I think that collective security is the only hope for world peace? Doesn't the League of Nations stand for collective security; and doesn't the L.N.U. stand for the League; and was the world ever in such need of all three of them as it is to-day? Therefore, so long as I remain extant at all, I shall remain a member of the premier organisation."

## A BOOK OF THE MONTH

### "NOT GUILTY" MEN

**WE WERE NOT ALL WRONG.** By Geoffrey Mander, M.P. Gollancz Victory Books. 2s. 6d.

This is a book that needed to be written. Always a thorn in the flesh of smug and complacent Governments, an inveterate questioner in Parliament on international affairs, Mr. Mander had a special claim to write it; and probably nobody could have made a better job of it. Note, in case you had forgotten, that Mr. Mander—as early as May, 1933—was one of the first in Parliament to call attention to the German danger. That others, who six years later had still not seen the light, are to-day excusing their blindness with the plea, "We were *all* wrong," is natural. "Not *all*," replies Mr. Mander. "There were many who were absolutely right in what they foresaw and foretold. Let facts speak for themselves."

The many includes the Labour Party, the Liberal Party, "rebel" Conservatives, and the League of Nations Union. It is not a question of being wise after the event, since all these consistently pointed out an alternative policy. The pity is that party controversy entered into the matter at all. "After all," as Mr. Mander writes, "the League of Nations and collective security were not ideals which were solely the province of the Parliamentary Opposition. They were not doctrines pressed upon the National Government, and repudiated by the National Government, who are now vindicated by the evident failure which has overtaken these hopes. It was the other way round." The real point was that the "Opposition" believed that the Covenant and collective security could be made to work.

Mr. Mander's method of letting his story tell itself is to take typical utterances made by "Opposition" spokesmen over a period of years, give them continuity with link passages of his own, and sum up in a few telling sentences. For

convenience, the Labour Party, the Liberal Party, and the League of Nations Union have important sections of their own; but in fact the foresight of each is seen to have been, in essentials, remarkably similar. Mr. Mander does well to show that, though he and his friends were most interested in peace, they were none the less willing to provide armaments when proved necessary. Thus Mr. Lansbury and his fellow pacifists, perfectly sincere as they were acknowledged to be, were never at any time in any sense representative of the Labour Party as a whole. For the Liberals Sir Archibald Sinclair, five years before the war, made it plain that "if it be agreed that we must have armaments, then it must be agreed that those armaments must be powerful"—"as powerful and as deadly as those of any dictator." The Union, of course, quite early saw that the only alternatives were a levelling up or a levelling down all round. It took the view that the latter course was far more sensible, but wisely insisted on "regular and untrammelled investigation," so that there should be no suggestion of relying on promises alone. But the crux of the matter, as Mr. Mander ably puts it, is this: "*If you are going to rely on isolated action by your own country, regardless of anybody else, you will require immense armaments; but on the other hand, if your weapons are going to be part of an international scheme for warning off or holding down an aggressor, the amount you require will be far less.*"

It was, Mr. Mander argues, the Government of the day which went in for unilateral disarmament, by pursuing a policy which threw aside one after another opportunities of securing the co-operation of the armed forces of other countries.

Read what the author has to say on the Labour Party's interest in the technical questions involved in defence against air

raids, on the Liberals' demand from 1936 onwards for the Ministry of Supply, which only came into existence within a week or two of the outbreak of war. But read especially the section on the League of Nations Union. Mr. Mander's lists of the Members of Parliament and other well-known personalities who have served on the Union's Executive are impressive. (Impressive, too, is the number of them who to-day hold important offices in the War Administration.) Further, he takes us behind the scenes, with his realistic descriptions of those "debates of giants" in which Sir Austen Chamberlain and others have taken part. The Union's policy, he shows, has invariably been as well thought out as it has been logical and consistent. Just because it was an astonishing success, the Peace Ballot was misunderstood and misinterpreted. The public response on the final question—which in effect asked, "Are you prepared to do something about it and take risks?"—should have been an immense en-

couragement to the Government if they had any intention of implementing their obligations under the Covenant. Time and again, in its reactions to big events, the Executive showed prophetic vision, almost clairvoyance. On the outbreak of the Manchurian dispute, for example, it at once said plainly that this was "a crucial issue for the whole future of the League." What it foretold in its warning, "Whose Turn Next?" issued after the betrayal of Czechoslovakia, has been fulfilled in detail. "*The twenty years' history of the Union,*" concludes Mr. Mander, "*has been a remarkable example of British idealism in the realm of practical politics.*"

"Not wicked, just hopelessly wrong," is Mr. Mander's verdict on those who come badly out of his searching analysis of events. There is, in fact, not a shadow of personal animosity in his indictment. He has simply set down the facts for all to heed, lest the same tragedy be re-enacted in the next post-war period.

LESLIE R. ALDOUS.

## FEDERAL SCHEMES

PEACE BY FEDERATION, by Sir William Beveridge. ECONOMIC ASPECTS OF FEDERATION, by Lionel Robbins. THE COLONIAL PROBLEM AND THE FEDERAL SOLUTION, by Norman Bentwich. WHAT FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IS, by K. C. Wheare. THE PHILOSOPHY OF FEDERALISM, by E. M. Joad. SOCIALISM AND FEDERATION, by Barbara Wootton. FEDERATION AND THE COLONIES, by Lord Lugard. (Federal Tracts, Nos. 1-7), Macmillan, 6d. each.

Max Beerbohm, himself no cricketer, was asked why he contributed to the *Daily Telegraph* Testimonial to W. G. Grace. "Well, I did so hate golf," he said. There has been something of the same sort about the flight to Federalism: folk have been apt to swallow it as an undigested slogan, often because, for some reason or other, they just disliked the League of Nations. These seven Tracts, not all by professed

admirers of Federalism, have now done a real service in blowing some of the fog off the face of Federalism. For that reason they should be warmly welcomed—they have in them the stuff of good debate.

The first two, part of a Symposium "Federal Union," have already been reviewed. Of the newcomers, No. 4 by Mr. Wheare, a brilliant Australian writer on colonial problems, stands out by itself. Mr. Wheare defines Federalism, beyond the misunderstanding of anyone who is not wilfully blind. It is tremendously hard, he adds, to start. And then, vast tact and skill are needed to work it. It avoids deep, dividing issues. Changes are at the pace of the slowest. Federalism, in fact, stands for Conservatism, compromise, legalism. These virtues and vices may well be kept in mind by those who are

all for filling the League's shoes right away.

Professor Joad tackles the philosophy of Federalism, the antithesis of Fascism. His attack on the latter is so high, wide and handsome that at times it would seem to be aimed at any modern State; even Sweden, Norway or Holland, who surely have made a fine contribution to civilisation. Mrs. Wootton argues that it is not a case of simple choice between Socialism or Federalism, which are rather two complementary parts of one desirable whole.

Highly interesting are the opposing views of Lord Lugard and Professor Bentwich on Federalism and Colonies. Both, however, realise the need of League principles and help. Lord Lugard, with a

unique practical experience behind him, supports extension of the Mandates System, but limits Federalism to outlining general principles of colonial policy and supervision of the National administration of the colony. Sir William Beveridge (Tract 1) also agrees on retention of National administration for the time being. Professor Bentwich, however, favours more far-reaching experiments, not necessarily for all dependencies—actual Federal administration, under supervision by a stronger League of Nations. But such experiments should be governed by one condition, that the native peoples should in some way endorse the change.

MAURICE FANSHAWE.

## TO ALL YOUTH GROUPERS EVERYWHERE

Dear Youth Groups,—On my desk is a little red tin box (red only because it looks cheerful!), and inside are file-cards giving details of Groups I have heard from and what they are doing. Here are some extracts:—

Wood Green and Southgate are holding fortnightly meetings on Sunday afternoons.

Morecambe sent me a formidable report of great and varied activities.

Edinburgh and Muswell Hill have amalgamated with their senior Branches.

Will other Groups please add to this news?

It is encouraging to see that some Groups which have been unable to carry on have joined with their senior Branches. Youth Groups are, after all, a training ground for Branch work, and now is a chance for younger members to be useful. The Union's General Council will be held in June, so what about asking your Branch to appoint a young member as one of its delegates.

Our thoughts are now turning towards the end of the war, and many Youth Groupers must feel that our members have been almost irretrievably scattered. I think that our first step after the war should be

an "all-in" National rally, to which all members may come, and we can pool our ideas about our future. Will you be thinking about this and let me know if you have any bright ideas?

Many books recently published make you think, and contain good material for discussion. There is Lord Cecil's book; and Mr. Mander's "We Were Not All Wrong" (reviewed in *Headway* this month) in which there is a lot about the League and our Union.

Well, those are a few things to be doing, but above all, please let us know what you are doing. I want so much news that in a short time the little red box has to be replaced by a filing-cabinet!

With best wishes for our future,—Yours very sincerely,  
ETHEL A. WAITE.

(Continued from Page 15.)

peoples against a system which represents the negation of social justice. . . . When war is done and arms laid down, the peoples of the world will rebuild democracy more in their own likeness than it has ever been. The cornerstone of the future lies in the failures of the past."

## THE LEAGUE CAUSE IN CANADA

More than five hundred people were present at a Complimentary Dinner in Montreal arranged by the League of Nations Society in Canada in honour of Mr. John G. Winant, then Director of the International Labour Office, and Mr. Alexander Loveday, Director of the Economic, Financial and Transit Department of the League. This function took place just before Mr. Winant's appointment as United States Ambassador to Great Britain.

The following are important points from the speeches:—

### Mr. Loveday

"We find all decent living, all law and order, all principles of social justice, threatened and jeopardised by the acts of the aggressors. But, if I do not greatly mistake what is happening, out of that suffering is growing a stronger conviction in the rightness of the League than ever before, a more profound belief in the need to establish an effective means for the preservation of the peace once peace is won, and an absolute and irresistible determination to defend those principles which are contained in the Covenant of the League. As I see it, the battle of the League to-day is being fought over London—and over Germany. It is being fought in the hills and valleys of Albania, on the Libyan coast and desert. Do any of us here doubt the inevitable triumph of the principles for which we all stand?"

"The political life of the League is suspended; but there is preserved to-day a small nucleus of officials, faithful servants of the League, who are maintaining that tradition and who are prepared to hand on the baton to a post-war generation when the time comes,

with all the records of the League in order. There remain, too, at Geneva, the greater part of the technical services of the League—the Health Section with its epidemiological service which is sorely needed to-day; the Opium and Social Sections; and a part of my own department."

### Mr. Winant

"No one who looks ahead to the social problems which war, whatever its results, brings in its train could consider without grave disquiet any lessening of the influence of the International Labour Organisation as a mechanism uniquely fitted to meet post-war problems.

"Calls on the International Labour Office have been more frequent in time of war and crisis than in the past. . . . One of the men in our Office appeared for six weeks before the British Parliaments to testify in regard to changes in their Social Security Act. The same official has advised the Government of the United States, and appeared only last week in Ottawa before one of your Committees.

"Plans for the future are now taking definite shape. The holding of an International Labour Conference is under consideration and preparations for it are under way. A session of the Governing Body might be held at the same time. Other meetings are being scheduled.

"We in the International Labour Organisation know that the world to-day is interdependent, and that the future of the I.L.O. and of all of us here is involved in the fight of the people of Great Britain, the Dominions and other

(Continued on Page 14, Col. 2.)



## FROM "HEADWAY'S" POST-BAG

### An International Air Force

Sir,—May I comment on the Master of Balliol's views on this point? I admit that an international air force needs a great deal of thinking out; but I do not admit that he who has command of it is sovereign. What I infer from the course of the present war is that an air force by itself cannot win a war, though victory is impossible without it. For a decision a land force is required which it is not proposed that the League should have. The air force, in other words, could not overwhelm any Great Power without the general concurrence of the rest; but it could make it pretty well impossible for aggression to succeed. This is what we all want, but it is a long way short of federal union. Such union is only possible between States that trust each other; but what we need is a working arrangement between States that do not.

J. WALLIS CHAPMAN.

Loughborough.

### Ethiopia

Sir,—To me, and doubtless to thousands of others, there is something sinister about the precautionary note at the head of Miss Pankhurst's article in April *Headway* on "Ethiopia and Justice." Are we to infer that the League of Nations Union stands for less of justice for Ethiopia than Miss Pankhurst claims? Does the Union recognise a colour bar? Does it fail to appreciate the fact that the Emperor's rule in his own land and his attitude towards the obligations imposed by the League Covenant have been throughout wise, faithful and more truly Christian than that of almost any living white-skinned ruler; also that the Ethiopian people, in spite of injustices that we and others have heaped upon them during this century and the unspeakable sufferings inflicted on them by their white-skinned "civilisers," have

shown marvellous restraint compared with many European peoples? They were first and longest in the field resisting aggression. Does the Union concur in the obstinate refusal of our Government or/and the B.B.C. to recognise the status of the Ethiopians as allies at least as honourable as those who have gone under within a few weeks or months?

Is the policy of the League of Nations Union controlled or coloured by some of the nineteenth century die-hards and left-overs, who still believe that exploitation is good respectable business, especially if applied to dark-skinned folk?

If the L.N.U. stands for less than even-handed justice, freedom and self-determination for *all* much of its usefulness will be marred.

(Mrs.) C. I. MATTHEWS.

Farnborough.

*(The L.N.U. to-day, as in the past, is a staunch champion of Ethiopia's rights. Even among friends of Ethiopia, however, there is room for difference as to details; and our note simply indicated that Miss Pankhurst had been allowed to express her personal opinions freely.—ED.)*

### Let the People Know

Sir,—Cannot we do more to let the people know of the idea and ideals of the League? Every bookshop is cluttered up with booklets touching numerous aspects of international policy. Many of these books deal with history and emphasise some failures of the League. Cannot headquarters produce a "Penguin" written in the popular style appealing to the masses and stressing the *future* rather than the *past*? Suggested titles:—

"The League and Life—To-morrow."

"You Can't Kill The League."

"The League Can Lift The World."

"The Lighthouse For Mankind—The League."

A. FULLER,

Chairman, Letchworth L.N.U. Branch.