

29 JUL 1942

# HEADWAY

## IN WAR-TIME

*The Journal of the League of Nations Union*

No. 31

APRIL 1942

PRICE 3d

### EDITORIAL

## SPRING OFFENSIVE

*Surely long days of hardihood and toil  
Well wrought, in man or woman, are the soil  
The best fruit springs from.*

EURIPIDES

Winter has broken, and there is an expectation of urgent events in the air. Although, under modern conditions, no "close season" in the waging of hostilities can be counted upon by belligerent nations, the tempo of the war as a whole has undoubtedly been slowed down by the exceptionally hard and prolonged winter. Britain's plans for a continued and continuously heavier aerial offensive against Germany, for example, were put out of joint by the most unfavourable spell of flying weather recorded in recent times. Hitler, notoriously, blames the Russian winter for the signal failure of the German forces to clinch the victory which, he had boasted too soon, was within their grasp. The Russians, who for their part have been making the best possible use of their opportunities, could no doubt furnish alternative explanations. Leaders and people alike refuse to be unduly perturbed by the threatened spring offensive which the Nazis, both to keep up the spirits of their own people and as a weapon in the war of nerves, have been boosting with all the resources of their propaganda machine.

Something, of course, is brewing be-

hind this smoke screen of words. For good or ill, the finer months ahead are certain to see fierce activity on the established battlefields coupled, in all probability, with the opening up of fresh areas of combat. The Germans, if Dr. Benes of Czechoslovakia is a reliable judge, are staking everything on their spring offensive; the vital stage of the war lies ahead of them and us. Where exactly they intend to strike the next few weeks will probably reveal. Our Russian allies appear to anticipate the south, as there the potential gains for the aggressor would be highest. In that event, the Middle East will assuredly come into the forefront of the picture. Further, if (as reported) General Rommel has been visiting Berlin and Rome, we should be prepared for lively developments in Libya. On any or all of these fronts, the most effective counter would be for the Allies to get in their blows first. But, as we know, our resources have had to be stretched to meet vastly extended responsibilities in all quarters of the globe. That, unfortunately, leaves the enemy with plenty of scope for taking the initiative.

In the Far East, where the Japanese



have seized key-point after key-point with relentless speed, audacity and efficiency, only the heroism of heavily outnumbered Allied forces has redeemed the sorry tale of disasters. There the hope lies that the day may not be too far distant when the Allies will be able to meet the Japanese on more even terms, especially on the sea and in the air.

Meanwhile, these events in distant seas have inexorably necessitated a tightening of belts at home. Small enough in themselves as are the latest restrictions and disciplines imposed, they should be an incentive to the total effort which the present situation demands—that total effort which no material compulsion can command, springing as it does from the heart and spirit of men and women. That the Allied cause will prevail none of us doubts. But have we the will so to mobilise all our material and moral strength that victory will be secured as quickly as possible and with the least “muddling through”? A positive goal—a constructive aim at the end of the war—is needed to stimulate the maximum “drive.”

“Ideals wither and grow stale if they are not progressively renewed and translated into the concrete.” Thus declared *The Times* in its striking leading article on March 13th, urging that the present mood of the nation demanded a plan now for a new order and leaders who could proclaim that goal with all the passion of preaching a crusade.

Surely this is the call to the spirit, to which the British nation and our Allies will most surely respond. More than ever is it the duty and the privilege of the League of Nations Union and its members to see to it that ideals which we have nurtured and cherished through sunshine and storm do not wither in the weariness of protracted battle. The Union’s responsibility to-

day is as great as it was in that critical period of the Battle of Britain, when our membership armed with faith and knowledge played so conspicuous a part in keeping up the morale of the people. This, then, is the time for our spring offensive. Let us go to it with sure, unshaken purpose.

## SHIFTING THE BLAME

Evidence is continually reaching us of a new and fairly widespread campaign throughout the country, the object of which seems to be to discredit the League of Nations and the Union in the eyes of the public. Certain speakers, including some with eminent names and titles, are trying to make the Union the scapegoat for Great Britain’s unpreparedness for the present war and, indeed, for her becoming involved in war at all.

In this connection a letter written by Lord Baldwin when Prime Minister, to the Conservative candidate at the Skipton Bye-Election in November, 1933, is not without interest. Denying that the Conservative Party did not believe in peace and disarmament, Mr. Stanley Baldwin wrote:—

“We, as a nation, have set an example to the world by disarming to the utmost length compatible with national security, and I would point out in this connection that this disarmament was carried out almost entirely by the Conservative Government and the Coalition Government in which the Conservative Party predominated.”

We would only add that the L.N.U., standing consistently for the all-round limitation and reduction of armaments by international agreement, never at any time advocated one-sided disarmament by Britain as an example.

# LIFE IN FRANCE TO-DAY

By MADAME MALEWSKY-MALEVITCH

(Our contributor, formerly Princess Zenaide Schakowskoy, was living in Belgium at the outbreak of war and volunteered as a nurse in a military hospital. On the collapse of Belgium, she stayed behind to look after the wounded, but later made her way into France. Leaving Paris last November, she eventually got to Lisbon, and recently reached this country.)

Since national unity no longer exists in France, it is difficult for us to consider her as a whole; and it is with sadness that, in weighing so-called “free” France—Vichy France—against occupied France, we give preference to the latter. The more one goes up towards the North, to the prohibited areas, to the coast and to the frontiers which are daily crossed by hundreds of fugitives, the clearer it becomes that the difficulties and dangers, far from breaking resistance, provoke it and that morally speaking the only dangerous enemy is the enemy from within.

Are the French “collaborators”? I think that the general answer of all those who have lived in France during this latter period, and who have mingled intimately in the life of the French people, would be the same as mine—95 per cent are NOT. Does that mean that this 95 per cent. are friendly towards England? I should not venture to answer in the affirmative. They are against the Germans, and victories won over the Germans (no matter who wins them) delight the French—and humiliate them at the same time. It is this humiliation, the constant reminder of their own defeat, which prevents the French from choosing their friends. This 5 per cent. of collaborators are to be found among the upper and lower middle classes and, to a very small degree, among the intelligentsia. Above all, the big industrial concerns are affected. Interest and ideology—sometimes, indeed most frequently, the one determining the other! The fear of com-

munism—as before the war—still causes the ruling classes to forget everything, even their duty to their country.

This proportion changes a little in the unoccupied zone. The *Légion Nationale*, that embryo of the French Nazi Party, and the *Compagnons de France*\* which are its preparatory stage, raise the collaborators to 15 per cent. But there, as elsewhere, the people, the mass of working-class men and women, are resolutely against not only the Germans but also the Marshal.

Pétain, whom in occupied France they are inclined to think of as an “old soft-head,” nevertheless plays a sinister part, cloaking under his title of “Marshal of France” the subversive actions of those who are dragging France entirely into German bondage. Darlan is less universally hated and despised than Laval. I should not even be surprised if he were to succeed in handing over the whole of the French fleet to the Germans without stirring up a revolt.† A large number of the senior officers of the Navy support him. The Chief of the Paris Police is an Admiral, and at Vichy Darlan gave the important posts to the Navy. Never has the French fleet played so large—and so sad—a part in the political destiny of its country.

\* This must not be confused with *Les Chantiers de Jeunesse*, which have taken the place of compulsory military service.

† Even though I think this an unlikely action on his part. The interest Vichy has in the eyes of the Germans is centred in the Colonies and the Fleet. In handing over the Fleet, Vichy would be handing over itself.



### Prisons

In both zones the prisons are full. Offences are many and varied, politics and the black market furnishing the greatest number. Thefts are also clearly on the increase. The labour camps, concentration camps and reprisal camps—from which hostages are drawn and put to death—are also full. There is a large number of miners in the prisons of the non-occupied zone. At Aix I saw some Belgian prisoners ranging from 16 to 18 years of age, and the Naval Prison at Toulon harboured for some time two Belgian boys aged respectively 12 and 17.

The Germans are organised and methodical in that as in other things, and every offence has its own special punishment. An anarchy that is by no means lenient reigns in Vichy France. The severity of the punishments depends on the zeal or the humanity of the judges, and the carrying out of the punishment on the humanity of the officials. Personally I have nothing but praise for the *procureurs*, examining magistrates, and the prison warders whom I met when I was concerned with Belgian prisoners in the South of France. Individually the Frenchman has remained a decent fellow; it is possible to explain many things to him and to make him understand them.

A new law also punishes all those who do not denounce political offences whether committed or about to be committed, including criticism of the policy of the Government.

### Material Living Conditions

The economic breakdown of France was extremely rapid. In June, 1940, the Germans entered into a flourishing country, with reserves which would certainly have been sufficient to feed the population of France for two or three years. Month by month, poverty degenerated into misery. Famine—as understood by those who saw the great

Russian famine of 1918-20—does not exist: to start, it has taken the form of under-nourishment. Later, maybe, it will have left its mark on children and young people for life. Tuberculosis will certainly be on the increase. Nevertheless it is undeniable that the revival of a national feeling, in France as in Belgium, is largely due to these material trials. France is paying, and paying dearly, for her deviations from the right path.

Food supplies vary slightly according to districts, even though officially the rations are the same. In Paris there is more fish than in Marseilles; Grenoble is more plentifully supplied with meat; there are eggs and butter in the Loire district, and in Provence there is that fruit which Paris only dreams about; at Sète, in the province of Herault, fish alone is obtainable—no vegetables, no meat, no wine. All this, no doubt, is a question of transport and of bad inter-departmental distribution.

Last summer, potatoes having been rationed to 2 kilogrammes a month and the sale of rice, macaroni and spaghetti forbidden, the only basic foodstuff was the daily 250 grammes of bread and the most common vegetables—*rutabaga* (a kind of turnip known as Swedish turnip) which had made its appearance during the last war.

Here is a typical meal obtainable at a small Parisian working man's restaurant at a cost of 12 francs: Clear soup, 60 or 90 grammes of meat or fish, with a very small quantity of vegetables cooked in water, hazel nuts. If no meat is included in the meal, 20 grammes of cheese is allowed. Food tickets have to be given up at these restaurants (5 or 10 grammes of fats). There is a great scarcity of edible fats, which causes the nails and hair to break and the skin to become scaly. Milk is delivered only to old people and children. No tea is to be had. People are allowed 125 grammes of a mixture of coffee and coffee sub-

stitute, and 500 grammes of sugar a month. Pastries are no longer allowed—only small tarts filled with dates or dried figs, and jam made from grape sugar.

In cafés, coffee is forbidden after 3 o'clock in the afternoon. Only *tisanes* (a kind of herb tea) are available. There are alcoholless days, and hours when the *apéritif* cannot be bought; and wine, so to speak, is not to be had in the beautiful country of France.

### Soap

Lack of soap is extremely distressing to people of our day. The French ration is clearly insufficient and emollients lack fatty substances. In few restaurants are cloths to be seen on the tables. Sheets in the hotels are more often ironed than washed after being used by clients making a short stay. Scabies is assuming plague proportions in some towns in the South.

### Tobacco

Together with soap, it is the shortage of tobacco which is telling most on people's nerves. Even anti-asthma cigarettes have disappeared from the chemists' shops. If by mistake or in a moment of forgetfulness, instead of putting the fag-end of your cigarette in the empty box you carry with you, you throw it away, it isn't a tramp who stoops to pick it up but a well-dressed gentleman.

### Clothes

France is still the most elegant country in Europe and the French, very ingenious where fashions are concerned, have found materials to help them out—e.g., wood for shoes, raffia for bags and hats. The big dress-making houses are allowed to sell without points—partly to preserve the traditions of good dressmaking and partly, perhaps, to dress the German ladies who come to Paris!

Fur coats are equally free of points

—but there are no fur coats! You have to give up a voucher for shoes—but, again, it is virtually impossible to get even one pair of walking shoes in decent condition.

### Transport

Trains are few, and the crowds of people travelling are tremendous. On the P.L.M. line, for example, going from Marseilles to Lyon or from Lyon to Nice, unless you reserve a seat several days in advance you have to stand. The buses, which are gas-driven, do not run on Sundays. Private cars have virtually disappeared from the roads. In Paris, where the *Metro* (Underground) is the quickest way of getting about, may be seen horse cabs, two-seater electric cars, motor bicycles, with every conceivable kind of trailer for suitcases and parcels. Here, as elsewhere, French ingenuity is astonishing.

## DOPE DEFERRED

Recent reports reaching the League Organisation which deals with the Traffic in Dangerous Drugs, from Rhodesia and Aden, allude to illicit traffic in certain intoxicating drugs made out of Indian Hemp. Their native names are Dagga, Ganja and Bhang. We trust that there is no "Wynken, Blynken and Nod" about their suppression!

### KENSINGTON BRANCH

On April 15 at 5.30 p.m.

At Essex Unitarian Church Hall,  
Palace Gardens Terrace, W.8

SIR FRANCIS

YOUNGHUSBAND, K.C.S.I.,

will give an address on

"BRITAIN, INDIA & CHINA:  
How Can They Draw Together?"

Members of Other Branches Welcome



## WORLD AFFAIRS IN PARLIAMENT

By OWEN A. RATTENBURY

It is hard to decide whether the coming or going of Sir Stafford Cripps to Parliament has given the more relief. In the terrible war circumstances, when almost overnight we have (temporarily we hope) lost a large portion of the Empire, the coming of this confident, earnest, smiling figure as Leader of the House had the same heartening effect as the Prime Minister's advent into power after Dunkirk.

Even Japan's capture of Hong Kong, Malaya, Singapore, its acquirement of tin, rubber, oil in the Far East—scorched earth notwithstanding, the potentialities of almost unlimited supplies are there—were offset by this return of our ambassador from Russia. Were there doubts about Russia? I think there were. But the confidence of Cripps—not in anything he said publicly in Parliament, but his very bearing—seemed to settle those doubts. Cripps knew! His dwelling in Russia for so long had given him the necessary knowledge. He was no sentimentalist. He was known as one of the greatest lawyers in the land—perhaps the very greatest—a man of logical mind, succinct in expression, analytical of evidence, capable of sticking to his position to the extent of being excommunicated from his own party. And this man's bearing was that of confidence. He addressed members privately in one of the large committee rooms and it was crowded out. His welcome to the front bench as Leader of the House was not noisy, but it was unanimous.

Then a week or two later there has developed the threat to India. There has come Chiang Kai-shek's visit to India, his interview with the recently released prisoner Nehru, the tying-up of our interests with Chinese interests, the questioning as to whether Moslem and Hindu are after all irreconcilable, the expectation of a declaration of Government policy from Mr. Churchill,

the doubt as to whether a united policy can be proclaimed. On March 10th the Leader of the House promised that on the morrow Mr. Churchill would make a statement. It was obvious from Sir Stafford's bearing that the declaration would have his approval. He was known to be friendly with Chiang Kai-shek and with Pandit Nehru. Did it mean surrender to the Congress? Hardly that, one thought! Neither Churchill nor Cripps was quite so crude as that.

### A Unanimous Conclusion

Next morning we understood. The Government had come to a unanimous conclusion. The terms of that conclusion could not be stated. The House at once realised the value of Mr. Churchill's wish (the Cabinet's wish) to see how it was taken by the people on the spot before announcing the full terms. The Government had decided to send a member of the Cabinet to consult all shades of opinion, to implement the arrangement made by the Government and to have plenary powers to alter the terms if necessary. The man to go was Sir Stafford Cripps. He had the full confidence of the Cabinet. The House showed that he too had the full confidence of the House. So the House loses its leader after but one speech of importance—but a speech of very great importance as will be proved in future Home affairs. In his place for the time being we have the Foreign Secretary—another man whose respect for Parliamentary discussion is recognized by everyone. The House is sorry to lose Sir Stafford Cripps so soon after his appointment, but it recognizes the facts of the situation. He is so eminently suitable as envoy extraordinary in this particular set of circumstances that there could be no second thoughts on the wisdom of the Cabinet in allowing him to go.

### Japanese Atrocities

The new Leader of the House had a terrible story to tell on the day before his appointment as Leader. The Japanese atrocities in Hong Kong had been the occasion of questions before, but the Government felt that until they had absolute proof of the truth of the allegations it was better to say nothing, for, of course, those who have been so brutally treated have anxious relatives in this country. It is unfortunately true. Mr. Jack Lawson commented with his question as to whether the B.B.C. would let the Germans and the Italians know how the new order is working with their new Ally. Mr. Eden promised the widest possible publicity. Anxiety was expressed about the position of people under the Japanese heel in Malaya and Singapore. Perhaps not enough attention has been drawn to a very significant part of Mr. Eden's statement:

"The Japanese army at Hong Kong perpetrated against their helpless military prisoners and the civil population, without distinction of race or colour, the same kind of barbarities which aroused the horror of the civilized world at the time of the Nanking massacre of 1937." Yet somehow that same civilized world continued to send supplies of scrap iron, rubber, oil and other war materials to Japan, and to derive profit from the supply of those materials. Not nations, of course, but nationals of those civilized nations!

This sentence of Mr. Eden's seems to make still more evident the mutual interest in the opposing of an efficient barbarism by Britain, America, China and Russia—for indeed there is little that the Japanese barbarians have done in Hong Kong that has not been done by the German barbarians in occupied Russia and by the Italian barbarians in Abyssinia.

### The "Struma"

The sinking of the *Struma* with 769 passengers on board, including 270 women and children, has naturally given much occasion for question in the House. She was a converted yacht of

about 200 tons. Flying the Panamanian flag she left Constanza, the Roumanian port on the Black Sea last October with 769 Jews on board, trying to effect their entry "illegally" into Palestine. She reached the Turkish Istanbul in December, when she was described as badly overcrowded, and repairs to her engines had to be effected. The Turkish authorities announced that the passengers could not be allowed to remain in Turkey. The Palestine Government, backed by Britain, made it clear that they could not be admitted to Palestine. On February 23rd the Turkish Government sent the vessel back to the Black Sea. She sank next day as a result of an explosion five miles from the entrance to the Bosphorus. She may have struck a mine or been torpedoed, as a Turkish vessel was about that time. Mr. Lipson pointed out that if the ship had been an enemy ship, German, Italian or Japanese, those on board would have been interned. Was not a policy of that kind better than exposing them to danger? Mr. Macmillan promised to lay all the points in the questions before Lord Cranborne, who is the Colonial Secretary. The answering of these questions by Mr. Macmillan suggests that the defence is on the question of the refusal to allow these Jews to go to Palestine—a perfectly legal refusal, possibly necessary, but giving grave concern to many in view of the terrible treatment to which our enemies have subjected the Jews for so many years.

During the month other matters which have exercised the minds of questioners have been first as to whether we are fighting the German people or the Hitlerites, brought out especially in approval of Premier Stalin's statement to the effect that we are trying to destroy not the people but the Nazis\*; the hope

(Continued on page 11)

\*Stalin said: "The war may result in the destruction of Hitler's clique, but it would be ridiculous to identify Hitler's clique with the German people and the German State."



## WHAT RUSSIA WANTS

By J. T. MURPHY

(Author of *Russia on the March*, *New Horizons* and other books on modern Russia)

Since the Red Army turned from the defensive to the offensive, and week by week has steadily pushed back the German forces from their advanced positions, new questions have begun to stir the minds of many people. Some are asking "Will the Russians, if they succeed in driving the Germans out of Russia, stop at their old frontiers and made a new pact with Hitler Germany?" Others are asking "Will the Red Army overrun all Europe and impose Bolshevism everywhere?" There are still others who ask, "Will Russia and Britain after the defeat of Nazi Germany agree about the kind of Germany which will succeed that of the Nazis?"

### Doubts and Fears

It is not difficult to recognise whence these questions arise. All of them reflect the doubts and fears arising from the political and social conflicts of the last quarter of a century. The first, of course, reflects the resentment and distrust of Russia caused by the Soviet-Nazi Pact of 1939. The second is a recrudescence of the old fears of the spread of the revolution of 1917 and formed the basis of the interventionist war against the Soviets from 1918 to 1922. The third reflects the deep consciousness which exists everywhere of the fundamental differences in the political and social systems of the two countries, and a feeling of incompatibility about their alliance for the common purpose of defeating the Nazi-Fascist combination. The differences are so strongly felt that it is feared that the Allies are bound to disagree concerning

the kind of Germany which must arise from the ashes of the Nazi régime.

The satisfaction that was felt by most people after Mr. Eden's visit to Moscow has not overshadowed these questions, and the more the surprising power of Soviet Russia has been revealed to the people of this country in the successes attending the Russian offensive, the more frequently are these questions asked. I doubt whether they will completely subside until some more precise agreement has been made between the Allies. At the same time I am sure that such an agreement is not beyond possibility. Indeed it should follow easily and logically from the declarations of all the Governments concerned.

### A Lesson from Experience

The days when revolutionary Russia sought to defend itself by the extension of insurrectionary action to the working-class of Europe passed away with the cessation of the war of intervention in 1922. Even before that, however, the Bolsheviks rejected the idea of imposing socialism or sovietism by military intervention on the part of the Red Army. Whatever the subsequent deviations from that theoretical position the rejection of the policy of imposing socialism by military adventure became practically axiomatic after the Russian-Polish War of 1920-21. Lenin frankly admitted that this particular aspect of the Russian-Polish War was a blunder not to be repeated. When the Red Army beat back the Polish invader and rushed towards Warsaw the Polish workers and peasants did not gladly welcome the Red Army as some of the Bolshevik leaders had anticipated. They rallied behind Pilsudsky who, with

French support, beat back the Red Army. That lesson has not been forgotten.

From the end of the intervention period at the close of 1922 and the establishment of formal diplomatic relations between the Soviet Government and most of the Governments of Europe, the propagation of the theories of revolution has been relegated to the Communist International, and the Government of Russia has stood firmly on the basis of legalised national State relations with other Powers. Of course, it was not satisfied with its frontiers, especially in the west, and was considerably embittered with the loss of Bessarabia. Nevertheless it could do little about the frontier question for lack of power. At that time a great deal of its economy was in ruins. Production in industry had fallen to unprecedented low levels. Indeed I think it is true to say that Soviet Russia's foreign policy for the last twenty years, starting with the catastrophic position of 1922, has been governed by the need for time to transform Russia into a mighty industrial power. It played for time in foreign affairs and raced against time in home affairs. At no time did the Bolsheviks regard this period as anything other than a breathing space between two wars. Their task was to make it as long as possible.

### Behind the Pact

It was this fact which lay behind the Soviet-Nazi Pact of 1939 and not any community of interest between Nazism and Communism such as some people most mistakenly assumed and almost led us into a war against Nazi Germany and Bolshevik Russia at one and the same time. By the Pact they secured a further eighteen months in which to intensify their preparations for the war which they knew they could not escape. Almost immediately after signing the pact with Germany they extended the

working day from seven to eight hours and launched a diplomatic offensive on the Border States culminating in the war with Finland. That offensive was governed more by military considerations than any other as subsequent events have so eloquently and emphatically demonstrated, when the major war burst upon Russia.

The line then established from Murmansk in the far north to the shores of Bessarabia in the south revealed what frontiers Russia regards as essential for her safety from a military point of view. There may be modifications with regard to Poland, although the frontier of 1940 was practically the same as that known as the Curzon Line which the Allies proposed in earlier years. One thing is certain, Russia victorious over Germany and her allies will not tolerate the fixing of a frontier which is strategically disadvantageous to herself. Russia wants a frontier easy to defend, and which, if need be, she can make impregnable. This she had already marked out by her actions in 1939 and 1940.

### No Truce with Nazism

With her own frontiers clearly set out the way is clear for the application of the principle of self-determination of nations to which Russia has consistently adhered since 1922. Russia has approved the Atlantic Charter which again affirms this principle and the right of every people to determine also their own social system. This, of course, is sound just so long as the nature of the social system which a country adopts can permit the application of this principle of self-determination. Nazism, however, rules out such a principle. As Mr. Rattenbury pointed out in his article in HEADWAY of February, 1942, it is part of the Nazi creed not to stay at home. It can be taken for granted that the Bolsheviks understand this too,

(Continued on page 12.)



## UP AND DOWN THE COUNTRY

Up to the time of going to press, speakers have been provided by Headquarters for more meetings in March, 1942, than in any month since the outbreak of war. Space, unfortunately, does not allow of a complete chronicle of all these meetings here; we are only able to quote from a number of reports sent in by local Branches.

Speakers from America, Yugoslavia, Poland, Free France, Norway and other countries have been provided by Headquarters for meetings of our own Branches and other organisations.

Addressing the annual meeting of the TAUNTON BRANCH, the Dean of Chichester declared that the present war was due to certain quite elementary human defects—chiefly ignorance and selfishness. There were two ways of trying to deal with the war problem, either to prevent it or to avoid it. The attempts of each country to avoid war for itself had frustrated the League and made a world war inevitable. The outstanding hope for a better order after the war had been given to us in the Atlantic Charter. Mr. Lloyd Fox was unanimously elected President of the Branch in succession to Mr. T. S. Penny, who is nearly ninety years of age. The Hon. Secretary reported on the Study Circle, which at its regular monthly meetings has been discussing many aspects of world settlement and is preparing to go on to the economic side. Bishop Fox's Junior Branch has held American and Russian evenings and film shows, as well as hearing papers on such subjects as Malaya and the International Labour Organisation.

Dr. Pepich from Yugoslavia, who spoke at the annual meeting of the GODALMING BRANCH, greatly moved the audience with the unhappy story about the sufferings of his country which he had to tell. This is one of our good Branches, which has actually increased its membership in the past year.

Dr. L. J. Sudjich addressed two meetings in Scotland on "Yugoslavia"—a luncheon meeting in EDINBURGH and an evening public meeting at STIRLING. Both were a great success, and arrangements are being made for a further visit from

Dr. Sudjich to Scottish Branches in the near future.

A great "Warship Week" parade in the town did not mar the attendance at the WEST HARTLEPOOL BRANCH'S meeting when Dr. Dawson spoke on "Germany Now and After the War," under the chairmanship of Dr. Pallister Barkas, M.A., Ph.D. Dr. Dawson said that this was one of the most inspiring meetings at which he had ever spoken.

The energy and enterprise of our WITHINGTON BRANCH are well illustrated by the full programme which they are maintaining. Since the 1941 Annual General Meeting, the following public meetings have been held:—Mr. W. Horsfall Carter on "Wings over Europe"; Mr. P. M. Oliver on "The I.L.O. in the Post-War World"; Mr. N. W. Jacobs on "Palestine"; Miss Roland and Mr. L. F. Behrens on "The League of Nations and Federal Union"; Professor Hicks on "The Nation-State after Hitler"; Professor Fleure on "The Peasantry in East Central Europe"; Professor Ritchie on "Collective Security"; Mrs. Coatman on "India at War"; Mr. W. Fitzgerald on "Russia"; and Mr. David Warnock on "Social and Economic Reconstruction." Dr. C. J. Wright was the preacher at the Annual United Service. On May 4 Dr. Lincoln Ralphs will speak on the "Present Situation in Europe and Beyond," and on June 1 Professor Bullock will take as his subject "The Political System of the U.S.A."

The Rotary Club of ORPINGTON, one of the many which are preparing reports on post-war reconstruction, heard a talk from the Editor of "Headway" on this subject in relation to the League. Inaugurating a discussion group at the new OAKWOOD NATIONAL YOUTH CENTRE, Mr. Aldous spoke on "The Role of Youth in the World of To-day and Tomorrow." He also addressed the PORTSMOUTH HIGH SCHOOL (at Petersfield) on "Some Aspects of Social and Economic Reconstruction," the Annual Meeting of the LINGFIELD BRANCH on "The Atlantic Charter" and the REIGATE Discussion Group on "Post-War Economic Problems."

NEW EARSWICK BRANCH is coming towards the end of a very successful series of meetings on "The Historical Foundations of a New World Order." These have not only helped to keep the membership together, but have actually gained seven new members.

Speaking at the L.R.F. Sandwich Luncheon on March 17, Miss Sophie Tichfield (Secretary of the Polish Research Centre) gave an address on her country packed with information and enlivened with humour. At the next Luncheon on April 15, Mrs. Corbett Ashby will talk on the Atlantic Charter.

CLAPHAM BRANCH has been carrying on despite exceptional difficulties, notably the removal of a large part of the membership to less blitzed neighbourhoods. The small attendance at the Annual Meetings led the local newspaper to assume that the membership was a dead one. This gave Mr. Landon, the local Secretary, the chance to tell newspaper readers "more about it."

Mr. John T. Catterall, Headquarters speaker, has addressed a series of Branch and Rotary Club meetings in the South-West of England, and has spent a week in Northamptonshire talking to L.N.U. Branches, schools and Rotary Clubs. An encouraging feature of Mr. Catterall's meetings for L.N.U. Branches is the enrolment of new members. Our NUNEATON Secretary writes that "Mr. Catterall's service was given immense praise by all who heard him and another early visit would be appreciated. Can you arrange for him to come again in April?" "We were very glad to have the opportunity

of hearing such an able lecturer," says our CHARLBURY Secretary. "He has put fresh heart into those of us who believe in the future of the League." When Mr. Catterall spoke on "Russia"—a country of which he has intimate first-hand knowledge—at the Annual Meeting of the LANCING BRANCH, music was provided by the Downlands Male Voice Singers.

Branches wishing to have Mr. Catterall speak for them during the next few months are asked to make early application to Headquarters. During the summer, he will be available for open-air meetings as well as for indoor gatherings.

Evidence still comes steadily along that, where there are willing collectors, members have no hesitation in paying their subscriptions. Thus one WORCESTERSHIRE Secretary writes:—"While I was collecting, I was surprised to find that all the members paid up willingly, and seemed quite pleased to see me."

*This month it is intended to resume the holding of open-air meetings in Hyde Park with an L.N.U. Speaker.*

*Local Branches, we hope, will also take advantage of the warmer weather and longer hours of daylight to organise open-air meetings in their own areas. Headquarters will gladly help in securing speakers for such meetings.*

## WORLD AFFAIRS IN PARLIAMENT

(Continued from page 7.)

that somehow food supplies can be sent to Greece without their being stolen by Germany—a hope for which the Minister of Economic Warfare announced that the Government were prepared to take risks; the Atlantic Charter and its bearings on British possessions; the obvious indifference of native races in Malaya and in a lesser degree in Burma

to our interests and its implications of a failure in our administration in the past.

In this connection it was interesting to note that Mr. Amery (who however is not a member of the Cabinet) made a categorical denial to Mr. Sorensen's question as to whether Sir Stafford Cripps would be empowered during his visit to India to communicate with political leaders in Burma who also have democratic aspirations.



## TWO BRIGHT IDEAS

THE ST. IVES BRANCH (Cornwall) recently tried an experiment which succeeded so well that we report it, in the hope that other Branches may be encouraged to follow suit. Several schools, including two well-known girls' schools, have migrated to St. Ives during the war. So, in the Guildhall, with the active co-operation of the Headmaster and Headmistresses, a meeting on the Atlantic Charter was arranged for 250 boys and girls. Each point of the Charter was dealt with in short speeches from eight of the girls, whose ages ranged from 14 to 17. The third speaker was a Polish girl who, although she had been in this country only three years, spoke faultless English. After these girls had done their job, a member of the Branch (Mr. W. Arnold-Forster) summed up.

A correspondent informs us that the speeches collectively gave "a pretty good estimate of the broad implications of the Charter," and adds that "it is a healthy sign that this sort of thing should be happening in England now." We agree, and gladly give publicity to this novel venture. Why not organise something along these lines in other Branches? Care should be

### WHAT RUSSIA WANTS

(Continued from page 9.)

and that they cannot and will not attempt to come to terms with Nazism. Stalin once remarked in his usual downright way, "The Nazis asked for a war of annihilation. We will give them one." Such a war does not necessarily stop at the German frontiers. It is possible that as the war reaches the German frontiers the German people may dispose of Nazism. Should they not do so, then it will be necessary for the Russians to march over the German frontier, and there can be little doubt of their determination so to do.

It should not be forgotten, however, that both our own Government and the Russians are pledged not to make a

taken not to prompt the students too much—help might be confined to suggesting questions to which they ought to find an answer. A few mistakes (such as there were at St. Ives) don't matter.

LETCWORTH BRANCH aroused enormous interest, and secured splendid publicity in the Press, by running a "Brains Trust" meeting, in public but along B.B.C. lines. The four members of the Trust were a Member of Parliament, a young schoolmaster interested in international affairs, the Vice-Chairman of the Branch who is Director of a local factory, and a lady with great experience of international work among youth—plus the Branch Chairman as Question Master. In advance, through the Press and otherwise, Letchworth citizens were asked to send in their questions, the only stipulation being that they must be connected with international affairs. Fourteen questions were answered in 70 minutes. When at the end the members of the audience were asked whether they would like a repeat performance, there was a unanimous response of "Yes"; and another "Brains Trust" has been arranged for April 15.

separate peace. The question therefore comes home to us for us to make up our minds on the question of the future of Germany. The Russians are determined that their frontiers of 1940 shall be in the main restored and strengthened. They believe in the principle of the people of each country deciding for themselves as to the kind of political and social system they desire. They are determined, however, that the Nazi system shall be destroyed. Are we equally determined? If so, the sooner Mr. Eden and Stalin meet again and precisely implement the agreements in principle already welcomed by the people, the sooner will the doubts and fears of the questioning multitude be set at rest.

## BOOKS OF THE MONTH

**PROBLEMS OF THE DANUBE.** By C. A. Macartney. (Cambridge University Press, Current Problems Series, 3s. 6d.)

It is difficult to do justice in a short review to Mr. Macartney's brave, lucid and profoundly wise analysis of Danubian and Balkan problems. There are frequent changes in the leading parts for the historic drama he unfolds—the Ottoman Empire, the Hapsburg Monarchy, the 1918-38 genuine attempts by Danubian groups to organise national life from within, Germany's savage retort with conquest of the whole area for the benefit of her own *Volk*. But the plot remains the same—the human story of a mosaic-like area of peoples lying between Germany and Italy and Russia, who are neither Germans, Italians nor Russians, but have among themselves a deep-rooted desire to live their own lives free from outside domination.

And the future? The right solution here is enormously important for, as history proves to the hilt, vital world and Danubian interests coincide. Three things, Mr. Macartney suggests, are both supremely worth doing and not unrealisable. The political independence of the area must be secured from outside, by a reinforced League or Great Power guarantee. Inside, the peoples themselves, learning their lesson at last, must co-operate in an association covering at least defence, foreign policy and economics. But this must be *planned as a unit*, must be primarily (as in Germany or Russia) for the benefit of all its own people. Such would serve as an economic intermediary unit between Germany and Russia. Lastly, the Western World, which has so much at stake in Danubian stability, must be prepared to pay for it further with positive help to these peoples. No imperialism: but avowed constructive assistance, such as indispensable capital, more liberal emigration policies—and all this, again, on a *planned* basis.

Here is a new Eastern Europe, making good the key-failure of Versailles in not authoritatively advising these nations to set up a co-operation which would give them the advantages of a great commonwealth. What nonsense it is to say that we Allies have not now got a living, in-

spiring alternative to the slave-efficiency of Germany's domination.

G. DROMORE.

**SOVIET RUSSIA: An Introduction.** By K. Gibberd. (Royal Institute of International Affairs. 1s.)

Miss Gibberd's booklet makes an admirable third in the Trilogy on Russia—the other two being Sir Bernard Pares' "Russia" (Penguin) and Jennie Lee's "Our Ally Russia" (Hurricane book)—, which is indispensable fare for those—an encouraging and growing number to-day—who believe that one of the best ways to help post-war reconstruction is to do everything possible to understand Soviet Russia, the Russian people, and to get their vast social experiment more in its proper proportions. Into 78 pages Miss Gibberd has sifted and packed a mass of precisely the kind of information which is so helpful. She gives us facts, with conspicuous fairness. The credit side is not stinted; criticism when it is given is level-headed and constructive. And there is plenty of liveliness. The two chapters on "The Struggle for Prosperity and Security" and "Living Conditions in the U.S.S.R." are models of their kind. If only there were a like chapter on Russian Literature and Art, which have had a unique influence on Russian history and character! But perhaps a further booklet on this side of life will be forthcoming. There is an excellent short bibliography and map.

M. F.

**HOW RUSSIA PREPARED.** By Maurice Edelman. (Penguin Special, 6d.)

It is a patent fact that Russia provided Hitler with his biggest surprise, but the majority of people still do not understand how it was done. Here is a timely booklet, in which one with an intimate knowledge of Russia lets the layman into the secret. Step by step, and in all its stages, he describes the ultimate fruition of "defence in depth"—the creation of an Eastern defence industry in self-contained duplication of the Western industries. The boldness and resolution with which the scheme was conceived and carried out blinded the outside world—not least Hitler. German engineers, deliberately



kept west of the Urals, could report back only on what they were allowed to see. In due course, the Luftwaffe struck at the western airfields, but only the fringe of the Red Air Force system was destroyed. As the Nazis advanced over scorched earth, "leap frog" industries retired as arranged. Though some cells were destroyed, the honeycomb remained. Today, "without black-out and without respite" in that great zone of interdependent war industry, the Soviet offensive to liberate the West is being prepared. Then there is Japan. The Soviet Government has regarded war in the East as inevitable, and its preparations will cutlast the longest war which Japan can wage. Nevertheless, if the young industries are to have every chance, Russia needs every machine tool, tank and aeroplane which Britain can spare. On post-war collaboration, Mr. Edelman believes that Russia's preparations for war will also serve the peace.

**THE BRITISH COLONIAL EMPIRE.** By W. E. Simnett. (Allen and Unwin, 8s. 6d.)

This rapid but extraordinarily comprehensive survey of the growth, methods of administration and prevailing conditions in some 40 British territories (with a chapter on French, Dutch, Belgian and Portuguese colonial systems) should be in the hands of all who are interested in the problem of Colonial Settlement. Without glossing over mistakes and shortcomings, the author has faith in the good qualities of British colonial administration. As regards the future, the collective responsibility of civilisation for the well-being of colonial peoples is by no means ignored. There are other colonial systems, and progress by one group cannot leave the others unaffected. Assuming that the principle of trusteeship is laid down for all, Britain should be able to submit her stewardship to the scrutiny of an enlarged Mandates Commission or World Colonial Court. Actual international administration, in Mr. Simnett's opinion, would be neither workable in practice nor in the best interests of the colonial peoples; but, by the co-operation and interchange of technicians and officials, colonial administration might well become increasingly cosmopolitan.

**VERSAILLES TWENTY YEARS AFTER.**

By Paul Birdsall. (Allen and Unwin, 15s.)

Across the Atlantic a vast amount of high quality research work is being done with an eye to the problems which will arise at the end of this war. Professor Birdsall's reappraisal of the last Peace Settlement has a practical as well as an academic interest. A legend has grown up, encouraged by German propaganda, that the Treaty of Versailles was wholly iniquitous both in conception and execution. The prosaic truth, we are shown, is that elements of good and bad were combined—there were Carthaginian and Wilsonian features. The author agrees with Harold Nicolson that the worst boundary decisions were due to sheer lack of co-ordination. At the same time, the British, French, Italian and Japanese delegations in varying degrees too often took the view that matters in which they were not directly interested were good counters to bargain with; while the Americans acquiesced, in the belief that the League of Nations and the new era would do the rest. This well documented survey certainly shows the mistakes to be avoided next time. Summing up, Professor Birdsall says that "a discriminating study of the League would suggest the value of beginning precisely where the League left off." The institutions and the principles of the Covenant are sound groundwork on which to build. American participation in the responsibilities of the settlement is much more likely to occur under the type of voluntary pledge contained in the Covenant than in the form of *Union Now*—or later.

**TREITSCHKE'S ORIGINS OF PRUSSIANISM.** Translated by Eden and Cedar Paul. (Allen and Unwin, 7s. 6d.)

More than mere historical interest attaches to the publication, in its first English translation, of this classic essay by the German historian and political writer who, in the words of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, "did more than anyone to mould the minds of the rising generation." Our present Prime Minister is a living illustration of how a historical sense can fit national leaders for grappling with the problems of the present day. For the historical background which it gives to Nazi Germany, Treitschke's work is important. But more than that, written as it was

eighty years ago before the author had really outgrown his earlier Liberalism, psychologists will find in it part at least of the explanation as to why Germany has been fruitful soil for militaristic adventurers culminating in the Nazis.

Two sides of Treitschke's personality clearly came into conflict in this book. The translators splendidly capture the romantic, idealistic mood which sometimes runs away with his pen. This will not do. As if to keep this other self in its place, he is continually at pains to stress the ruthlessness with which the Teutonic Knights pressed on in that "northward and eastward rush of the German spirit and the formidable activities of our people as conqueror, teacher, discipliner of its neighbours." None, he declares, can understand the innermost nature of the Prussian people "unless he has familiarised his mind with those pitiless racial conflicts whose vestiges . . . live on mysteriously in the habits of our people." Totalitarianism is foreshadowed in the "profound doctrine of the supreme value of the State, and of civic subordination to the purposes of the State, which the Teutonic Knights perhaps proclaimed more loudly and clearly than do any other voices speaking to us from the German past."

Some modern readers will find a prophetic application to the present situation in his judgment on the old battle of Tannenberg: "Thenceforward the Teutonic Knights had forfeited the prestige of invincibility which is half the power of a militarist State."

In their preface the translators add pertinent comments. The lesson to be learned from Treitschke is that no form of fanatical nationalism or racialism—German, Polish or other—is likely to lay the foundations of decent human behaviour. As a solution they urge a world where a new spirit prevails, a sort of universal New Deal. In that form, of course, their Utopia is vague and inadequate; but doubtless it was beyond their province to go into details.

L. R. A.

**SHALL OUR CHILDREN LIVE OR DIE?**

By Victor Gollancz. (Gollancz, 2s. 6d.)

"A reply to Vansittart on the German problem" is the author's sub-title—by which he means a reply not only to what Lord Vansittart actually wrote in "Black

Record," but to the whole gospel of hate and revenge which others have elaborated on that basis. The uneven development of capitalism made Germany an explosive force. She arrived late on the scene but forged ahead with terrific energy. "The very existence of Germany" was the cause of 20th century war scares and wars. To solve the German problem, it is necessary to break the alliance between militarists, industrialists and Junkers, and to bring about the total defeat of Hitlerite Germany *from within*. Mr. Gollancz gives telling quotations from Hitler, Goebbels, Himmler and others to show that the Nazis have a "fourth battlefield"—Inner Germany. Organised opposition is not yet, but it will develop. The Germans have acquired Prussian characteristics environmentally, but the history of the Soviet Union shows how rapidly men and women change in a new environment. Propaganda of hatred is bad, because it clouds judgment and prevents us from solving our problems in the light of reason. A crushing defeat of the Hitler war-machine is indispensable to what is to follow; but then we must help the German people to destroy the power of their own guilty men.

This is not the place to discuss the author's economic theories, intensely challenging as they are. His judgment on the Atlantic Charter is conditioned by his avowed socialism. "In economic and social matters," he agrees, "the aspirations of the Charter are progressive, and the only criticism that can be brought against them is that they are incapable of realisation without more radical change." Not so convincing is he when he construes the political clauses to imply that "because the League failed presumably all such attempts are now to be abandoned."

E. B.

**FOR THE LEAGUE**

In the Civil Estimates for 1942, the sum of £76,000 appears as Great Britain's annual contribution towards the cost of the League of Nations. We understand that the next Eire budget (to be introduced in May) will include £8,338 for the League.



## LONDON INTERNATIONAL ASSEMBLY

In the absence of Lord Cecil, M. Zaleski, President of the Polish Civil Chancellery and one of the Assembly's Vice-Presidents, took the chair at the February meeting. There was a further debate on Point III of the Atlantic Charter and it was decided to ask Commission 3 to study and report back to the Assembly on some of the issues raised; notably, the nature of the international obligations which those states to whom sovereignty is restored should be expected to undertake in common with others, and a proposal that the International Authority should require the maintenance of a democratic system in all states in order that their peoples might be really free to choose their governments.

At the March meeting the Headmaster of Rugby, Mr. P. H. B. Lyon, submitted for discussion the general proposition that "in order to increase the will-to-win of the United Nations and to lessen the vigour of their enemies, it is desirable that our peace aims should be more clearly and precisely stated."

There was a vigorous discussion in which speakers took part from the American, Australian, Belgian, Chinese, Czechoslovak, Dutch, Ethiopian, Free French, Greek, Indian and Polish, as well as the British groups. A good many of the issues raised are already being considered in the various Commissions and the debate undoubtedly helped to clarify opinion and served one of the principal aims of the Assembly by enabling its members to understand more fully each other's point of view.

There are now four main Commissions

at work: (1) On "Political Warfare," with Professor Worm-Müller, of Norway, as its Chairman and Count Jean Balinski, of Poland, as Secretary; (3) and (4) Sitting together under the presidency of Senator de Brouckère, of Belgium, to consider "Future Security Against War" and "Social and Economic Reconstruction," and (5) With Dr. Gilbert Murray as Chairman, on "The Place of Education, Religion, Science and Learning in Post-War Reconstruction." Commission 2 on "The Trial of War Criminals" is now starting work, under the Chairmanship of General de Baer, President of the Military Court of the Belgian Army in Great Britain.

Each of the Commissions has appointed one or more sub-commissions or smaller groups of experts to study special aspects of the general problems upon which they are engaged. On one day there may be at the Czechoslovak Institute a meeting of jurists and former League officials to consider some technical point in planning the international organisation of the future. M. Henri Rolin, a former Legal Adviser to the Belgian Government, who was one of the most distinguished Presidents of the International Federation of League of Nations Societies, will be in the chair. At the same time a committee of economists and financial experts may be meeting in the Board Room of Unilever House under the chairmanship of Dr. Beyen, of Holland, a former Director of the Bank of International Settlements. Scarcely a day goes by without meetings of one or more commissions or sub-commissions and the Assembly is eagerly awaiting their reports.

C. W. J.

### MAIN CONTENTS

	PAGE
Editorial: Spring Offensive - - - - -	1
Shifting the Blame - - - - -	2
Life in France To-day <i>By Madame Malewsky-Malevtich</i> - - -	3
World Affairs in Parliament <i>By Owen A. Rattenbury</i> - - -	6
What Russia Wants <i>By J. T. Murphy</i> - - - - -	8
Up and Down the Country - - - - -	10
Books of the Month - - - - -	13
London International Assembly - - - - -	16