

18 JUL 1941

S 1083

HEADWAY

IN WAR-TIME

The Journal of the League of Nations Union

No. 22

JULY 1941

PRICE 3d.

WHAT THE GENERAL COUNCIL DID

When DR. GILBERT MURRAY voiced admiration for the way in which the Conway Hall had "held itself up amidst the ruin around it," he put his finger on one of the psychological factors which helped to determine the character of the Union's General Council meeting on June 26 and 27. "That," said Dr. Murray, "I take to be a symbol of our cause." And, indeed, running through all the discussions could be traced a vein of confidence that, whatever fresh material desolation this war might bring, the League (or something like it) and the Union would still stand as signposts for the future. Though not a whit less determined, the Council's mood was less grim than a year ago when grave, unknown events were in the offing. This year, Germany's latest aggression which had brought Russia to our side, aroused rather a sense of expectancy.

It was a good-tempered and realistic Council.

Visitors from France, Czechoslovakia, Poland and U.S.A. were present.

Lord Cecil's Speech

LORD CECIL, in his presidential address, said that Russia's decision to defend her liberty and independence had transformed the whole situation of the

war. The Council must take the earliest opportunity of expressing our adhesion to the policy announced by the Prime Minister. Our supporters, and our critics, must be left in no doubt where we stood. Lord Cecil ridiculed the suggestion that Great Britain was alone, when we had on our side the U.S.A., Russia, China and the British Empire—at least three-quarters the civilised population of the world. Against us were "the powerful and sinister Empire of Germany, her pathetic satellite Italy, and that curious body which sits at Vichy and appears to represent nobody but itself." But we had also the moral support of the vast majority of the peoples of the world, plus the "imponderables"—freedom, truth and justice. This was no reason for sitting back and doing nothing. On the contrary, now was the time to redouble our efforts to secure victory—and victory as rapidly and completely as possible. Make effective these immense forces and we should win. "Victory," said Lord Cecil, paraphrasing the famous words of Nurse Cavell, "is not enough," though he agreed that the first job was to destroy Nazism. Our main object as a Union was to build up a new system, a system of peace, under the protection of which

new advances in economic and other fields could be made. Our purpose was to preach the essential doctrines on which settlement must be based. The Supremacy of the Law was, in his opinion, the essential thing. Finally, Lord Cecil appealed to his hearers not to make the mistake of attaching undue importance to this or that detail and, in striving to get the best, throw away something that wasn't so bad after all.

As soon as the urgency resolution on Russia had been circulated, it was moved by LORD CECIL and briefly seconded by DR. MURRAY, who pointed out how scrupulously—over-scrupulously—Russia had avoided giving offence to Germany. After a short debate—in course of which MR. H. H. ELVIN referred to the sterling work done by Sir Stafford Cripps in difficult circumstances, MRS. E. M. WHITE supported the resolution exactly as it stood, and MR. G. GREEN (Skipton) said that it expressed in the simplest possible way what all felt—the motion was carried unanimously.

Planning the Peace

“World Settlement after the War,” together with the commentary prepared by the Executive, claimed the bulk of the Council's time. There was plenty of argument, but it was friendly in tone. Critics stressed their appreciation of what the Executive had done, as well as their own loyalty and enthusiasm. No doubt many branches, through their own discussions, had come to realise how much the Executive had earned the gratitude of the whole Union by the way in which it had tackled a most difficult and complex task.

LORD LYTTON, who as Chairman of the Executive presented the commentary, answered the earlier protest of MR. J. W. WYERS (Blackpool) that too little time had been allowed for branch discussion.

What they were discussing was not something new, but something brought out eighteen months ago and brought up to date and suited to the actual time. The Union had to steer between being too general and too particular. Anybody could draft a policy in general terms; but “directly you go into detail, directly you come down to specific machinery, you give the opportunity for criticism.” After describing how the Executive had reached agreement after a great many discussions and the hearing of a great deal of argument, Lord Lytton added: “But in this, as in all other matters in life, you will find what you look for. If you go into a garden to look for worms and snails, you will find them; but you will miss the pleasure which you might have derived from the perfume and colour of the flowers. And so with this document: If you look at it with the purpose of finding faults or deficiencies, you will surely find them. But if you study it in the hope of finding some ray of light in a very dark world, some constructive policy, some glimmer of hope, some inspiration, some encouragement for the future, then I believe you will find those things.”

In the debate which followed, the most specific objections were those levelled at the “Inner and Outer Rings” (paragraphs 20-22 of the Statement), whose import is made clear in the Commentary. MR. WYERS (Blackpool) thought that the majority would have nothing to do with it, and also wished to change the International Air Force (para. 23) to an International Police Force. MRS. E. M. WHITE, after congratulating the Executive on having got as far as it had, said that it was fundamentally the wrong line to have groups of States. MISS M. ATKINSON (Tyne District Council) wished paras.

20-23 to be replaced by a much more definite system of preparation in advance. DR. MURRAY intervened to say that the criticisms of the Inner and Outer Rings were due to misunderstanding. Experience had shown that there were some countries which could fight and fight effectively, but others for whom fighting would mean instant destruction. The Rings were designed to produce a more effective organisation than we had had in the past.

Certain definite amendments were brought forward. A motion to refer back for further consideration, submitted by MR. ELVIN who thought that the commentary was too apologetic in tone, was lost by an overwhelming majority. MR. F. N. KEEN, who had tried his hand at drafting a shorter statement, found no seconder. A Birmingham motion asking for a short declaration confined to the principles upon which the whole Union would be united, presented by MR. F. E. PEARSON, was defeated. So too was a series of amendments brought forward by MR. W. LANDON on behalf of the Clapham branch.

Lord Cecil, from the chair, expressed sympathy with the object of the Northamptonshire Federal Council who wished the ten points in the letter from Church leaders (*The Times*, 21/12/40) to be included with the statement; and it was agreed to draw attention to the points in a footnote to the statement.

Replying to MR. BAYS (Cornwall) and others who asked for a short statement, Lord Lytton said that the Executive had this in mind; but it must be *in addition to*, and not instead of, the full statement of policy.

Two Members of Parliament, MR. GEOFFREY MANDER and MR. P. J. NOEL BAKER, made notable contributions to

the discussion. Asking how far the Union had been able to carry the British Government with it, Mr. Mander cited Lord Halifax's declaration, Mr. Eden's Mansion House statement, and the meeting of Allied and Dominion representatives in St. James's Palace as evidence of a very definite advance since the last Council meeting. Advocating an International Air Force after the war, Mr. Noel Baker said that the damage already produced by the war in the air was nothing compared with what was to come. When it was all over, public opinion everywhere would demand such measures of disarmament as would bring about the total abolition of air warfare.

Valuable Reports

Particularly gratifying was the enthusiasm with which the Council received the reports on “Social and Economic Reconstruction,” “Colonial Settlement,” and “Peaceful Change,” which were presented by PROFESSOR SARGANT FLORENCE, MISS FREDA WHITE and MR. NOWELL SMITH respectively. The branches and members of the Union were strongly recommended to study these documents. Oral reports on the action taken by the Executive with regard to “Minorities” and “Education in World Citizenship” were also given by MISS K. D. COURTNEY and DR. MURRAY.

Finally the Statement and Commentary were approved in the terms of the resolution printed on p. 5.

Presenting the *Annual Report* for 1940, LORD LYTTON added a rapid survey bringing the story of Union activity up to date. He mentioned our efforts to recreate here in London something approaching the International Federa-

tion of League Societies, through our conferences with representatives of friendly and Allied States—"What the British Government has done officially, we are doing unofficially." (Later Miss K. D. COURTNEY gave fuller details, to the immense satisfaction of the Council.)

Our Finances

"Not bad considering the difficult times through which we have been passing," was Mr. H. S. SYRETT'S summing up of the financial position of the Union. The Treasurer explained that we had been able to reduce our old debts by more than £11,000; but he wanted to see them wiped out completely and to build up a reserve fund so that, when the time came for the Union to embark upon some big activity, the cupboard would not be bare. The question of membership was giving some concern and, as membership was the life-blood of the Union, he urged the Council to face up to it. Mr. Syrett then referred to the dilemma of those whose consciences wondered whether their desire to continue to subscribe to the Union could be reconciled with their duty to invest every spare penny in War Savings. "You can do both," said Mr. Syrett, "by subscribing to the Union and requesting that the money be lent to the Government. You will thus help to finance victory and help the Union as well. If any one wishes to act in this way, whether the amount be £1 or £5 or £50, just let us know your wishes, and I will undertake unreservedly to put the money right away into War Bonds."

The election of officers, though car-

ried through expeditiously at an early stage of the proceedings, deserves a word of comment. Foremost on the list stands our Hon. President, Mr. Winston Churchill, who in the days of "appeasement" was proclaiming that the League was the only path to safety—that "there, on the rock of the Covenant of the League of Nations alone, can we build high and enduring the temple and the towers of Peace." The names of our Joint Presidents (Lord Cecil and Dr. Murray), the Chairman of Executive (Lord Lytton) and Treasurer (Mr. Syrett) are household words in the Union. Our Vice-Presidents, all of whom have been good friends of the Union for many years, are a distinguished company. They include Cabinet Ministers—Mr. Alexander, Mr. Attlee, Lord Cranborne, Mr. Eden and Sir Archibald Sinclair; Church leaders—the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, the Moderator of the Free Church Federal Council, the Moderator of the Church of Scotland, and the Chief Rabbi; Field Marshal Smuts and the Dominion High Commissioners; and others well known in many walks of public life.

After the adoption of the urgency motions on Ethiopia and the Conference with Dominion and Allied Representatives, the Council asked the Executive to consider the proposals of the Chelsea branch for post-war organisation. So concluded a Council which Lord Cecil thought had been one of the most useful in the history of the Union. The Executive, added Dr. Murray, had derived real help from the branches, and the meeting had been particularly valuable in the interchange of ideas.

LESLIE R. ALDOUS.

GENERAL COUNCIL RESOLUTIONS

Russia

The General Council of the League of Nations Union condemns the lawless and treacherous invasion of Russia by Germany,

Regards such action as destructive of all good faith between nations; and

Welcomes the assurances by the Prime Minister and the Foreign Secretary that we will give to Russia all assistance in our power in her resistance to this international crime.

World Settlement After the War

The General Council—

Approves the Statement, **WORLD SETTLEMENT AFTER THE WAR**, together with the Commentary prepared by the Executive Committee, on the understanding

(1) That further opportunity will be afforded of considering the subjects of Social and Economic Reconstruction, Colonial Policy, Peaceful Change, Minorities, and Education in World Citizenship.

(2) That modifications of some of the details of the policy may be required if changes in the international situation render this necessary.

NOTE.—The Chairman undertook that the Executive would, in the light of the discussion at the General Council, give further consideration to paragraphs 20, 21 and 22 of the Statement of Policy; and those who had suggestions to make were asked to communicate them to the Executive as soon as possible.

Reports on Social and Economic Reconstruction, Colonial Settlement and Peaceful Change

The Council thanked those responsible for drawing up the Reports, noted with satisfaction that the Executive would examine them in detail, and recommended Branches and members of the Union to study the documents.*

* Copies of these Reports may be obtained from 11, Maiden Lane, London, W.C.2.

Conference With Dominion and Allied Representatives

The General Council—

Notes with pleasure that a Conference between members of H.M. Government and Dominion and Allied Representatives was held at St. James's Palace on June 12;

Is gratified by the resolutions adopted at the Conference; and

Expresses the earnest hope that further gatherings of a similar nature will be held in the future.

Ethiopia

The General Council—

Rejoices in the restoration of freedom to Ethiopia, and in the return of H.M. the Emperor to his throne;

Expresses its admiration of the soldierly heroism and strategic skill which have led so rapidly to these happy results; and

Urges H.M. Government to consolidate them by the immediate re-establishment of full diplomatic relations with the Ethiopian Government.

Post-War Organisation

The General Council—

Realising that a time lag between the cessation of war and the launching of a campaign for our policy would endanger our success,

Urges the Executive Committee to give the most urgent and careful consideration to the following suggestions:—

(i) To prepare a skeleton plan of action including:

(a) Districts and halls where large meetings could be held;

(b) A series of well-organised open-air meetings;

(c) A panel of speakers ready at short notice to undertake both indoor and outdoor meetings.

(ii) To train new speakers during the coming longer evenings, giving special consideration to organising facilities for members in the Services, A.R.P. work, etc.

(Continued on page 6, col. 2.)

WORLD SETTLEMENT AFTER THE WAR

The Statement of Policy entitled World Settlement After the War, since its revision by the Executive Committee in January and its issue to the Branches, has been much discussed and freely criticised. Some members of the Executive Committee have expressed disagreement with particular clauses either publicly in the columns of HEADWAY or privately in letters and memoranda. Some Branches have sent in amendments to certain passages, and one Branch has proposed to rewrite the entire Statement in its own words. All these comments and criticisms have been considered by the Executive Committee and referred by them to a Sub-Committee to collate.

The Sub-Committee after examining all these comments arrived at the following conclusions:

1. That none of the criticisms received showed complete disagreement with the fundamental policy embodied in the statement but all of them sought rather to improve the wording or to change the emphasis of certain features of the policy.
2. That it was unprofitable to amend the Statement from month to month in an attempt to keep pace with the ever-changing fortunes of the war.
3. That it was desirable to restate the fundamental principles on which the policy of the Statement rests, and which the League of Nations Union would advocate and work for however the international situation might change.

The Executive having approved these conclusions, submits the following commentary on the Statement.

COMMENTARY

The Statement aims at defining as fully as is now possible the kind of policy which the League of Nations Union would wish to see carried out when the defeat of the Totalitarian States has been accomplished.

It is impossible to predict with certainty what the situation may be at the end of the war. No one can foretell what would then be the state of public opinion about post-war problems either in this country or in any

other, if no attempt were made to form it beforehand.

But as it is the function of the League of Nations Union to influence the public opinion of our own people, we should be clear in our own minds now what is the opinion we want to create, and begin to create it before the war is over. Moreover, since the greatest need of all countries is peace, and Hitler has promised that in his New Order peace will be secured by the armed forces of Germany, it is necessary that Britain should make it clear to other nations by what alternative means we would secure peace to them if we were victorious. Our ability to do this quickly and effectively may have a decisive effect on the course and duration of the war itself.

The first principle therefore of our policy is that peace when it comes must be dur-

RESOLUTIONS (from p. 5).

(iii) To simplify our policy into slogans suitable for posters and easily read leaflets.

(iv) In the event of a General Election, not only to issue the usual questionnaire, but to give full publicity to the replies of the candidates, and actively support whichever candidate advocates our policy, irrespective of party.

Meetings of Executive Committee

The following motion, standing in the name of the Chelsea Branch, was withdrawn after the Chairman had promised that the Executive Committee would consider what action could be taken to achieve the object of the motion:

The General Council—

Realising that the future success of the work of the L.N.U. depends on the appeal it can make to the mass of the people, and especially to the younger generation,

Recommends that in future meetings of the Executive Committee be held at such times as will enable all sections of the Union's membership to be represented.

able. To secure that object we are also agreed:

- (1) that the best guarantee of peace is an effective collective system of defence;
- (2) that any such collective system must be real and not illusory. The obligations therefore of any State joining a collective system must be more clearly defined than was the case under the Covenant, and their enforcement must be organised in advance and not left to the decisions of individual Governments at a time of crisis.
- (3) that a distinction must be made between measures which will be necessary immediately on the termination of hostilities and for some time thereafter, and those required for the organisation of peace on a permanent basis. The first stage must of necessity be concerned primarily with the restoration of national Governments in the territories occupied by Germany during the war, the withdrawal of German troops, the reorganisation of the economic life of Europe, and above all, the measures necessary to prevent a renewal of the war. These measures should be of a temporary character, recognised as such and completely superseded by the permanent settlement as soon as this can be reached. The second stage which cannot possibly be inaugurated until the normal political and economic life of the occupied countries has been re-established, should nevertheless be envisaged, planned and prepared for in advance, and everything should be avoided in the first stage which might make the permanent organisation of peace on a collective basis more difficult in the second stage.

The problems which will have to be considered in each of these stages may now be enumerated.

STAGE I.

IMMEDIATE POST-WAR SETTLEMENT.

1. Restoration of occupied territories.

We are all agreed that Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Albania and Abyssinia must be restored as independent States with their own Governments, and that German and Italian troops must be withdrawn from the other occupied territories. During this stage the pre-war frontiers should be restored tem-

porarily wherever it is possible to do this by treaties with Germany and Italy. Where frontiers have been altered by States with which we are not at war they cannot be rectified in the peace treaties with Germany and Italy. The permanent settlement of frontiers should be reserved for the second stage, in which other than belligerents will take part.

2. Reorganisation of the economic life of Europe.

The economic conditions of the whole of Europe when hostilities cease are bound to be chaotic, perhaps even catastrophic. Concurrently with the movements of population which the restoration of the occupied territories will involve, every effort must be made as soon as possible to restore the supply of necessary foodstuffs and the raw materials of industry, and to readjust international currencies. The complexity of this urgent necessity is one of the reasons why a considerable interval must elapse before the second stage of permanent world settlement can be reached. It would be useless to attempt any permanent settlement until the economic life of the various States of Europe has been at least partially restored.

3. Security.

The most important and most difficult problem of this stage will be that of security. In so far as the victory has not been brought about by collective force the security measures during this first stage will be lacking in collective authority. It is obvious already that the only European State that could effectively co-operate with the troops of the British Empire in the defeat of the German army is Russia. It is also clear already that Britain can only bring the war to a victorious conclusion with the help of the U.S.A. Whether the United States will have become an active belligerent before the end of the war and whether the U.S.S.R. will have become an ally or an enemy cannot at the moment be foreseen. But it is already clear that the force by which victory will have been achieved is the only force by which security can be maintained during this first stage. The disarmament of the Aggressor States and the occupation of such points as may be necessary to prevent a recurrence of the war are inevitable features of this first stage, and our people should be prepared for the responsibility which their victory will place upon them.

STAGE II.

PERMANENT WORLD SETTLEMENT.

It is to this second stage—the stage of world settlement and the re-establishment of an international authority—that the Statement mainly refers, and the machinery there suggested will perhaps be better understood if it is realised that this stage is not intended to be brought into operation immediately the war is over. It cannot now be stated how long the first stage will last. The only thing that can be said is that that stage must be a preparatory one and that the second stage should be introduced as soon as the conditions have become favourable to its success but not before.

In this second stage we have suggested the kind of machinery that we would like to see adopted and would work to bring about. Our proposals cannot be more than that, since admittedly this machinery can only be brought about by general agreement after free general discussion. Our reason for suggesting the re-establishment of an International Authority is that in our opinion peace in the modern world can only be maintained by international co-operation, and the experience of the last twenty years has only confirmed this opinion. We are convinced, however, that the International Authority of the future must have greater powers than the League of Nations ever had, and that greater limitations of national sovereignty must be accepted by all its Member States in the interests of international peace.

Our reason for suggesting its division into inner and outer rings is that in our opinion a practically world-wide co-operation of States is necessary both to promote human welfare in peace time and to prevent the recurrence of war by acts of aggression. But experience has proved that few States, if any, are willing to accept the status of a belligerent in every war that may occur in any part of the world, however remote. As however peace can only be maintained if in every part of the world some powerful combination of States is prepared to resist aggression whenever it threatens or takes place, we were forced to consider the establishment of what we have called inner rings of States with unlimited obligations to resist aggression in limited areas. Whether or not States will be found willing to undertake such obligations, and what States they will be, experience alone can decide. In any case we recognise that a special responsibility for the maintenance of

world peace rests on those usually called the Great Powers. It is of the utmost importance that this truth should never be forgotten.

On the assumption that such machinery is found to be practicable, it would perhaps be well to define the obligations which we propose to assign to each group. Every State member of the International Authority would be required to accept the obligations of the Outer Ring. In the event of a war being threatened or initiated in any part of the world by a State which has been declared an Aggressor by the International Authority, it would be an obligation of every member to withhold the supply of all war materials to the aggressor State and to supply them to the victim of aggression. The obligations of the members of the Outer Group would be limited to this attitude of non-belligerent partiality. Neutrality would be permissible to none. Any State which, by reason of its fulfilment of this obligation was attacked by another, would, as a victim of aggression, become entitled to the full assistance of the Inner Group. The States members of the Inner Group in the area where the aggression took place would from the outset adopt the status of full belligerency against the Aggressor. If it were known for certain that those obligations would be strictly fulfilled by the members of both Groups, the possibility of aggression would be reduced to a minimum, as hardly any State in the world contains within its own territory all the materials necessary for war under modern conditions.

It only remains necessary to say a word about the subjects of the international limitation of armaments and the international Air Force which have proved difficult to some of our members.

Obviously no State can be expected to accept the obligation of full belligerency as the member of a policing group without the armed force necessary to fulfil it. On the other hand, unlimited competitive armaments not only create the greatest danger of war but the financial burden which they entail is also the greatest obstacle to prosperity in peace. Is there any way of reconciling these two apparently conflicting requirements? We think there is, namely, by an International Agreement to abolish aggressive weapons and supervision by an international commission to prevent their construction in secret. If there had been no submarines, tanks, heavy guns, or military aviation, none of Hitler's or

Mussolini's aggressions would have been successful.

We believe that when this war is over there will be a popular demand in all countries for the abolition of bombing aircraft which have wrought such havoc upon the civilian population everywhere, and if this demand should lead to the abolition of military air forces and to international control of civil aviation, it would be possible for the first time to arm the International Authority with a weapon possessed by no national State, and thus give to the policing powers of the Inner Groups that margin of superiority over any aggressor which would enable them to prevent a breach of the peace. Whether international public opinion will be ready, by the time the second stage in the policy we have outlined is reached, to give the International Authority of the future such additional power as is involved in the possession of an international air force, we cannot tell. But we can at least say that it is desirable and begin to prepare our own people for such a possibility.

To sum up: the essentials of the policy we advocate are:—

- (1) That the maintenance of world peace is the greatest interest of every State;
- (2) That aggression is an international crime

which every State should combine to prevent;

- (3) That international co-operation is necessary for the maintenance of peace;
- (4) That freedom and justice can only be secured by the substitution of the processes of law for the brutality of war;
- (5) That if the law is to prevail there must be force behind it;
- (6) That if war is to fall into disuse, there must be machinery for settling disputes peacefully which commands general acceptance.

Such a system of international co-operation involves the readiness of each State—

- (1) to submit to the collective judgment of other States in its disputes, grievances or claims;
- (2) to support the forces of law wherever they are used to prevent breaches of the peace.

It is to prepare the public opinion of our own country for such a conception of international duty that our Statement was prepared, but any proposals which would achieve as well or better than our own the objects we have in view would be equally acceptable to us.

MR. WINANT'S CREED

Mr. John G. Winant's valedictory Report to the Governments, Employers and Workers of Member States of the I.L.O. has reached this country from Montreal. In simple, stirring language the present U.S. Ambassador to Britain outlines his conception of the post-war New Order—"The cornerstone of the future," he says, "is already apparent from the mistakes of the past."

This is his fine concluding passage:—

"During my service as Director, short though it has been, I have known the strength of the I.L.O., the great strength of democracy, and its weakness, the human weakness of democracy. I move

into my new field of service with undiminished confidence in the ability of the organisation to continue to serve mankind in this critical period. I hope that I, personally, may have opportunity to assist in this task. I leave the International Labour Organisation in your hands—those of the Governments, the employers and the workers of the free democratic countries of the world. It is your instrument for orderly social change. As you use it, it will become strong. It lives in the movement of your opinion and in your faith. It is armed with your courage and your conviction. With God's will and a just cause, you will not fail."

UP AND DOWN THE COUNTRY

Lord Strabolgi, Professor Craik Henderson, M.P., Mr. D. L. Lipson, M.P., Miss K. D. Courtney, Mr. L. E. Genisieux (France), and Miss Hebe Spaul were among the speakers supplied by Head Office for meetings during June.

Younger people formed a substantial part of the audience at the DORKING AND DISTRICT Annual Meeting, when the Branch President, Mr. Wilson Harris (Editor of the *Spectator*), spoke on the part the League might take in post-war reconstruction. He stressed the importance of ensuring future security for the smaller nations. While the first step must be the complete disarmament of Germany, nothing should be done to prevent her economic recovery. Members of the French, Czechoslovak, Polish, Norwegian and other Air Forces now serving with the R.A.F. might form the nucleus of an International Air Force. It was the business of the L.N.U., said Mr. Wilson Harris, to instruct public opinion while the war was going on.

GODALMING'S Annual Report shows that, while "the familiar and time-honoured activities of pre-war days" have been maintained, remarkable success has attended the series of public discussion meetings at which experts on world and home affairs have given addresses followed by general discussion. "These small meetings (the average attendance is about 40) provide, it seems, for war-time needs better than larger and more spectacular efforts. They create an informed nucleus of opinion on current problems which should be invaluable as different issues have to be faced now and in the future." Godalming has found that these meetings are self-supporting, as the collections more than cover expenses.

"The League or the New Order?" was the subject taken by the Headmaster of Charterhouse when he addressed the summer garden meeting of the GUILDFORD Branch. The Provost of Portsmouth and Mrs. Corbett Ashby visited the nine local

schools, where the senior pupils displayed lively interest and asked excellent questions. Mrs. J. T. Harrod, of Godalming, also spoke at a junior school, and to a group of interested people at a Women's Fellowship.

WITHINGTON BRANCH has been carrying on with a well-planned series of public meetings. After lectures on general principles last autumn, the monthly meetings this year have covered the problems of specific countries, i.e., France, China, Abyssinia, Soviet Russia and the New Order in Unoccupied France.

AIRDRIE Branch, which in the past year has increased its membership from 100 to 134, has been holding fortnightly meetings of the discussion group. A symposium on "War Aims and Peace Aims," an address on "The League and Federal Union," from Sir Robert Greig, and talks on the Jewish problem throughout Europe, "Germany, Jekyll and Hyde," domestic events in Czechoslovakia by a refugee student, and on "Germany in the Cameroons," by the Branch Chairman, Mr. Turner, have so far been included in the varied programme.

New members were enrolled at the HARROGATE Annual Meeting, when Mr. R. A. White, after presiding over the business proceedings, spoke on "World Settlement After the War."

WALSALL Branch is starting a study group, to study the successes and failures of the League and their bearing on questions of post-war settlement.

At the EDINBURGH Branch Garden Party, the Rev. Professor John Baillie, D.D., spoke on his experiences and impressions gained during his recent tour of the United States. A "full house"—four times as many people arrived as had been expected—gave the "catering department" some anxious moments.

His Worship the Mayor inaugurated REIGATE'S series of public discussion meetings on present-day problems, with a talk on "The Concept of Liberty."

During May and June the subjects were "My Friends the Abyssinians" (Miss Steedman), "Post-War Reconstruction" (Mrs. Duncan Harris), "The Present Political Situation in India" (Mr. G. H. Langley, M.A.), and "China Faces the Future" (Mr. A. D. Clegg). At the July meetings, Count Balinski will speak on "The Future of Poland," the Rev. Canon Godwin on "World Citizenship and Religious Education," and Mr. C. R. Allison, M.A., on "America and Europe in 1941."

NORTHAMPTON Branch and the Workers' Educational Association cemented their co-operation by running a one-day summer school, at which Dr. Wolfram Gottlieb (of the B.B.C.) gave lectures on Turkey and the Near East.

At a meeting arranged by the HENDON Branch in conjunction with the local Red Cross organisation, and addressed by Miss Hebe Spaul, the local Commandant of the Red Cross, learning of the valuable work being done by the League in war-time in connection with Health, promised a donation to the Union's funds.

At CHORLEY WOOD a series of public meetings on Post-War Reconstruction was run in connection with the University of London Discussion Class. Miss K. D. Courtney opened a discussion on "League or Federation?"

Speaking to a record attendance of Rotarians at the 1,000th weekly meeting

of the NORWICH ROTARY CLUB, Mr. Geoffrey Shakespeare, M.P.—a vice-president of our Norwich Branch—predicted that the first object of the victors in this war would be again to establish machinery whereby international security could be placed on an unassailable foundation and, in his judgment, this second experiment would have a greater chance of succeeding than the first because of the better chance of receiving the full co-operation of the U.S.A.

Visiting the SOUTHALL ROTARY CLUB for the third time in a year, the Editor of HEADWAY surveyed Hitler's New Order in theory and fact. He also spoke at the Willoughby Road Methodist Church Men's Meeting, Harringay.

In a letter to the L.R.F., a Union member writes:—"I am continuing the good work in the R.A.F.—through personal contact, thus not infringing the King's Regulations. I find that the men are very willing to listen, agree (occasionally) and discuss the League, although most want to argue. . . . Anyhow, besides converting with a bit of luck, it is doing me good for after the war, as I hope then to take our work seriously." The L.R.F. is sending a copy of this letter to other workers now serving with H.M. Forces, and asking them whether they too would like to be put on the mailing list to receive up-to-date information.

SUMMER SCHOOLS

ON THE COAST OF NORTH DEVON at the Tors Hotel, Lynton war-time home of Badminton School, August 8-15. Organised by the Council for Education in World Citizenship. Lectures and discussions for teachers on (a) the background and issues of the war, (b) education for peaceful change in social and international affairs.

IN HERTFORDSHIRE at Knebworth House. Chairman: the Earl of Lytton. A week-end School on Problems of Post-war Reconstruction Sept. 4th-8th.

Full Particulars of both Schools from 11 Maiden Lane, W.C.2.

ALLIED DECLARATION IN LONDON

Ministers and High Commissioners, representing the Governments of the Allies, meeting in conference in St. James's Palace on June 12, made the following joint declaration of their aim in the fight against aggression:—

(1) That they will continue the struggle against German or Italian oppression until victory is won, and will mutually assist each other in this struggle to the utmost of their respective capacities;

(2) That there can be no settled peace and prosperity so long as free peoples are coerced by violence into submission to domination by Germany or her associates, or live under the threat of such coercion;

(3) That the only true basis of enduring peace is the willing co-operation of free peoples in a world in which, relieved of the menace of aggression, all may enjoy economic and social security; and that it is their intention to work together, and with other free peoples, both in war and peace to this end.

FROM RECENT SPEECHES

Mr. Winston Churchill:

"It is but a few years ago since one united gesture by the peoples, great and small, who now lie broken in the dust, would have warded off from mankind the fearful ordeal it has had to undergo. But there was no unity. There was no vision. The nations were pulled down one by one while the others gaped and chattered. One by one, each in turn, they let themselves be caught. One after another they were felled by brutal violence or poisoned from within by subtle intrigue. . .

"Is the tragedy to repeat itself once more? Ah, no! This is not the end of the tale. The stars in their courses proclaim the deliverance of mankind. Not so easily shall the onward progress of the peoples be barred. Not so easily shall the lights of freedom die. But—but time is short. Every month that passes adds to the length and to the perils of the journey that will have to be made. 'United we stand. Divided we fall.' Divided, the Dark Ages return. United, we can save and guide the world."

(June 16, 1941.)

Mr. Anthony Eden:

"Let no one suppose that we, for our part, intend to return to the chaos of the old world. To do so would bankrupt us no less than others. . . . To organise the transition to peaceful activities will need the collaboration of the United States, and ourselves, and of all free countries which have not suffered the ravages of war. . . . No one can suppose that the economic reorganisation of Europe after the Allied Victory will be an easy task. But we shall not shirk our opportunity and our responsibility to bear our share of the burdens. The peaceful brotherhood of nations, with due liberty to each to develop its own balanced economic life and its characteristic culture, will be the common object. . . . In the tasks that lie ahead, may there be given to our statesmen the vision to see, the faith to act, and the courage to persevere."

(At the Mansion House, May 29, 1941.)

Mr. C. R. Attlee:

"The main ideals of our civilisation ring through the speeches of President

Roosevelt, the Prime Minister and Mr. Fraser, as through the utterances of the humblest worker here; and it is on this spiritual unity that we must build the new world, whose watchword must be freedom and social justice. The Labour Party stood for collective security and the rule of law, and have been abundantly justified. The tragedy of Europe has been the disunity of the peoples in the face of the common enemy. . . . It is only by adopting this principle of collective security when this war is ended that we can establish lasting peace. An organised world must replace the anarchy which led to this war."

(Labour Party Conference at Whitsun.)

Field-Marshal Smuts:

"Isolation is as dead as the absolute sovereignty of the national State.

Security, reform, the better ordering of our world community, all call for an effective common authority. Thus only can our world be made reasonably safe for peace and liberty, the twin ideals of democracy. In that common world authority, America must play a leading part. The failure of the League since 1932 is probably the main cause of the present world war. America's sporadic efforts to help from outside proved unavailing. As a member of the League, her role would probably have been decisive. I must therefore conclude that, just as world organisation is essential, so America's membership in such an organisation is no less essential. She holds the key. Let her use it and open the door through which the world can escape from chaos and suffering."

(In his broadcast on "The Vision of the Future.")

FROM "HEADWAY'S" POST-BAG

PROFESSOR BRODETSKY REPLIES TO MAJOR ROSEVEARE

SIR,—Major Roseveare is justified in his contention that permanent partnership between Great Britain, the Dominions and the U.S.A. cannot be guaranteed so long as the partners retain the power to secede, and I certainly would be very happy if a real union were immediately possible; but I consider federal union to be "fanciful" because the knowledge that secession would be impossible is likely to discourage, and even prevent, real co-operation immediately. The U.S.A. is ready for partnership. It would be a grave political error to endanger this by insisting upon immediate union from which there can be no "escape." We should encourage the partnership until

it gradually passes over into union.

If Major Roseveare will refer to an article of mine in HEADWAY (February, 1940), he will see that I consider union to be the second stage after international co-operation has been secured.

But Major Roseveare is not justified in adding the word "exclusive" to my suggested Anglo-American "inner ring." The object of my reference to Russia was to suggest that Russia should co-operate in, and, in fact, be part of, this "inner ring," if possible. If this is not clear in my recent article then I am grateful to Major Roseveare for giving me this opportunity for making it clear.

S. BRODETSKY.

ACID TEST FOR PEACE IN EUROPE

By MAURICE FANSHAW

From the gulf of Finland to the Adriatic stretches a strip of eight countries, Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Yugoslavia—the chief Eastern marchlands of Europe. Exposed on all sides to the greed of Great Powers—Prussia and Russia above all, but Austria and Italy also—this wedge of peoples has in the past been a key pin to the stability of Europe. It is bound to be a testing ground for Europe's security to-morrow.

A First-Rate Book

We have been disgracefully ignorant about these areas. But Miss Wanklyn's book* has dynamited any excuse for this kind of thing, whether for expert, or student, or ordinary reader who wants to know. All now have access to central facts about the history, social conditions, culture, geographic accessibility, economic horoscope, and so on, of these millions of marchland peoples. First-rate maps flash the facts from eye to mind; there is an excellent minimum bibliography. Above all, the book comes pat to the occasion. Without knowledge there can be no judgment. Without judgment to inspire the Peace Makers of to-morrow, these marchlands, as sure as the sun rises, will be driven into war once again, and Europe with them.

In reviewing a book of this size there must be selection. Let us look at recent history. It is a plain story of exploitation, more or less efficient, of these small countries by neighbouring Great Powers, who woke up, in the 19th century, to the profitableness of this kind of brigandage. A story of tremendous importance to-day, because of dangerous half-truths which have crept into a kind of currency. Two

* "The Eastern Marchlands of Europe." By H. G. Wanklyn. (George Philip and Son. 12s. 6d.)

such slogans in particular are "the little nation is dead," and "all that people care about is economic security." Modern camouflage, in fact, of those old Great Power practices, Slavery and *Panem et Circenses*.

Admittedly, there was an increase of total prosperity in the marchlands during the period of exploitation preceding 1914. But mark this: The wrong groups in these countries were united. The structure was ill-balanced. The bulk of the people did not profit from the prosperity. And, above all, economics were identified with foreign control. "We eat Germans in our bread," muttered the Letts.

So these peoples turned for help to their own cultures and traditions. These gave them inspiration; but, at the same time, focussed the attention of the exploiters, who proceeded to try and wipe them out, so as to rivet their economic control more firmly on those whom they regarded as inferior and subject races.

Independence at Last

The Great War intervened, and towards its close became identified with freedom from cultural oppression. With the Peace Treaties came the first chance these eight countries had had of making their independence good—their first taste of Liberty.

Eight new small, or smallish, States. Would the Great Powers help them, would they allow them to work out their own salvation?

Of course, the eight made mistakes. Great Powers have no monopoly of that! The heady wine of political and cultural liberty made them over-suspicious of neighbours, and helped to block some of the natural lines of economic growth. The Baltic Provinces never quite grasped

that they were also Russia's natural trade-gate to the West. States in the Danube area never rose to a common and common sense use of the economic advantage of their central position.

But for all that, and in spite of the wreckage left by the War, these marchland States did make real progress, and it was on a far broader basis than before. A very large peasant proprietor class took the place of a small number of feudal or foreign land-owners. Intensive dairy farming was introduced, to the benefit of many. Finland and Czechoslovakia, in particular, and also the Baltic Provinces, surpassed by their own efforts the living standards of 1914. The Baltic Provinces and Czechoslovakia built up valuable new markets in Britain and across the Atlantic. Most of the Governments showed signs of profiting by early mistakes. Moreover, ever larger numbers of people were gaining administrative experience.

The Great Powers

What of the Great Powers? It is true that, in the early post-war years, the Great Powers, particularly the United States, helped these small States with loans. Had they been *International Loans after the League of Nations pattern*, history might well have been changed. But when the Great Depression came, largely caused by these Great Powers, their very help became a menace to the existence of the smaller States. For these European loans were recklessly recalled—at the one time when they were most needed. As a result, the field was left clear for Germany, the Power who more than any other was at heart consistently antagonistic to the independence of these smaller States. And Germany had a proved weapon in her *Drang nach Osten* policy for fishing in troubled waters and spreading her own political power under the guise of economic assistance. She used it with relentless Nazi efficiency.

The sequel everyone knows: The Second World War; Soviet Russia's

strategic seizure of three of the new States, and Germany's reduction of four more to vassalage or worse.

After this War

Politically the experiment of small independent States has crashed. But let there be no doubt about this point: *Economically they could*—all the evidence shows it—*have worked out their own salvation* to the satisfaction of their own folk, and to the benefit of Europe—but for the lack of one thing, *Security*. And again it was the Great Powers, the States in the League and outside it, who denied them this. Precisely the same issue will arise when this war ends. The economy of these States is viable enough, if we give them security, whether they are restored as independent units or in Federations. With security, there can be prosperous small States. You can have the good small life.

ANGELL AND BISHOP

Sir Norman Angell, speaking at a large War Savings rally in Ottawa (organised in co-operation with the Ottawa Branch of the League of Nations Society in Canada), said:—

"If we had done ten years ago in respect of China what we are doing now, we should not now be at war. Ten years ago we could have taken the risk of conflict with Japan. There would have been no bombs on London. Hitler had not yet come to power. The Axis had not yet been born. The risks were relatively small compared with those we now take to do that very thing."

Under the heading "Abyssinia," the following passage appeared in the Bishop's letter in the *Southwark Diocesan Gazette* for June, 1941:—

"It is melancholy to reflect that if five years ago, or earlier, we and those associated with us in the leadership of the League of Nations had firmly withstood Italy even to the extent of war against her, the present far greater calamity might never have fallen upon the world."

ADDRESS BY THE GREEK MINISTER

His Excellency MONSIEUR C. SIMOPOULOS, the Greek Minister in London, was the speaker at the second luncheon in London organised jointly by the New Europe Circle and the International Committee of the League of Nations Union. DR. GILBERT MURRAY introduced the guest of honour to a distinguished company, which included representatives of the Allied nations now in this country.

"Amidst this tragedy which we are living," said M. Simopoulos, "it is a source of comfort that the study of post-war problems is not ignored, and the desire continues to find the best means of serving that dearest of all ideals—peace, true peace, which should be based on justice and liberty; a peace, in other words, which is not the peace of the so-called New Order."

Outlining humanity's efforts throughout the centuries to grapple with the peace problem, the speaker considered that the institution of the League of Nations marked a great stage on the road. If the League had seemed to fail, that was because the success of an institution was judged by the actions of those who applied that institution. The League did not succeed because the collective will which was its foundation was not yet mature, was not sufficiently prepared to

assume the responsibilities. By examining exhaustively the reasons for the League's failure, we should be able to learn invaluable lessons for the future, so that the same tragic mistakes might not be repeated.

"There is collective suffering," said M. Simopoulos, "because there was no collective resistance. This must not happen again." And again, "Dangers are not averted by retreats. They are merely postponed, and this at the expense of those who retreat."

Greece, the speaker continued, had special reasons to be grateful to the League of Nations, and he was glad of the opportunity to emphasise this. The settlement of refugees in Greece would remain "an unforgettable example of the ideal of humanity and fraternity among nations. The work of the League, whenever left unhampered, has been magnificent."

Turning to Lord Cecil, who was present, the Greek Minister added: "I cannot but express publicly my profound gratitude, because a few days ago he sent me the Golden Medal of the Nobel Peace Prize awarded to him, as a contribution for the relief of Greek suffering in the war. My gratitude is infinite for this noble gesture."

A DUAL PURPOSE

We specially commend to all friends of the Union the good advice given by Mr. H. S. Syrett, our Hon. Treasurer, at the General Council Meeting. It is recorded on page 4.

Any Branch or member wishing to send any sort of subscription or loan to the Union, and at the same time wishing to obey the exhortation to "lend for victory," is invited to send such gift or loan to the Secretary at 11, Maiden Lane, London, W.C. 2, with the request that the money be invested in the Union's name in War Bonds or Certificates. Mr. Syrett has given his personal guarantee that this will be done immediately.