

HEADWAY

IN WAR-TIME

The Journal of the League of Nations Union

No. 44

MAY 1943

BRITISH LIBRARY

21 JUL 1943

POLITICAL AND
ECONOMIC SCIENCE

PRICE 3d

THE BERMUDA CONFERENCE

By MRS. EDGAR DUGDALE

Some five months have now passed since the Polish Government published its first Report on the progress of Hitler's campaign to exterminate the Jews, and more than four months since our Government began expressing their determination to bring to justice everyone concerned in perpetrating these atrocities, and meantime to do all in their power to rescue such victims as could still be saved out of occupied Europe. The British public (slow to believe in a degree of wickedness and cruelty so far outside their experience or imagination) became deeply stirred when the facts were brought home to them. Thousands have declared themselves willing and eager to make personal sacrifices to help the refugees if asylum were offered them in this island, and scores of thousands have manifested their desire that such asylum should be thrown open. Men and women prominent in almost every sphere of British life have voiced the humane instinct of multitudes, and the leaders of all the Churches have spoken with a unanimity never equalled in the religious history of our country. So far as the British people are concerned, nothing has stood in the way of the Government turning its expressions of good intention into immediate action, by

relaxing the existing ban on the entry into this country of aliens from enemy-occupied territories. Nevertheless this has so far not been done, or done only to so small an extent that the concessions almost seem calculated to show up the grudging spirit in which they are made. The wife and children of a refugee who has succeeded in joining the armed forces of an Allied nation are allowed to land, if they can reach our shores—but his aged parents will be excluded. A technician valuable to the war-effort may be let in, but not because he is a human being in extremity. And when asked to waive these regulations in favour of persons fleeing for their lives from Nazi terror, the Minister for Home Security, speaking in the name of the War Cabinet, returns "No" for an answer.

Looking for a Sign

This is not exactly a happy omen for British initiative in the Conference on refugee problems which is meeting in Bermuda. We have, to be sure, the Foreign Secretary's assurance that these discussions are meant to lead to more than a re-chewing of the cud of the "difficulties" on which the principal Allied governments have been ruminat-

ing for the last few months. But we still look for a sign that the Governments are imbued with a sense of urgency at all commensurate with that of the Nazis in this matter of exterminating the Jews. The Germans are a methodical people. When Himmler visited Poland last summer he speeded up the time-table for the mass-murders which had been laid down in the spring. There is every reason to believe that the revised dates have been pretty well adhered to. In arranging any international programme of rescue for those threatened victims who may still be able to escape, the Bermuda Conference must realise that it is engaging in a race with death.

Difficulties of course will confront the Conference at every stage. The world is not an easy place in which to arrange the simplest affairs of life or movement at the present time—still less in which to organise the transport and maintenance of helpless, homeless, starving strangers. To minimise these problems is not the way to impress or to stimulate those who have to consider them practically. But the public have the right to ask that our Government's delegates should go to Bermuda with their minds fixed on the future rather than on the past. Ministers are never tired of reminding us of all that this country did before the war in the way of receiving and supporting the victims of Hitler's persecution.

The British Contribution

This record forms, on the whole, a not unworthy chapter in the long history of Britain's traditional attitude towards political refugees. But the time has not come to thumb it over complacently, especially as it has been followed by pages across some of which the word "Too late" is already scrawled. The British contribution to the international Conference should not be an account rendered of what we did in a time of lesser need, but a statement of what we are prepared to do at this eleventh hour,

in a far more acute emergency. Only thus can we in decency ask that question of other States.

And what should our answer be? There has perhaps been too prevalent a belief that very little can be done. The reports which first stirred the national conscience came from Poland—the country in all Europe whence escape was most difficult and efforts to facilitate it most nearly hopeless. Wrath and horror could only find expression in solemn pledges of retribution to come—pledges which, as Mr. Ben-Zwi, Chairman of the Jewish National Council, bitterly exclaimed, can never bring the dead to life. Attention has focussed on the blood-stained walls of the ghettos, on the reek of corpses on the fields of execution. It is right to try to realise these things, but the time has come to think more of the living. Many thousands of Jews are still alive in Central and Southern Europe. In every Axis satellite or occupied State they are in danger, more or less imminent, of death or deportation, never knowing how soon the jaws of the trap will close upon them. Impulse and reason urge them to flee, but unless flight has some objective it is merely a counsel of despair, especially for family groups. Whereas, if they can plan to reach some definite haven, it brings a gleam of hope. Therefore, the first step that Britain should take is to make it known that whatever other Governments may or may not be able to do, no refugee reaching any port, or territory under British control will be refused temporary asylum. Following on that there are possibilities for organising camps, maintenance, and even shipping facilities, which, in the opinion of people closely acquainted with the conditions in the various countries, offer practical prospect of helping many to escape.

Fulfilling an Obligation

It is not likely, however, that very large numbers will make for our own

shores. Such places as Cyprus or North Africa are more accessible from the Southern or South-Eastern European countries which most of the refugees will attempt to leave—and of all the possible places of refuge, Palestine is the most obviously desirable. In the first place there is hardly anyone among the half million Jews who have settled there in the past twenty-five years who has not friends or relatives among the persecuted in Europe, and there is no other country in the world where these can count upon an ungrudging and indeed eager welcome. This is a psychological point which those concerned in what is fundamentally a work of humanity cannot overlook. In the second place Palestine is suffering from an acute labour shortage; there is no country where the problems of work and maintenance for the refugees can be more easily solved, with greater advantage to the war effort. The British Government has undertaken to facilitate the transport to Palestine of some thirty thousand Jewish children, if these can be collected out of Europe, and this engagement is often referred to as if it were the first fruits of the pledges made last December when the facts of

the extermination campaign were established. But in reality it is only the fulfilment of an obligation undertaken under the White Paper of 1939, which when restricting Jewish immigration into the National Home, with a view to finally stopping it altogether, allocated a certain number of certificates especially for refugees. The certificates now set aside for the children are the residue of these. The Government would have had no right to withhold them, and in granting them they have done nothing to open the gates of Palestine to adult Jews (other than the limited number permitted to accompany and escort the children). It is important to be clear about these facts, for the nation which, under international Mandate, controls and administers Palestine, has a very special moral responsibility for the lives and future of Jews who desire to enter the Jewish National Home. Let us never forget that they have the right to claim the promise, solemnly given them with the approval of the League of Nations, that they should come in "by right, and not on sufferance."

THE REAL FRANCE AND THE LEAGUE

Both General de Gaulle and General Giraud last month sent telegrams to the Acting Secretary-General of the League of Nations at Geneva, informing him that:

"The French who are at present free to give expression to their will are unable to regard as having effect the notification which was made to you on April 19, 1941" (Darlan's notification of withdrawal). "The notification was made without the French people, then deprived of the exercise of its sovereignty, being able to pronounce through the organ of legitimate representatives on the position of France in regard to the League of Nations.

"In consequence I ask you to be good enough to consider that that notification, made under foreign pressure, cannot have effect and that, in consequence, France continues to form part of the League of Nations.

"For its part, the National Committee has always considered that France remained bound by her engagements and retained her prerogatives as a member of the League. It is in that spirit that you have been kept informed of the steps taken in virtue of and within the framework of the Mandates assigned to France in the territories of the Cameroons and the States of the Levant."

WORLD AFFAIRS IN PARLIAMENT

By OWEN A. RATTENBURY

Although there have been matters of some interest in the House of Commons since my last month's article was written, they must give way to the much more important debate in the House of Lords on "International Relations after the War."

Lord Cecil's Motion

The House of Lords debate was opened on a motion by Lord Cecil, and produced notable speeches also from Lord Lytton, Lord Perth, Lord Samuel, Lord Sankey and others, with Lord Cranborne's reply.

Lord Cecil, in effect, asked from the Government more specific information concerning the nature of the International Authority which it would be desirable to set up after the war with a view to the maintenance of peace and the encouragement of international co-operation. Thanking the Government for recent declarations on the subject, he had a special word of praise for speeches by Mr. Morrison and Mr. Eden and the Prime Minister's broadcast. As it appeared to him, the Government's attitude could be summarised in certain propositions:—

1. The first essential is victory.
2. International aggression must be stopped.
3. That, in turn, involves some form of international organisation.
4. What is to be the nature of this organisation?

From the Prime Minister's speech it appeared that the "world institution" (as he called it) was to be based in the first place on the United Nations led by the four Great Powers, but ultimately designed to embrace all nations. Lord Cecil thought that the criticism that the Prime Minister had intended to exclude China was a misreading of the broadcast; but, in any case, Mr. Eden had made it perfectly clear in his Maryland speech that China was to be treated on terms of absolute equality. The next items he would mention were the disarmament of the Axis Powers and the trial and punishment of war criminals, followed by the creation of an International Police Force and a

general reduction all round—when that force had been created—of armaments.

Lord Cecil included a "personal word of deep appreciation" to the Prime Minister concerning his definite references to the value of the League of Nations, and, from the depth of his experience gave a general indication of how the existing League could be taken and reconstituted for the new authority.

Reasoned Discussion

In the reasoned discussion which followed—the whole debate reached a singularly high level—Lord Cecil was warmly congratulated on having raised the matter. Lord Samuel made four main points. He stressed the advantages of confederation over federalism in the present state of the world, incidentally paying a warm tribute to the I.L.O. The comity of nations could only be brought about by stages. This country would not be able to avoid considering the question of the administration of colonies. Lastly, if any one point was more important than any other, this to his mind would be Anglo-American co-operation.

Lord Lang of Lambeth, paying tribute to the pioneers of the League, thought that they had blazed a trail which we all had to follow. Lord Sankey stressed the pivotal position of Great Britain in the world organisation of the future.

The High Light

Then came the high light of the debate—Lord Lytton's speech. While not pressing the Government for promises, he strongly urged that they would not wait until the end of the war before entering into consultation with our Allies. Victory was not an end in itself, but the means to an end—peace, by which he meant freedom from the recurrence of war. The anxiety of all the peoples of Europe on this subject was not realised in this country. It was his privilege to meet representatives of all the countries now occupied by Germany and to have discussions with them. They were most anxious to know what this country was going to do after

the war. They knew, of course, what kind of a peace would follow an Axis victory, but they wanted to know what kind of a peace would follow an Allied victory.

Reference had been made to the Atlantic Charter and to the great broadcast speech by the Prime Minister, which were excellent so far as they went. But he entirely agreed with Lord Cecil that it was not so much the machinery that mattered as the will behind the machinery. He would welcome assurances that those with predominant power at the end of the war would not use it selfishly, but co-operatively in order to provide that security under which all nations could live and develop.

Lord Lytton concluded with five "pregnant" questions (as Lord Cranborne termed them), and it is convenient to consider them here in conjunction with the replies which the Lord Privy Seal subsequently gave. To the first—whether, after restoring the independence of the occupied countries, the Government intended to collaborate with them to secure such economic conditions as would enable them to thrive, Lord Cranborne assured Lord Lytton that such was the Government's intention. Secondly, it was their object that the new international society should give both freedom and security to its members. Asked what contribution H.M. Government were prepared to make to the provision of that security, Lord Cranborne referred to Mr. Eden's speech in the House of Commons on December 2 last. Thirdly, Lord Lytton had wanted to know whether the Government were prepared to abandon the policy, so disastrously reiterated in the years preceding the war, that the armed forces of this country would never be used except for the defence of British interests. Lord Cranborne, who did not appear quite to relish the form of the question, agreed that the main interest of this country was the maintenance of peace, to which the policy of Great Britain and the other United Nations would be directed. As regards the last question, were we going to use our monopoly of power selfishly, Lord Cranborne thought it was covered by his previous replies.

Early Discussions

From Lord Perth came a strong plea that the United Nations would be wise to

begin consultations among themselves at an early date—at least to clear the ground by preliminary talks. From his experience at Geneva, both as Secretary-General of the League and as Secretary of the European Union founded on the initiative of M. Briand, he doubted whether regional groupings of States could be effected on any considerable scale.

The Bishop of Chichester brought a new note into the debate when he said that we should come to grief unless, in any International Authority, there was a moral standard for international conduct accepted by all the nations.

International Organisation Essential

Lord Cranborne's reply to Lord Lytton's points has already been outlined. Speaking for the Government, he declared that there was no doubt about the need for some system to regulate the relationships of States and, if the first League had failed to achieve all that had been hoped, its spirit was burning more brightly than ever. The pioneer work had not been wasted and this time we must create a more effective League. Though it need not necessarily be absolutely universal, it must be more powerful than any potential aggressor. It should also contain all nations inspired by the principles for which it stood. Behind it should be an overwhelmingly strong armed force—better to have this force too large than too small. In his opinion, the principle of pooling resources, of granting mutual facilities for defence, should form the basis for the post-war security system.

Finally, the members must be able to consult quickly on any development of the international situation likely to lead to a breach of the peace. The chief permanent official should be able on his own initiative to tell the members of any potentially dangerous development. If the Earl of Perth, when Secretary-General, had had this power, the history of the League might have been very different.

Lord Cecil, in thanking Lord Cranborne for his full and interesting reply, reiterated that the important thing was for the new League to interfere at any early stage and not to wait until war had actually broken out.

THE PROBLEM OF SECURITY

By K. M. BUTLER

In dealing with the problem of social security many enthusiasts, with the best of intentions, have viewed only one aspect of what must be a many-sided problem. In the words of Mr. Herbert Morrison, "There has, I suspect, been a great deal more hot air and enthusiasm about the Beveridge Plan than understanding of it."

Now many people are disappointed at the Government's attitude towards the Beveridge Report. They expected more enthusiasm for a plan which sought to remedy those injustices which have prevailed too long in an enlightened country. But there is a grave danger arising from this disappointment, in that the minds of many citizens are becoming so absorbed with the problem of social security that they are becoming more and more Nationally minded, and ignoring the "New World," in consideration of the "New Britain."

In a speech to the House of Commons, Sir John Anderson pointed out that "After international security, which in the view of the Government must be the first of our peace aims, there must come the establishment of our national economy on a sound basis, with export trade in a healthy condition and employment continuously maintained at the highest level."

We must not allow ourselves to forget that even the author of the Beveridge Report has stated that the success of his scheme depends upon the consideration of certain other eventualities, and in relation to this subject he specifically mentions unemployment.*

None of us knows what conditions may prevail either in our own country, or throughout the world when the war ends. We think and hope that Government planning of demobilisation, taxation, and of industry, may abolish unemployment in this country. *But that is not enough.*

The reason for this statement is obvious to those who have lived through the

*Sir William Beveridge also lays down, as the first of his four conditions for attaining freedom from want, international co-operation for production in peace.—ED.

slump periods in the years between the wars. Loss of trade in our own country leads to unemployment in other countries, with tremendous repercussions throughout the world, and this can only be avoided by a careful system of *International Planning*, which must take precedence over any other scheme for security. Sir William Beveridge himself has said "Maintenance of employment is not a thing which any country could plan for itself without reference to what other countries were likely to do."

Unemployment, as we all know, leads to intensive Nationalism, where each country sets up trade barriers against, and withdraws capital from, other nations, and this in turn leads to discontent and to war. The lesson we must learn is that this is no case of National urgency; it is a case of International urgency.

First of all must come the preparation for the Freedom From Fear, laid down in the Atlantic Charter. However much we should like to appropriate the major portion of the post-war Budget for national reforms and social services, we must remember our debt to those other countries without whose courage and help we should have little chance of a better and more prosperous future.

Have we thought sufficiently about the cost of security and Freedom From Fear, including those economic concessions, and other financial assistance without which permanent peace cannot be established?

As democratic citizens it is up to us to visualise the grave dangers which lie ahead. We must have National agreement upon the urgency of the question, and crush any tendency to make political capital of such an important subject, where one Party pleads for the lion's share of National expenditure for social security, and yet another Party claims priority for defence and International security purposes.

Most of us can remember, although many appear to have forgotten, the folly of the years in the not very distant past, when certain people were crying out for concerted action against aggression, and

protesting against expenditure for our re-armament programme at the same time.

History must not be allowed to repeat itself. Another war will have been fought in vain, unless we, the people, realise that we are not alone in this war, nor shall we be alone in the peace which follows. Before insisting that our own house be

put in order immediately, let us ascertain first, whether insistence will endanger the peace and prosperity of the rest of the world.

International and not National is the thought which should precede all our considerations of the great and glorious task of Reconstruction which lies ahead.

DEFENCE OF DEMOCRACY—FIRST THINGS FIRST

By GORDON DROMORE

Democracy, these days, has not wanted for defenders, on both sides of the Atlantic. But it is from America that the latest and best statement has come of the Democratic ideal. This is *Mr. Agar's A TIME FOR GREATNESS* (Eyre and Spottiswoode, 7s. 6d.), which, though written primarily for Americans, brings equal inspiration to us in Great Britain. To-day none of us dare be ashamed to aim at high seriousness, when the choice before all is between a worse evil and a better good than mankind has ever known before.

Three truths run like shining threads through this defence of democracy. Our civilisation is good. But, like bad or careless stewards, we have neglected to serve this great tradition faithfully. Wherefrom have sprung great weeds of self-distrust and confusion, which we now have to fight as hard as Hitler's own created Hell.

To-day, says Mr. Agar, is the Great Divide of History: good and evil have never been so contrasted before. He has no patience with the half-thinking of the Carr "Period" school. Hitlerite barbarism stands for no supersession of a mere 19th century phase, but for the neck or nothing destruction of civilisation itself. Civilised life, the deepest need of human nature, is based on the fact that it does make sense. An ordered world, where rules and promises are respected, which aims at supporting the good and cramping the bad, does make sense. Emphatically Hitlerite barbarism does not.

Why, perhaps one asks, did this typhoon of barbarism blow up in Germany? Mainly because the German "national tradition is grossly and iniquitously inferior" to any other people in the modern world. Only the German has taught that the barbaric soul is a regenerator.

Plagues like the German movements only happen in bad times, when the world's institutions are failing to meet the demands of life, when traditions are not being taken nobly nor promises sincerely. Democracies share some of the blame for this malaise. Their fatal weakness was a craven fear of war as opposed to a positive love of peace. We were afraid to act greatly and got bogged in "too little and too late." The price of peace and democratic civilisation, we said, is eternal vigilance. But we neglected to pay either.

And the future? For, unlike the Germans, we have to win both the war and the peace. History has rarely given us such copy-book lessons of the evils of ignoring principles. Ignoring principles has meant making excuses for anyone and anything, all along that road which led from the beer halls of Munich to the bloody mud of the Ukraine. Back to principles then. Moral convictions are not only a matter of restraining the bad; they mean unleashing the good qualities in our civilisation, and realising the moral purpose of our culture. Are there not to our very hands noble principles and high potentialities in the League of Nations system, in the Atlantic Charter, in the Lease-Lend revolution in international finance? And Democracy has its own "explosive idea"—*equality*, which must not degenerate into identity, but stands for equality to be civilised as well as to get ahead. To achieve both is the first duty of the democratic and the Christian world; for moral convictions are impossible unless we believe they must be expressed in noble action. "The occasion," said Lincoln, "is piled high with difficulty and we must rise with the occasion."

THE PROBLEM OF THE PUNISHMENT OF WAR CRIMES

By DR. VACLAV BENES

In his recent wireless speech Mr. Winston Churchill expressed in cordial words his appreciation of "the immense work which was accomplished by the creation of the League of Nations." He spoke in favour of the establishment of a new, genuinely effective, League of Nations, "imbued by the same lofty conceptions of freedom, law and morality" but rid of its old defects. In these words the British Prime Minister was expressing the conviction of the overwhelming majority of the European and, let us hope, also of the non-European nations. Yes, the international community and international collaboration should be restored on the basis of the League of Nations! But at the same time it should be strengthened and improved in such a way that it should be able successfully to solve all the difficult tasks connected with the organisation of peace.

The Problem of Sanctions

Already to-day methods are being sought to make the League of Nations into a genuinely effective instrument of peace—possessing perfect and universally binding stipulations for the peaceful settlement of international disputes and a perfect system of automatic sanctions for the eventuality of a new war of aggression. The question of sanctions—which is in essence the main problem—is in particular in the forefront of discussion to-day. If we examine the nature of sanctions and the experiences hitherto gained in connection with them, then we cannot help feeling that the military association of the United Nations represents the great international police force which is making a collective intervention against the peace breakers—just as the adherents of sanctions conceived it. The only mistake—but a fundamental one—is that this intervention is being made at a time when so many States have already become the victims of aggression, almost at the last moment when there is great danger that the aggressors and enemies of an international order of law might prevail.

It is nevertheless necessary to realise that the course of the present war and in particular the association of free nations which it has called into existence are a source of great satisfaction and a good argument for those who believed in the League of Nations and demanded its improvement. To-day at last economic and military sanctions are being applied in full measure against the aggressor. Preparations are also being made for post-war measures which should make it impossible for him to repeat his attack against the rest of the world. In practice the United Nations have taken over the ideas for the realisation of which the League of Nations vainly strove for many years.

If, however, we consider the question of sanctions in all its consequences—as has been done by certain eminent statesmen and jurists of the democratic States—we must realise that it is closely bound up with the problem of war as an international crime, a crime not only in the political sense but also according to the principles of criminal law. If we judge sanctions from this point of view it must be quite clear to us that their moral significance, their culmination and at the same time the most decisive fulfilment of international justice consists in personal sanctions against the authors of war and against those who—although they do not bear personal responsibility for the war—have committed shameful and base crimes during the war. The punishment of the authors of the war and of those guilty of what are called war crimes is a condition of the full success of the struggle of the United Nations which in essence is an exercise of sanctions against the aggressor.

Already before the war international public opinion was moving in this direction. The Geneva Protocol and the Briand-Kellogg Pact—which in a time when international ethics were on the decline could naturally not be appreciated and fully exploited—for the first time branded aggressive war as an international

crime. It is true that views on the significance of these documents were not unanimous but after the experience of the present war it can be said that the conviction that aggressive war is a crime is firmly anchored not only in the minds of the people but also in the legal convictions of all civilised nations. The overwhelming majority of the nations believes that war is a terrible crime whose repetition must be prevented, come what may, and whose authors must be punished.

The Punishment of War Criminals

It is necessary, however, constantly to bear in mind that the question of just retribution for war crimes is a far more difficult problem than would appear at first sight. A mere glance into the past will convince us that the will to punish the war criminals is not of itself enough. The experiences from the last war have taught us that belief and desire are not sufficient. Knowledge is also necessary. Knowledge means to comprehend all the problems and difficulties and to endeavour to remove them. Public opinion even when based on moral indignation and sincerity cannot have the influence that is to be desired unless it is accompanied by at least an elementary knowledge and clarity of aims. After the last war, too, it seemed that the public indignation of the free nations would not permit the war culprits to escape their punishment. Despite a number of serious shortcomings the stipulations of the Peace Treaty of Versailles provided the legal basis for the carrying out of retribution but all endeavours to put them into practice met with ill-success. Law yielded to political considerations and preference was given to economic and political sanctions.

This was an easier solution but a less just one, for the main authors of the war and the war criminals escaped.

As after the last war so also to-day the moral, political, legal and purely technical aspects of the problem of retribution are being discussed. Once again the character of war crimes is being analysed in detail, a definition of them is being sought, the questions of superior orders, the responsibility of heads of State, the problem of an international criminal court and of the extradition of war criminals—all these are being discussed. In addition there are the

fundamental questions of the system of law according to which the criminals are to be prosecuted and the court which should try them. All this, however, is only a form of an external framework for a satisfactory solution of the whole problem. What we are now concerned with is to see that appropriate use is made of the results of these endeavours whose success demands the highest possible measure of international collaboration; to see that in contradistinction to what happened in 1919 the victorious powers should not draw back at the last moment in fear of the consequences connected with the punishment according to law of the authors of the war and of the war criminals. It will be a difficult task for immediately after the conclusion of hostilities voices will be heard demanding that all should be forgotten. I consider that it will be the duty of all who are striving for international collaboration—also therefore of the League of Nations Union—to inform the world public of the significance of just retribution and by their influence to render impossible a repetition of the events of 1919.

Not Revenge but Justice

The objection is very often made that it is impossible to begin a new life in liberated Europe by carrying out punitive repression against whole groups of the population of the defeated States. Those who make this objection point to the fact that the Axis Powers will be sufficiently punished by the consequences of their actual defeat, by the afflictions of war and the economic and political sanctions which will befall them after they have lost the war. Those who make these objections forget that retribution is also one of the main Allied war aims. The United Nations are fighting for the preservation of the rule of law and order, of the principles of human honesty, decency and international ethics. The final victory of these ideals is impossible without the exercise of retribution. It is not a matter of revenge but of justice. In order to avoid revenge we must see to it that justice is satisfied.

After the last war the defeated States were subjected only to military, political and economic sanctions. Even though we are aware that these consequences are connected with every lost war, it is necessary

(Continued on page 14)

UP AND DOWN THE COUNTRY

Accounts of Annual Meetings and Annual Reports from Branches have been pouring in at Head Office. They tell an encouraging story of enthusiasm vanquishing difficulties and of sustained Union activity up and down the country.

A "League Scrapbook," prepared as a novelty for the Annual General Meeting of the MORECAMBE BRANCH, was so well received by the audience that a repeat performance in another hall was immediately arranged. Miss Pat Fetherston, in sending a copy of her script to the Editor, says that it could be performed by almost any Branch. The cast at Morecambe was composed entirely of members of the Committee and the Branch. The A.G.M. produced some new supporters who, it is thought, will be useful to the Branch. Anticipating an influx of new members, the Committee has decided to carry on actively during the summer, and another meeting is being arranged for June.

BOURNVILLE WORKS BRANCH summarises its past year's work as "one of healthy controversy and full activity on the part of the Committee, of renewed interest in and at open meetings, and steady support from our members." A remarkable feature is that extensive transfers of employees to National Service have not seriously affected the membership, which is close to the 400 mark. With more collectors, better still could be done.

The Annual Meeting of the KESWICK BRANCH was addressed by Lieut.-Col. Piers North, D.S.O., M.V.O., from the Ministry of Information. The Annual Report records that, not only were large and successful meetings frequently held, but the Branch reached its goal of a paid-up membership of over 500.

Under the chairmanship of the Mayor of Coventry, Dr. Ambrosová (Czechoslovakia) and Mr. S. K. Chow (China) addressed the Annual Meeting of the EARLSDON BRANCH. During 1942 the Branch membership increased from 230 to 239, with an even greater proportionate rise in the amount of subscriptions collected. The lady members have sent several parcels of knitting to the Polish Comforts Fund organised by Lady Warrender.

BURY BRANCH reports "a better year," with £10 more than in 1941 collected in subscriptions, chiefly owing to the recruitment of several new collectors. At the Annual Meeting Mr. John T. Catterall spoke on "The League and the Future."

Sheriff Sir George Morton presided and the Secretary of the Union, Major Freshwater, spoke at the Annual General Meeting of the EDINBURGH BRANCH last month. The Annual Report is a record of a great deal of admirable work done last year. An Allied Discussion Group has been formed and is concerning itself with the question of Famine Relief, in which there is a growing interest. Plans for the future were discussed at a meeting of members of the GLASGOW BRANCH at which Major Freshwater also spoke. A new Chairman (Mr. A. Mackay) and Committee were provisionally elected. We look forward to the Branch regaining much of its old importance and influence.

"Ready for Action" was a local newspaper's headline verdict on the Annual Meeting of the WISHAW BRANCH. All the speeches drew attention to signs that the League was coming into its own again. Mr. Balmain, the Secretary, reported that members were remaining loyal and their subscriptions were coming in fairly freely. "The Branch is doing well and good local work continues," is the cheering report from the Treasurer of our PAISLEY BRANCH.

Considering the war-time shortage of active members, NEW SOUTHGATE AND FRIERN BARNET BRANCH reckons its progress during the past year as reasonably satisfactory. The number of new members, if not large, more than counterbalanced the few who were lost to the Union.

BARTON HILL BRANCH, at its recent Annual Meeting, was able to report a paid-up membership of 130—an increase on the previous year.

At the Annual Meeting of the OXTED AND LIMPSFIELD BRANCH, which was addressed by Mr. Catterall on "World Order or Chaos?" book tokens were presented to pupils at local schools, won in the annual essay competition.

LETCHWORTH BRANCH is another which

can look back on a year of intensive activity and which, with the encouragement of the Prime Minister's broadcast, means to do better in 1943. At the Annual Meeting Mr. Leslie Aldous, speaking on "Cornerstones of Peace," outlined the present work of the League and the I.L.O.

GODALMING BRANCH held a very successful Annual Meeting at which the Rev. William Paton, D.D., gave a masterly address on "The Church and the Future of World Order."

RAWTENSTALL BRANCH was delighted with Mr. Catterall's visit. In addition to the public meeting, at which the Mayor presided, Mr. Catterall spoke on "Russia" to the senior students at Haslingden Grammar School. From the school he went to a canteen, where he addressed the workers for 25 minutes. In the afternoon there was another fine gathering of students at the Bacup and Rawtenstall Grammar School, where he spoke on the possibilities of a New Order with special reference to the Atlantic Charter. At each of the schools the Chairman of the Branch offered a prize for the best essay written on the respective talks.

The warmth with which Dr. Gilbert Murray was welcomed at the Buffet Luncheon of the LONDON REGIONAL FEDERATION in April confirmed the feeling he expressed that he was "among friends." Our cause, he said, was definitely on the map, and people had gradually come to see that something very like the League must emerge. Peace could not endure without goodwill, nor could it last without strong and continuing unity among the United Nations.

The 23rd in the L.R.F.'s series of Luncheon Talks will be held at the Y.W.C.A. on Tuesday, May 11, when Mr. A. Michalopoulos, Under Secretary of State for Information in the Greek Government, will speak on "Greece's Contribution to the Cause of Freedom."

MUSWELL HILL'S International Brains Trust, according to an enthusiastic member of the audience writing to her daughter in Lancashire, "made the B.B.C. efforts look silly." Captain L. D. Gammans, Hornsey's M.P., made a very able Question Master, always ready to elucidate any involved point which arose out of the 28

written questions. The Brains Trust itself consisted of Miss Freda White, assistant editor of the *New Statesman*, Miss Hebe Spaul, who had travelled extensively in Soviet Russia, Mr. George O. Romney, director of some 60 American Red Cross Clubs in Britain, and Dr. Hellmuth von Rauschensplat, author of "How to Conquer Hitler" and "Help Germany to Revolt."

BOURNEMOUTH also held a Brains Trust, with the following "team" to answer questions: Miss Ruth Diamond (U.S.A.), Dr. G. Adamkiewicz (Poland), Mr. S. L. Hourmouzios (Greece), Mr. Gustav Stern (Czechoslovakia), and Mr. J. E. Parry (Great Britain), with the Rev. E. H. Wade as Question Master.

A big meeting in the Dome at BRIGHTON was held on the subject of the massacre of the Jews in Europe. The speakers were the Bishop of Chichester and Mr. Victor Gollancz.

M. Andre Philip (Fighting France) spoke for the Union at the PETERSFIELD Town Hall. At LANCING a meeting was addressed by Lord Winterton. Mrs. Corbett Ashby visited the County High School at WALTHAMSTOW. At WIMBLEDON the Rev. Marcus Spencer gave an address on "America and the Future of Peace," and the Rev. H. T. Donaldson spoke at NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE on "Foundations of Peace."

ROTARY CLUBS which had L.N.U. speakers during April included:—WEST HAM and ST. ALBANS (Mr. Jaya Deva on the "Far East"); ROCHESTER (Maj.-Gen. J. W. van Oorschot on "Holland"); STAINES (Mr. Leslie Aldous on "Social and Economic Reconstruction"); and MITCHAM (Mr. S. Farstad on "Norway").

A group of eight WOMEN'S INSTITUTES, at PURLEY, heard Mr. Catterall, as did the ST. CATHERINE'S W.I. at GUILDFORD. Mrs. Rischbeith, O.B.E., spoke at CROWTHORNE W.I. (Berks) on "China and the Far East." The WILLESDEN W.C.A. had a talk from Miss June Foo on "China."

HARTFORD (Cheshire) BRANCH raised over £20 for the United Aid to China Fund by means of a whist drive held during March.

BOOKS OF THE MONTH

INDIAN POLITICS 1936-42. (Report on Constitutional Problems in India, Part II.) By Prof. R. Coupland. (Oxford Press. 7s. 6d.)

The Second Part of Prof. Coupland's Report on India, for the Nuffield Trust, reaches even a higher standard of calm objectivity and clearness than the first. This is an "imperative" book, if ever there was one. Here are the facts, the actual record of politics in the Provinces and of party politics as a whole, described in detail and with no beating about the bush. Space is given to the merits and the de-merits of all the Congress Ministries. But it emerges that, when war came, their resignations were not due to any popular demand but the peremptory orders of Congress "High Command." Congress, says Prof. Coupland, is a revolutionary one-party Nationalist organisation. It is "totalitarian" since, though dominated by Mr. Gandhi and other members of the Hindu intelligentsia, it professes to represent all Indian communities and classes. There is a separate analysis of the work of non-Congress Ministries, which was remarkably successful in Bengal and the Punjab. In a book where every page is of interest, two further points of major importance should be noted, the increase of communal tension, and the great and growing scope of India's war effort. The Indian army is nearly two million strong, and it is a voluntary force, which is an inconvenient answer to the statement that India is against the war and that the British Raj has disarmed her. With undisguised impatience we look forward to the third part of the Report, dealing with the possibilities of the future.

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF FASCISM. By Peter Nathan. (Faber & Faber. 8s. 6d.)

A much needed comprehensive book on psychological aspects of Fascism. Though there is plenty of Freudism in these pages, it can be easily understood by the ordinary reader. There is a discussion of the theory of Projection, the process by which Nazis and Fascists attribute to some scape-goat class the impulses they are afraid of in themselves. There is a good deal about the masculine stress of the movement, the frightened male (whether it be reaction to

women's emancipation, or the general fear of anarchy). In view of the problem of what is to be done with Germany after the war, it is of vital importance to try and grasp what perhaps might be called the human side of Fascism—what it is in it that "makes you feel good." We have got to realise the strength as well as the weakness of Fascism, the combination (a hard fact) of a kind of moral exaltation with indulgence in the worst and most degrading side of human nature.

WORLD ECONOMIC SURVEY. 1941-1942. League of Nations. (Allen & Unwin. 12s. 6d.)

On all sides the demand is heard for science to loom larger in social and political life. It is insufficiently realised that the application of scientific method has long been the practice of the League's technical organisations. The latest of these Reports, produced by the Financial, Economic and Transit Department, gives a wealth of information on present world conditions. Here are the facts and figures of Germany's New Order, which, partly as a result of the Russian invasion, emerges as ruthless concentration of the whole Continent's economic and human resources on the needs of war, with no regard to human welfare or any future consequences. Europe's industrial system is changing rapidly in ways which will be very difficult to alter. Special chapters deal with the food and transport situation in Europe, with Allied shipping, with the key position the U.S.A. now occupies in trade, with the immense Allied war production—Great Britain's *per capita* output being the highest in the world. No post-war planning can neglect the staff-work scientifically accomplished in this latest League Report.

NEW PAMPHLETS

The *Labour Party's* Report on THE COLONIES (Transport House, 3d.) comes at the right moment. Its policy, based on the principle of service, instead of power, aims at the well-being of the natives and self-government as soon as possible. Though it realises that colonies in different

stages have different needs, the underlying assumption that our political institution should or can be transplanted to soils so different from their own, seems somewhat open to criticism. India is a warning. But much can be said for eliminating the strategic and economic one-sidedness of the present colonial system, by the introduction of more international control, e.g. by the strengthening and extension of the Mandate system (this is the L.N.U. policy) to all backward colonial territories and by reversing protection. Further, there must be positive planning for the education and economic growth of the native population. This will cost money—a good deal. But with colonial policies resting more on an international basis, Great Britain could give a lead to an international movement, which would certainly be capable of raising the necessary capital. Readers will do well to consider this Report, in conjunction with the *British Government's* WHITE PAPER ON COLONIES and with *Lord Hailey's* BRITAIN AND HER DEPENDENCIES" (Longmans, 6d.).

Under the title of NAZI MASSACRES OF THE JEWS AND OTHERS, Victor Gollancz reproduces the practical proposals for immediate rescue made by the *Archbishop of Canterbury* and *Lord Rochester* in speeches on March 23 in the House of Lords. (Price 2d.)

Two new pamphlets on subjects of international interest come from Messrs. John Crowther, Ltd. (Bognor Regis and London). *RIISING CHINA* (price 1s. 6d.), by *Wm. F. Burbidge*, is a brief history of our Ally and contains a biographical sketch of Generalissimo and Madame Chiang Kai-Shek. In *BRITAIN AND WORLD AIR TRANSPORT*, *B. J. Hurren*—now serving with the Fleet Air Arm—sums up the possibilities of civil aviation after the war, without making extravagant claims for the air in rivalry to other forms of transport. The weakness is that he does not carry the implications of international supervision or control to their logical conclusion. (Price 2s. 6d.)

UNDER STALIN'S COMMAND, by *Lieut.-Col. Hans. Kahle*, with a foreword by Gen.

Sir Hubert Gough, gives a review of Soviet strategy and tactics in the great battles fought by the Russian armies up to February of this year. (Russia To-day Society, 1s.)

We have also received a 16-page pamphlet on THE I.L.O. IN WORLD AFFAIRS, containing the text of a most interesting and comprehensive lecture given by *Colonel David Carnegie* to the Leamington Branch of the L.N.U. in March of this year.

The National Peace Council (144, Southampton Row, W.C.1) announces the publication of three new pamphlets in its "Peace Aims" series:—

In No. 17, entitled "Towards a World Order" (1s. 1d., post free), Lionel Curtis, Señor de Madariaga, Prof. A. L. Goodhart, M. P. H. Spaak, Prof. V. Minorsky and others discuss the political and constitutional aspects of the peace aims problem.

In No. 18, entitled "When the Fighting Stops" (7d., post free), G. D. H. Cole discusses some of the political and economic problems which are likely to arise in the immediate after-war period.

In No. 19, "The Future of Germany" (10d., post free), H. N. Brailsford, Prof. H. G. Wood, Col. T. H. Minshall and Mr. P. Gordon Walker consider the policies to be directed towards Germany to ensure her re-entry into a peaceful international system.

**WHAT IS THE LEAGUE DOING ?
WHAT IS THE UNION DOING ?
WHAT IS THE UNION'S POLICY ?**

HEADWAY will tell you. An annual subscription of 3s. 6d. or more to the League of Nations Union will ensure your receiving it regularly every month

**LEAGUE OF NATIONS UNION,
11, Maiden Lane, London, W.C.2.**

FROM "HEADWAY'S" POST-BAG

Weapons of Peace

Sir,—The change in the mind of those in Great Britain who in the seven years prior to this war had been indifferent or hostile to or derisive of the League of Nations is quite remarkable. With few exceptions they now agree that there must be a League, or United Nations, willing and strong enough to keep the peace. In other words there must be "collective security."

In the United States, too, opinion has swung that way. This was shown some months ago by the results of a nation-wide public survey, which disclosed that much the largest proportion of voters—and the more intelligent section, too—favoured such a policy. Students of international behaviour know that no nation was more loyal to its League obligations than Russia. It was Litvinov who said that "Peace was indivisible." We have no reason for think-

POST-WAR, RELIEF

In the spate of talk about what should or should not be done in the matter of post-war relief, there is a certain risk that people may overlook what has actually been accomplished and is being done. Little excuse now remains for this since readers can find in the *Bulletin of International News*, March 16 (published by the Royal Institute of International Affairs, 1s.), a helpful account of the progress made to date by official organisations. For example, there is the help already brought by the Middle East Supply Centre (Anglo-U.S.), the joint action under Lease-Lend in sending supplies to North Africa, the International Wheat Agreement for a relief pool of 100 million bushels of wheat. More important still is the cumulative progress being made by the key organisation known as the Post-War Requirements Bureau, which Lord Cranborne described on December 7. This Bureau has set up four Committees—Agricultural, Transport, Nutrition and Health (the last-named under the well-known League expert, Dr. Melville Mackenzie), which are composed of experts from the Allied Governments in this country, from the U.S.A. and from the British Empire. The *Bulletin* briefly outlines what has been done and also stresses the point of co-operation with the work of Voluntary Societies.

All who are concerned with the special point of food after the war will also be stimulated by a discussion on this subject recently broadcast to the U.S.A. and now published by the *British Survey*, Vol. IV, No. 17 (15, Buckingham Street, W.C.2, 3d. each copy).

ing that Russian public opinion does not support its leaders, now, in such a policy.

How can it be ensured that the leading peoples of the world will remain not merely in favour of, but be determined to establish and maintain such a policy?

As visualised by Dr. Gilbert Murray at a recent meeting of the Brains Trust, the nations now united for war should remain united after the war in a pledge to win the peace. Probably they would invite other nations of like mind to join them in this big thing.

This winning of the peace will involve, first the disarming of the aggressors and keeping them disarmed, then the establishing of an international Police Force. It will, however, mean much more than that. It will be largely a War of the Spirit and will call on men everywhere to forsake self indulgence and

(Continued on page 15)

WAR CRIMES

(Continued from page 9)

to admit that they are in essence less just for they strike the whole nation without regard to the degree of guilt. Personal sanctions were not applied and the main culprits escaped. The fiasco of the endeavour to punish the war crimes was the first breach driven into the post-war legal order and at the same time the first success of reborn German Imperialism—the precursor of present-day Nazism. The political solution was an emergency solution, it was easier and more comfortable than the industrious seeking out and legal prosecution of the true culprits. Political considerations prevailed over legal ones. To-day we see quite clearly where this weakness led.

I believe that this time the international association of free nations—employing the rich experiences of the League of Nations and of the other institutions of international co-operation—will enforce the extension of the essential political and military sanctions to include individual sanctions according to the principles of criminal law against the authors of the war and the war criminals.

FROM "HEADWAY'S" POST-BAG

(Continued from page 14)

throw off lassitude and indolence in a great effort to benefit mankind everywhere. It will ask the business man, who is rarely indolent but often self-seeking, to make "service" not "self" his motto.

What weapons are there available for winning this peace? For establishing and maintaining it? How can we incline the hearts of men everywhere to keep a just international law?

I suggest that of the many weapons there is none capable of being made so powerful as "radio" and its near ally "television." What these can be made to do almost staggers the imagination. Is it too much to hope that the United Nations will establish—say, at Geneva—the most powerful radio apparatus in the world and the same later on with television when it is developed? It will be developed.

There could thus be presented to all important people in the world, Pictures, Plays, Songs, Entertainments, interesting and instructive Talks, as well as accurate news, and through it all could be made to run like a golden cord an appeal to the spirit of man to persist in maintaining universal peace. All the things created in these programmes should be the best only and be produced, spoken and sung only by the best experts of each country in his own language.

Such a Radio and Television Service would cost a big sum to install and to maintain, but not really heavy when divided amongst the United Nations. Really, can we afford to do without it? Can we afford not to use to its full the most powerful weapon on earth in this war for the will to establish and maintain peace?

I suggest that a big international radio establishment expertly operated by the most suitable and able people only, to each country in its own language by its own experts as described above may project the most popular of all radio programmes and become the most powerful of all weapons in winning the peace.

Therefore I urge that the L.N.U. adopts it as a policy to press upon the British Government. I am aware of the great work and influence of Dr. Gilbert Murray in the cause of education that should be world-wide and effective, but am doubtful that the general public have yet realised what could be done on lines outlined in this letter and feel very sure that our Government and others will move more quickly and thoroughly when their peoples insist on it.

Derby.

F. W. WEAVER.

Russia's Foreign Policy

Sir,—Mr. Henry's reply left my facts unchallenged and my arguments unrefuted. He does not deny that Great Britain guaranteed

the integrity of the Poland of 1939 and that we declared war to fulfil that guarantee. I hoped that we might agree in our condemnation of the Curzon, Hoare-Belisha, Runciman and all other boundary lines imposed by the strong on the weak.

Since our letters the Russian Government—not just one or two "wild men"—has launched a campaign of vilification against Poland. In violation (as "Centurion" reminds us) of the Atlantic Charter, Russia demands territory. Unlike that of the Polish lecturer, the demand is not from a justly punished aggressor but from that aggressor's chief victim.

Mr. Henry now suggests a plebiscite, but can the dead vote? Poland is becoming a vast cemetery. Up to December only, 2½ million Poles were slaughtered by the Germans. Would these and all who fell defending Poland against German and Russian aggression have voted for their country's dismemberment? And what of the mass deportations? These would render any plebiscites in the Baltic States wholly unrepresentative.

Only those who see no moral issues at stake in this war will approve Russia's violation of her 1941 agreement with Poland and her present "claims" against that crucified country. Are we to betray Poland as we betrayed Ethiopia and Czecho-Slovakia?

May I assure "Centurion" that I certainly do envisage "the restoration of the sovereignty of every pre-war state, however small." To this and nothing less, Great Britain has repeatedly pledged herself. With this promise we have encouraged even the smallest of the enemy-occupied states in their years of suffering and oppression. Which are the small states whose sovereignty is, in "Centurion's" view, not to be restored and to which of the larger countries is their sovereignty to be transferred? Are these small countries not to be consulted? How can such a policy be reconciled with "Centurion's" own reference to the Atlantic Charter? The alternative to complete restoration is a return to big-power politics.

"These same British who started this war in order to preserve the European *status quo* declare that an end is to be made of this *status quo*. The small nations are not to be allowed to choose their right places by themselves; these places are to be assigned to them by three Great Powers who are to have a monopoly of armaments and economic policy."

Thus the *Berliner Boersen Zeitung* represents alleged British policy, the "better way" of "Centurion's" internationalist, as a shameless betrayal of Europe.

The League of Nations Union has always championed the right of small nations to their liberties and independence. Poland, by the way, is the second largest (in area and popula-

tion) of all the occupied states. On the other hand Andorra, Liechtenstein, Monaco and the Vatican City—even these are not too small to be free. National sovereignty does not necessarily imply “national armies and tariff walls.”

Wakefield.

C. L. BERRY.

Words for All Nations

Sir,—I am extremely surprised that such eminent men should advocate the use of Basic English as an international language. I have studied Basic English—among scores of other projects—and find that it is one of the least suitable systems proposed in recent years for international use. Invented languages, such as Esperanto, are far superior.

Since it was first published under the name “Panoptic English” in 1928, the author has seen fit to revise it considerably. He has added a large number of words, some with numerous meanings, to the vocabulary, and altogether it has become nothing more than a thinly veiled attempt to foist our own language on to the world—in a very deceptive form.

This is only one of the many attempts to present English as a universal language. It has previously been combined with German, French, Spanish, Latin; and has had its spelling revised in other systems. I have also seen or heard of or read of foreign equivalents of Basic English, such as Basic French, simplified Spanish, or Root German.

I recommend the study of Basic English to

all who have not yet examined it. It is worth while finding out that it would be unsuitable even if foreigners were willing to try it.

Ilford.

WM. GREEN.

All the Difference

Sir,—The *Evening News* on March 17 carried an article asserting that in the post-war world we must be Air Obsessed, with a boxed insert as follows:—

“UNHEEDED WARNINGS

“The writer of this article refers to the constant pre-war warnings (which went unheeded) by Mr. Winston Churchill of the growth of the Luftwaffe.

“We would point out that the *Evening News* also was loud in sounding the alarm against threatened menace—at a time when many of those people who are now so busy telling us how to win the war were pinning their faith to collective security.”

So blatant a misrepresentation obviously could not go unchallenged, and I trust they received many more influential letters than mine—a copy of which I enclose.

NOREEN BLYTH WHITELOCK (Mrs.).

Burgess Hill.

[Our correspondent's letter to the “*Evening News*” pointed out that Mr. Churchill advocated *Air Strength* in conjunction with *Collective Security*, whereas they advocated it as part of an *Isolation* policy—a very different thing.—ED.]

MAIN CONTENTS

PAGE

The Bermuda Conference. By Mrs. Edgar Dugdale	- - -	1
World Affairs in Parliament. By Owen A. Rattenbury	- - -	4
The Problem of Security. By K. M. Butler	- - -	6
The Defence of Democracy. By Gordon Dromore	- - -	7
The Problem of the Punishment of War Crimes.		
	By Dr. Vaclav Benes	8
Up and Down the Country	- - - - -	10
Books of the Month	- - - - -	12
From “Headway's” Post-Bag	- - - - -	14