

HEADWAY

IN WAR-TIME

FRANCH L
MAY 1944
OF POLITICAL
ECONOMICS

The Journal of the League of Nations Union

No. 55

APRIL 1944 51083 PRICE 3d.

ABANDONING THE ATLANTIC CHARTER?

BY A MEMBER OF THE L.N.U. EXECUTIVE

The following Resolution was passed by the Union's Executive on March 16, after two discussions:—

"In view of the discussions in Parliament on February 22nd and 23rd, the Executive Committee of the League of Nations Union reaffirms its belief that a just and enduring peace can only be secured by adherence to the principle embodied in Article 2 of the Atlantic Charter that territorial changes should not be made except in accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned."

A great issue is here involved.

What Mr. Churchill Said

Note first what the Prime Minister said in the Debate referred to in this Resolution:—

"Marshal Stalin and I spoke and agreed upon the need for Poland to obtain compensation at the expense of Germany in the North and West."

He added that

"the term 'unconditional surrender' does not mean that the German people will be enslaved or destroyed. It means, however, that the Allies will not be bound to them at the moment of surrender by any pact or obligation. There will be, for instance, no question of the Atlantic Charter applying to Germany as a matter of right and barring territorial transferences or

adjustments in enemy countries. . . . If we are bound, we are bound by our own consciences."

No Pact with Hitler

Now it is perfectly clear that the Charter is not a Pact made with Hitler or anyone else. In October, 1918, the Germans did ask President Wilson to arrange an armistice on the basis of his Fourteen Points, and Wilson did obtain the Allies' agreement to this, subject to two reservations. This time, the intention is that no such bargain shall be made with the faithless Nazi Government.

But that does not itself invalidate the Charter as an obligation of right. Its preamble says that it was meant "to make known certain common principles in the national policies of their respective countries on which they base their hopes for a better future for the world." In adhering to the Charter, the United Nations have formally stated that "their countries seek no aggrandisement, territorial or other" and that "they desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned." These were to be basic principles of the peace settlement; they were affirmed in August, 1941, as a reassurance to American isolationists and critics of

British imperialism, as a guide to ourselves and our allies, and an indication of policy which might help to divide our enemies.

Does the Charter Apply to the Enemy?

It would be ridiculous and unworthy to argue that the first two Points were not meant to refer to enemy countries as well as others. Of course they were. When Mr. Churchill signed them he was not merely saying that Britain would be good enough to refrain from grabbing, or encouraging others to grab, bits of the territory that she was fighting to liberate from "Nazi tyranny." If there had been any idea of excluding territory that is lawfully Germany's (which does not include Austria or Czechoslovakia) the Ministry of Information could not with any honesty have sent many thousands of copies of the Charter abroad, in propaganda leaflets, without any warning to that effect.

Has Mr. Churchill Repudiated the Charter's Policy?

Must we regard Mr. Churchill's statement of February 22nd as an abandonment of Points 1 and 2 of the Charter to a major degree? I am afraid we must. Mr. Eden's speech of February 23rd, explaining that Points 4 and 5 (about the enemy's access to trade, etc.) retained their full validity, is evidence that this interpretation is officially accepted.

The departure is not a minor one. In applying broad principles of this kind to a peace settlement involving many complex factors, it would be unreasonable to expect complex application of each conception without modification. If, for instance, Mr. Churchill had said that the Soviet Union had an unanswerable case, on strategic grounds, for a pushing back of the Finnish frontier from the gates of Leningrad, or for the control of a base so vital to the defences of Leningrad as Hangö, few if any would have objected that this would be an unwarrantable departure from that principle of "no aggrandisement" (which was affirmed in the Anglo-Soviet alliance as well as in the Charter). In Poland east of the Curzon Line, and in Bessarabia, Russia can sup-

port her claim on ethnographic grounds; transfers here would be restitutions, not aggrandisement!

But the proposal in question is radically different. The territory referred to is to be offered to Poland as "compensation" for what she loses to the Russians. The territory in the North must mean East Prussia: the territory to the West of Poland must mean not only Danzig, but also, presumably, Silesia and Posen. According to a report in the *Manchester Guardian* which claimed high authority, the territory which the Poles would be invited to take from Germany might extend even so far as Stettin! The Russians would hold Königsberg.

Is This a Sound Policy?

If it is true that the Poles had acquired, by their invasion in 1920, more territory to the East than was justifiable on a population basis, then that territory ought to revert to Russia. It is no kindness to our Polish allies to mince words about this. This Polish case is a very weak one, as General Smuts pointed out in 1919; but it is a case which ought to be judged on its merits, even now, with the help of others besides the Russians and the Poles.

Should the loss of territory in the East justify a Polish claim for "compensation" in the North and West? Surely that is a vicious principle, a relic of the kind of imperialism which the world must get rid of.

Would the seizure of E. Prussia and Eastern Germany be justifiable on the ground that the Germans have brutally shifted the population in many of the border lands between Teuton and Slav, and have murdered an immense number of Jews and others, especially in Western Poland? Mr. Eden advanced this as an argument on February 23rd. Certainly the population in some of these lands has been transferred by this appalling calculated savagery. (For evidence, see the I.L.O. book on "Displacement of Populations in Europe"). But surely that huge evil in West Poland will not make easier the good government of E. Prussia by the Poles. That is a land of Germans; overwhelmingly, indisputably German.

The discussion in the L.N.U. Executive
(Continued on page 3.)

THE I.L.O. CONFERENCE

LONDON DIRECTOR TELLS W.A.C.

Meeting under the chairmanship of MISS K. D. COURTNEY, the WOMEN'S ADVISORY COUNCIL of the League of Nations Union, heard a full description of the plans for the forthcoming International Labour Conference from MR. CLIFTON ROBBINS, Director of the London Office of the I.L.O.

The social side of life, began Mr. Robbins, would be very important after the war. As a result of total war we were witnessing a social upheaval compared with which the upheaval caused by the last war was nothing. Nobody yet knew the consequences. Nothing less than the reconditioning of society itself was the task awaiting the world after the war.

Though nowadays the idea of having tripartite discussions on industrial matters was a commonplace, it was revolutionary when the I.L.O. started twenty-five years ago. When the present war began the I.L.O. for a time had suffered from the effects of "blast" but, with the support of Governments, workers and employers, it had speedily recovered. To-day it was in the almost embarrassing position of "all men speaking well" of it, and was settling down to the job of playing its part in international reconstruction.

The recent Governing Body meeting had been just like the old Geneva days, and had recreated the Geneva spirit in London. The I.L.O. had always been an integral part of the League of Nations, and this

(Continued from page 2.)

on these issues was one of the most impressive I have ever attended. It is a great honour to be a member of a committee which can debate such an issue on such a level. The outcome is indicated, guardedly, in the Resolution quoted above. Being resolved to prevent Germany from committing aggression again, we shall discredit our cause if we show ourselves unprincipled in victory, and we shall defeat our purpose if we arm the Germans with a nation-wide resolve to undo an intolerable wrong.

starting again in London had therefore been highly important from the whole point of view of international organisation. Moreover, it was not merely an inter-Allied affair. A delegate from Sweden had attended the London meeting. Eventually it would represent the whole world as well as the inter-Allied world.

The decision to hold the International Labour Conference at Philadelphia for a month from April 20 was a great act of faith. Well knowing that at that time the whole of Europe might be aflame, Governments and the other parties to industry yet thought it worth while to send delegates.

The Conference, continued Mr. Robbins, would have "a pretty plateful of work" before it. First came the main lines of policy for the future. We heard a lot nowadays about U.N.R.R.A., Hot Springs, Currency Boards, and so on. Relief, nutrition and finance must all be allied somewhere to work and industry. It seemed that, under the International Authority, there would be a whole series of international organisations doing various jobs of work, with the I.L.O. one of them. Where exactly would the I.L.O. come into the picture? Mr. Eden had spoken of giving it a "power of scrutiny." It was important that it should not be hampered by decisions taken in other watertight compartments.

Most important, too, would be the organisation of employment in transition from war to peace. The difficulties would be tremendous, for the change-over involved a whole series of complicated problems. Similarly Social Security implied something like an international Beveridge Plan. Then there was what might be called the "Social Mandate" for Colonies.

In tackling all these big problems in the space of a month, concluded Mr. Robbins, the International Labour Conference would be surprised and delighted if it found solutions to all. But at least a start would be made. The nations would get down to them in earnest and begin to see their way for the future.

THIS MONTH'S INTERNATIONAL LABOUR CONFERENCE

(FROM OUR INDUSTRIAL CORRESPONDENT)

The stage is being set at Philadelphia for what is known officially as "the Twenty-sixth Session of the International Labour Conference." April 20 is the date fixed for the opening of the proceedings, which are expected to last in all for about a month. This will be the first full-dress Conference of its kind since the outbreak of hostilities in 1939. The New York Conference in the autumn of 1941 was an improvised affair. True, at that stage of the war, it was a remarkable feat to bring together delegates from thirty-six nations. Primarily, however, it was a gesture of the I.L.O.'s determination to keep going in war-time. Now, at length, the time has come for the Organisation really to get down to business.

Forty Countries

Who will be there at Philadelphia? The simplest thing will be to start by saying who will not. The Axis Powers—Germany, Italy and Japan—will have no part in the Conference. Neither will a few more countries like Spain and those satellites of Hitler who have severed their connection with the I.L.O. But, at the moment of writing, some forty countries have announced their intention of being represented, and their number is likely to be increased. They include Great Britain and all the Dominions. The United States, who is providing hospitality, is of course one of the most enthusiastic members of the I.L.O. The occupied countries with governments in London will be fully represented. There will be strong contingents, from the Latin American countries, whose zeal for social progress has developed enormously in recent years.

It will be no easy task for the depleted staff of the International Labour Office to get everything ready in time. Normally, as soon as one year's Conference was finished the Office started getting ready for the next. This time all the preparations will have to be crammed—and under war-

time conditions—into the space of four months.

A Heavy Agenda

The agenda, too, is almost frightening in its immensity. All the items were very carefully chosen by the Governing Body at its session in London during December.

As a start it seemed essential to define the *Future Policy, Programme and Status of the International Labour Organisation*. All around us, though the war is not yet over, we see the beginnings of concerted international action to deal with post-war problems—Hot Springs, U.N.R.R.A., and the rest. Thus it is imperative that the I.L.O. should keep pace with these developments, that the social problems connected with reconstruction should be given their place in the scheme of things, and that full use should be made of the I.L.O.'s knowledge and experience.

The Conference will have before it a full report prepared by the Office on these matters. The adoption of a new Declaration of General Principles, or "Social Mandate," is foreshadowed. Ways and means of making the I.L.O. more effective will be thoroughly discussed. Suggestions from various quarters, include regional activities, mutual supervision of the application of international standards, speeding up the adoption of Conventions and Recommendations, and stricter rules regarding reports on action by Governments. Some of the workers' delegates will also strongly press for the I.L.O. to be made financially independent.

The second item on the agenda—*Recommendations to the United Nations for Present and Post-War Social Policy*—had the approval of all members of the Governing Body, including representatives of the United Nations. Here, again, the Office is preparing a report, which will deal with the social objectives of economic policy; the general principles which should be applied in such matters as conditions of work, social security, child labour, paid holidays, prevention of accidents, indus-

trial relations, industrial hygiene, labour welfare and the like; the social provisions to be inscribed in any peace settlement; and social policy in the territories of Axis countries occupied by the forces of the United Nations.

Possible Conventions

On the previous items it is not proposed that the Conference should adopt any Conventions. Next follow, however, some more technical questions, with regard to which action in the form of Draft Conventions or Recommendations might appropriately be taken. *The Organisation of Employment in the Transition from War to Peace*, for example, is a problem which the Office has already studied in detail, and carefully considered proposals will be submitted to the Conference. So too with *Social Security*, with special reference to problems arising out of the war. *Minimum Standards of Social Policy in Dependent Territories* appears on the

agenda because the Governing Body thought it necessary for the I.L.O., in restating its policy and objectives, to take parallel action in respect of colonies and similar territories.

The *Director's Report and Reports on the Application of Conventions* will conclude the formal business of the Conference.

It is interesting to note that the International Labour Office, in writing to Governments to urge them to arrange for full delegations to attend the Conference, points out that the items down for discussion affect women as much as men. Therefore the inclusion of women in the delegations, either as delegates or advisers, is tactfully suggested. States with colonial responsibilities are also asked to include—among the Government, employers' and workers' delegates or advisers—some representatives of dependent territories.

FROM "HEADWAY'S" POSTBAG

(We regret that, owing to pressure upon space, other letters from readers have had to be held over.—Ed.)

History Teaching

SIR.—I feel that a protest should be lodged against the sweeping statements made by your contributor, Flying Officer R. P. Odell, in the February number of HEADWAY.

I have known many schools from the inside, but there is not one of them where the history syllabus or the attitude of the teacher is such as he describes.

Mr. Odell must have been unfortunate in his experience, and I am sure that many headmasters and headmistresses would be glad to invite him, after the war is over, to see something of the history teaching in their schools.

E. M. TANNER.

Headmistress.

Roedean School.

Bad Manners

SIR.—Does anyone know what has become of the man Greiser, who cocked a snook at the League's High Commissioner for Danzig?

Though, no doubt, he is only one of the lesser gangsters, I think, nevertheless, that he

should be made an example of, when the time comes.

Others who should not be forgotten are those Italian journalists who shouted the Emperor of Abyssinia down at Geneva.

It should, I think, be made clear that international bad manners are not to pay any more than aggression or crime—though the penalties will no doubt be different.

J. E. C. EATON.

United University Club.

(Greiser's name appeared some time ago on a list of Gauleiters who had been summoned to see Hitler. He is not likely to be forgotten by those who are keeping count of War Criminals, and it would appear that he will have to answer for more serious crimes than his historic display of bad manners at Geneva.—Ed.)

Our Address:

HEADWAY

**11, MAIDEN LANE,
LONDON, W.C.2.**

Telephone

Temple Bar 6140

RUSSIA AND THE MOSCOW DECLARATION

By REG BISHOP (Editor of "Russia Today")

(We hope to publish a series of articles on the Moscow Four-Power Declaration from the respective points of view of various countries, both great and small. Here, to start, is a representative opinion from the Russian angle.—Ed.)

In discussing the Soviet Union and its relation to particular world problems one cannot go far wrong if one always bears in mind that that country has been actuated throughout its whole existence by two guiding principles, namely, the building up of Socialism inside its own borders and keeping war away from those borders. And as the Soviet Government realised long before Litvinov actually uttered the word, in the middle '30's, that "peace is indivisible," keeping war away from their own borders has meant to them straining every nerve to keep war away from the world.

Actually, and contrary to widely-held opinion, the Soviet Union has pursued a thoroughly consistent policy through the whole period of its existence, whether inside the League of Nations or not, whether its relations with any particular country were, at any given moment, friendly or not.

That policy was expounded by Joseph Stalin in a speech delivered on January 26th, 1934, in which he said:—

"Some German politicians say that the U.S.S.R. has now taken an orientation towards France and Poland . . . That is not true. Of course we are far from enthusiastic about the Fascist régime in Germany. We never had any orientation towards Germany, nor have we now towards Poland and France. In the past, and at the present time, our orientation is towards the U.S.S.R. and towards the U.S.S.R. alone, and if the interests of the U.S.S.R. demand rapprochement with one country or another which is not interested in disturbing peace, we take this step without hesitation."

If one understands the plain language of that statement, one cannot misunderstand any moves the Soviet Government may make, nor its policy in any given situation. From 1917 onwards the Soviet Government has been prepared to pursue a policy of reciprocal friendship with all régimes, regarding the internal policies of governments as being exclusively an affair for the people of the countries concerned. But

when reciprocity has been refused, then the Soviet Government has considered itself free to pursue its own independent policy.

Realist Principles

When the Four-Power Declaration made at the Moscow Conference in October, 1943, is under discussion the above facts need to be borne in mind. Two clauses of the declaration—Nos. 4 and 5—are of particular interest just now. They lay it down that the signatories recognise the necessity of establishing at the earliest practicable moment a general international organisation based on the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states for the maintenance of international peace and security, and that, pending the establishment of such an organisation, they will consult with each other, and with other members of the United Nations, as occasion requires, for common action.

The policy pursued with the U.S.S.R. is generally admitted to be a realist one, and sometimes that is used as a term of reproach, though actually it is far from being so. It was an utter lack of realism which precipitated war in 1939 and which had previously allowed Hitler and Mussolini to get away with the spoils on countless occasions.

Throughout the period from 1934 to 1939 the Soviet Union was a member of the League of Nations, and it is paying no unjustified compliment to add that throughout the whole of that period it was the staunchest advocate, the stoutest pillar, of collective action. When the system of collective security broke down in 1939—and it was no fault of the Soviet Union that it did so—the Soviet Union had to take what individual measures it could to maintain its own security.

Continuing War Co-operation

Joseph E. Davies, at that time U.S. Ambassador in Moscow, reported in 1937 to his Government that all Soviet policy

was being subordinated to securing a peace alliance with the European democracies and Great Britain. In this war Soviet spokesmen have made it abundantly clear that they are anxious to ensure that the war-time co-operation of Great Britain and U.S.A. shall continue into the years of peace, and that they see no reason why differing political and economic systems need constitute an obstacle provided that there is integrity of purpose on both sides.

The whole history of the Soviet Union shows that it will support any organised international system which it feels is really striving to do the job it sets itself. When this war is over the Soviet people will want a guarantee against the further spoliation of their country and the massacre of its inhabitants. Their realism tells them that such security can best be found in the principles contained in the Moscow Declaration. In addition, and this is important, the Soviet Government is one of the signatories of this Declaration, and the Soviet Government has a habit of honouring obligations which it undertakes. In the political, as in the commercial field, it has an unchallengeable record in this respect.

Russian Comment

Speaking in Denver, Colorado, on December 2, 1943, of the effects of the Moscow Conference on American public opinion, Mr. William L. Batt, Vice-Chairman of the U.S. War Production Board, said:—

"I think what Russia wants in the post-war world is an assurance of continued peace and a square deal. They are wise enough to know that we want the same thing and that together we can go far towards getting it."

The issue of the official Soviet Government newspaper, *Izvestia*, which gave the terms of the Declaration, made the following comment in a leading article:—

"The second most important political outcome of the Conference is the definition of the common strivings towards continuation of the present close collaboration and co-operation of Great Britain, U.S.S.R. and U.S.A. into the period which will follow the end of military operations. Conviction of the fact that the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition set up for the conduct of the war must guarantee the winning of the peace as well as the war is contained in the Declaration on general security. The

Chinese Government has also joined in this Declaration. It therefore expresses the will and decision of four of the greatest Powers in the world, who take upon themselves the responsibility for the future organisation of peace."

The article further declares that the Declaration is "the first stone in the foundation of the post-war future," adding that its principles bridge the gap between the present and future collaboration of all the freedom-loving states, both large and small, for the full development of political, economic and social welfare of the peoples.

The exact form which the post-war international organisation will take is something which only the future can determine, but provided that it is an organisation of sovereign states, genuinely seeking to maintain peace and check aggression, and that its aspirations are backed by powers sufficient for their fulfilment, there can be no doubt in any reasonable person's mind that amongst the bastions of this organisation will be the U.S.S.R.

LEAGUE REPORT

THE REPORT ON THE WORK OF THE LEAGUE, 1942-43, by the Acting Secretary-General, which was reviewed in the February HEADWAY, is now ready in the English edition. Price 2s., from Messrs. Allen and Unwin (League of Nations Publications), or from the Union Book Shop.

PUTNEY BRANCH

MR. VERNON BARTLETT, M.P.

on

"THE WORLD OF TO-MORROW"

April 17 at 7.15 p.m.

UNION CHURCH, PUTNEY (corner)
of Upper Richmond Rd. and Ravenna Rd.

THE CASE AGAINST MUNICH

AN ANSWER TO LORD MAUGHAM

By THE EARL OF LYTTON

Lord Maugham's little book* marshals the arguments in defence of Mr. Chamberlain's foreign policy in 1937-8 with the skill and lucidity of a trained lawyer, but he has failed to answer the case against that policy, which as a politician he has never understood. He begins by stating certain premises, and argues from these that Mr. Chamberlain's Government was wise and statesmanlike in preventing war in 1938 by the Munich agreement.

His premises are these:—

(1) That the State of Czechoslovakia was an unnatural combination of discordant elements which the Government of the Republic had never succeeded in reconciling.

(2) That the Sudeten Germans had never been happy in Czechoslovakia and always wanted to be incorporated in the German Reich.

(3) That Hitler was justified in annexing by force the Sudeten territory of Czechoslovakia, because the majority of the people living in it spoke the German language, though that territory had never belonged to Germany.

(4) That Hitler had done nothing up to then to indicate that his word was not to be believed, or that his policy threatened any other State.

(5) That British interests were not menaced by the decision of Hitler to annex the Sudeten territory.

(6) That Germany was very powerful in a military sense and equipped with the most modern weapons.

(7) That France and Britain were weak and ill-equipped.

(8) That France was torn with internal dissensions, and that her statesmen were unreliable and corrupt.

(9) That there would have been no agreement within the Empire that war was justified to keep the Sudeten Germans within the Czech State.

(10) That the League of Nations had ceased to exist as an effective political factor.

(11) That Russia, having no common frontier with Czechoslovakia, could not give her military assistance.

(12) That by preventing war in 1938 a valuable year had been gained, which was well spent in rearmament, and this enabled us to win the Battle of Britain in 1940.

Inaccurate Premises

That is Lord Maugham's case. The accuracy of some of his premises is questionable. It could easily be shown that during all the eighteen years of the Republic what Lord Maugham calls "the turbulent German minorities" were quite satisfied to remain in the Czech State till Hitler started his doctrine of *Deutschthum*, and even Henlein himself maintained almost up to 1937 that separation from Czechoslovakia was not what they desired. It could also be shown that, if the Covenant of the League of Nations was no longer an effective instrument for peace in 1937, that was only because Britain and France had failed to use it; and that, if Germany had by then become the strongest military Power in Europe, that was because the Governments of which Mr. Chamberlain had been a member had failed to use the power they possessed to prevent it. Again, it could be argued that there was plenty of ground for questioning the trustworthiness of the author of *Mein Kampf* even in 1938. Finally, the value of the delay claimed could be shown to be quite illusory. Lord Maugham admits that the German rate of armament production was ten times greater than that of Britain or France. In addition, Mr. Chamberlain had presented Germany with the

*THE TRUTH ABOUT THE MUNICH CRISIS. By Viscount Maugham. (Heinemann. 5s.)

great armament factories of Czechoslovakia without firing a shot or losing a man; and so confident was he that he had secured "peace in our time" that very little re-armament was in fact carried out that year. Relatively, therefore, Germany was stronger in 1939 than in 1938.

The Author's Blind Spot

But what Lord Maugham fails to see is that, if all his premises were true, they might perhaps be claimed as justification for not intervening at all, but are no justification for the kind of intervention and the kind of settlement for which Mr. Chamberlain was responsible. If Lord Maugham and his colleagues in the Government believed all the things which he says in his book why, in heaven's name, did they not leave the Czechs to fight their own case and resist the German aggression, which they certainly would have done? They would have been beaten, no doubt, unless Russia had come to their assistance, which was a not impossible contingency; and the result would have been the same as it was after Munich. Britain and France would have been humiliated, as they were after Munich, but at least they would have escaped the crowning humiliation of having negotiated a peace at Czechoslovakia's expense.

Encouraging Hitler

The only justification for intervention was that Hitler's threatened aggression was an international crime, which should be prevented if possible, and that, if carried out, it would constitute a menace to every other country in Europe, including our own.

That is what Mr. Chamberlain meant to imply when on September 11th he declared that "Great Britain could not remain aloof if there were a general conflict in which the integrity of France was threatened. . . . It is of the utmost importance that Germany should make no mistake about it; she cannot with impunity carry out a rapid and successful military campaign against Czechoslovakia without the fear of intervention by France and even Great Britain."

Lord Maugham says of this declaration that "it was as far as any British Minister could go," and he adds, "It left little room

for doubt as to the first result of a German invasion if France went to war. There would appear to be little ground for criticising the attitude of the British Government at this time on the ground of lack of courage."

If Mr. Chamberlain's statement was not lacking in courage, it cannot be said to have been conspicuous for wisdom. It is impossible to imagine any statement more calculated at that moment to encourage Hitler in his aggressive designs on Czechoslovakia. The carefully studied vagueness of its words deprived the statement of any value as a warning. It showed clearly what Lord Maugham admits to have been the truth, that Great Britain and France recognised the desirability in their own interests of preventing "a rapid and successful military campaign against Czechoslovakia" and were extremely unwilling to take steps to that end. If Mr. Chamberlain had said that an attack on Czechoslovakia would involve, not "the fear," but the *certainty* of a war with Great Britain, Hitler might have hesitated, as he had done in the previous May when the Czech Government made it quite clear that they would resist any attack upon their country. If all the countries that are now at war with Germany because they did not stand together in time had made the same declaration, Hitler would most certainly have refrained from his contemplated aggression. To make it clear, as Mr. Chamberlain did, that we did not mean to fight, was the height of folly; to use diplomatic pressure, as he did, to prevent the Czechs from resisting, and to achieve "a settlement," admittedly with great personal courage, which did not prevent the aggression but enabled it to be carried out without "any fear of intervention by Britain or even France" was the depth of degradation. No one can justly accuse Mr. Chamberlain of personal cowardice, but the foreign policy of his Government was dictated by fear of war—as distinct from determination to prevent war.

That was an attitude which invited aggression in all parts of the world, which made worthless the guarantees we scattered about in 1939 to Greece, Roumania and Poland, which made war ultimately inevitable, which led to the downfall of France in 1940, and would have led to the downfall of this country, too, had not the leadership passed into very different hands.

THE WORLD'S WHITEHALL

By LESLIE R. ALDOUS

THE INTERNATIONAL SECRETARIAT OF THE FUTURE. By a Group of Former Officials of the League of Nations. (Royal Institute of International Affairs. 2s. 6d.)

Without an International Civil Service to give it a corporate and continuous existence, any "general international organisation" such as is foreshadowed by the Moscow Declaration would be stillborn. Thus every scheme for the International Authority of to-morrow includes not only an "Assembly" and a "Council" but a Secretariat. Article V. of the Union's Draft Pact for the Future International Authority briefly outlines the organisation and functions of the Secretariat.

Chatham House's new study of the administrative problems of international organisation is therefore most timely. The Group which prepared this 64-page pamphlet consisted of Lord Perth, Mr. Th. Aghnides, Mr. Erik Colban, Mr. A. Pelt, Mr. F. P. Walters and Mr. J. V. Wilson, all of whom held high administrative rank in the League Secretariat. No team could have been more competent to draw practical lessons from their direct experience of how international machinery works.

As a starting point it is necessary to know what type of international organisation the Secretariat will have to serve. The Chatham House Group, taking as their guide the Atlantic Charter and the Moscow Four-Power Declaration, assume with some confidence that the immediate international issue after the war will continue to be how to promote better co-operation among sovereign states, not how to abolish them. They also think that the organisation will have a world-wide character, starting with the United Nations and expanding rapidly to include neutral countries and ultimately the ex-enemy countries. Further, it will cover both political and, for want of a better term, "welfare" questions—i.e. all problems which possess an international aspect. On this last point the Group add with all the emphasis at their command that "progress in welfare matters can ultimately be secured only if peace is assured, and that the primary and essential

duty of any international organisation must be to check any tendency towards aggression and to prevent aggression by force if need be."

International Loyalty

Having decided that the new International Authority will inevitably bear a strong family likeness to the League, the Group then consider in detail how its international civil service will compare with the League Secretariat. The changes proposed are few. That is not surprising. The efficiency of the Secretariat, in the period between the two wars, was a byword. It was often admitted by critics who doubted the League for other reasons.

These experienced observers, who watched the Secretariat grow into a skilled instrument of international co-operation, are sure that a spirit of international loyalty among public servants can be maintained in practice. That is not to say that, among the staff at Geneva, there were never any cases of lobbying, intrigue and pressing of national interests. But "as with diphtheria, a high proportion of immunisation, although less than one hundred per cent., suffices to prevent an epidemic."

Closely bound up with this question of international loyalty is that of national representation. The Group do not believe that, in an imperfect world, the appointment of a quota of officials for reasons primarily of nationality can be entirely eliminated. A system which depends upon the co-operation of Member States cannot ignore the factor of national prestige and interest. Besides, there are advantages in having as many nations as possible directly interested in and familiar with the actual work of an international organisation. The principle that the Group stress is that everybody in the service should have useful and constructive work to do.

The Directorate

There is not space to dwell upon such aspects as tenure and recruitment—for which readers should go to the Report itself. The Directorate of the service, however, will be a matter of the utmost importance, especially if recent proposals

(supported by the Group) to increase the powers of the head official are adopted.

The responsible posts will be few in number and will excite considerable competition. A strong case exists for having nationals of the major Powers well represented among the higher posts, not to champion the policies of their Governments but to put them in a stronger position in dealing with the principal Governments. Nationals of the smaller countries should also be included; and in the long run the best solution may be to have one of the two chief officials drawn from a major, and the other from a smaller, Power. Any appointment, however, must be justified administratively. It is further essential not to undermine the position of heads of sections, all outstanding experts in their respective fields.

The Group are opposed to the proposal to shoulder the head of the service with the additional duty of taking the chair at meetings of the main political organ. The objections which they point out would not apply to the appointment of a permanent chairman. He, however, would have to be a person of exceptional ability and qualifications; and on the whole they think that the League system of filling the chair by rotation worked well.

External relations and the liaison activities of officials are discussed, as well as ways and means of "putting over" the international organisation to world public opinion. Something like a revolution in the running of the Information Section is suggested, to give it more freedom than the corresponding section of the League and to enable it to keep pace with modern methods of spreading news. Mr. Pelt, formerly Director of the League's Information Service, has added an appendix on this subject.

An Adequate Budget

"If the League breaks down," said the late Lord Balfour, "it will be because of money." The Group takes this dictum very seriously. Throughout its career, the League's finances were held in a framework of economy which grew in rigidity as it grew in age. Arrears were never so formidable a problem as the League's enemies pretended. For the period 1919-1938, no less than 93.7 per cent. of the contributions due from Member States

was ultimately collected. But, when income and expenditure were so finely balanced, even small defaults or a time lag in paying could have serious consequences—perhaps the paring down of the trivial sum allowed for some useful sideshow, or "robbing Peter to pay Paul."

The Group's suggestion is that the collection of contributions must be made as nearly automatic as possible. If there is an International Bank after the war, its services could be used for the collection of League dues from the Member States. In the budget, a reserve should be provided to cover unforeseen needs.

Good administration is essential to the success of the new international organisation. "But," the Group remind us in their concluding observations, "it must never be forgotten that the guarantee of success lies ultimately in the hands of the peoples—of individual men and women exercising through constitutional processes their will ungrudgingly to use and support the organisation. It will be of vital importance to have the best possible machinery; but the quality of the machinery does not and cannot offer an adequate substitute for the will to use it."

UNION NOTES

The Annual Meeting of the General Council of the League of Nations Union will be held in the Livingstone Hall, Broadway, Westminster, on Thursday and Friday, June 29th and 30th, and (if necessary) July 1st.

The Hon. Walter Nash, Deputy Prime Minister and Finance Minister of New Zealand, showed during his latest visit to this country what a good friend he continues to be to the League of Nations movement. He found time to address the New Commonwealth Society on "International Order." A week later he attended a meeting of the Executive Committee of the League of Nations Union, and, after staying to tea, gave a survey of Pacific Problems to an audience which included members of the London International Assembly.

UP AND DOWN THE COUNTRY

THE SAVINGS BANK DEPARTMENT of the G.P.O. has a record which reflects the greatest possible credit on the Secretary, the Treasurer and the collectors. As the members live in almost every district of London, all the subscriptions have to be collected when opportunity serves during the day. Yet the Branch musters 500 members, all fully paid up. Owing to long hours and overtime, meetings are out of the question in war-time; but all members get either HEADWAY or the NEWS SHEET. Further, as part of the effort to spread knowledge, no fewer than 123 books on international affairs have been presented to the Departmental Library. These are always in great demand and are eagerly read. Financially, the Branch so adjusts its activities to its resources that incomings and outgoings practically balance each other.

The influence of the Savings Bank Branch spreads far beyond its own bounds. Miss M. Ridges, for so many years a tower of strength, has been hard at work reviving the HEMEL HEMPSTEAD BRANCH. By personal calls she has succeeded in getting 111 members to pay their subscriptions. Those who do not receive HEADWAY are indebted to the Savings Bank Branch for NEWS SHEETS. Miss Ridges has also arranged for 2540 copies of the Church Magazine Inset to be sent as often as published to seven churches of different denominations in England and Northern Ireland.

Mr. W. Arnold-Forster, taking the place of Miss K. D. Courtney, did some useful work during a tour of the North of England. At a meeting in MANCHESTER, he took as his subject "The Moscow Declaration and our L.N.U. Policy." At NELSON two meetings were arranged in a works canteen, as well as a public meeting in the Town Hall. Mr. Arnold-Forster completed the tour with a visit to BRADFORD. The opening meeting, at WILMSLOW, was addressed by Mr. Leslie Aldous on "The Future of the L.N.U."

At a Federal Council meeting arranged by the L.R.F. in March, Miss Courtney gave an address on "Thoughts on the Moscow Declaration." She reminded her

audience that, during this period of war, momentous events were almost a daily occurrence and it was apt to be forgotten that the Moscow Declaration was of epoch-making importance. It became so because it stated a policy authorised, not by the representatives of the U.S.A., Russia, China and Great Britain who signed it, but by the Governments which they represented. The issue of the L.N.U.'s Draft Pact for a Future International Authority coincided with the holding of the Moscow Conference—in fact, Mr. Eden had gone to Moscow with a copy of our Draft Pact in his pocket! This Draft Pact was not intended as a last and final plan for the International Authority of the future; it was elastic and open to revision at any time.

The LONDON REGIONAL FEDERATION held its Buffet Luncheon on 14th March which was "China's Day," and it was therefore appropriate that the address should be on "China To-day." Mrs. V. Wallbridge gave a graphic picture of the struggle which China had endured over the last decade, and of the indomitable spirit of her people during this period of civil war and Japanese aggression. China had lacked all the essentials of modern warfare. When the Burma Road, which was vital for transport, had been closed, China had "scratched out" new roads, and it was this patient, wise and enduring China that would win through. China could contribute greatly to the future of peace if given the respect and opportunity she needed. A sum of over £7 was taken in the retiring collection for the United Aid to China Fund.

At the next lunch at the Y.W.C.A., on Wednesday, April 12, the speaker will be Salvador de Madariaga on "The Future of Europe."

WHITEFIELD'S TABERNACLE renewed its interest in Union policy when Miss Ethel Waite visited and spoke on "OUR Part in World Order" at the Young People's Fellowship. It is hoped, as a result, to re-establish the Branch there.

Branch meetings held during the month included OXTED (Miss Courtney); BEDFORD

(Sir Ralph Wedgwood on "Economic Reconstruction after the War"); RUGBY (Captain Edgar Granville, M.P., on "Control and Development of Civil Aviation in the Post-War World"); ST. ALBANS (Rev. Marcus Spencer on "Social Conditions in the U.S.A."); BLACKHEATH (Pastor Viggo Jensen on "Denmark"); WELLINGTON (Mr. Edward Hambro on "Norway's Place in the Post-War World"); COVENTRY (Senator H. Rolin and Dr. S. F. Osiakowski); LEAMINGTON (Mr. Gustav Stern on "The Future of Central Europe"); and a local speaker on "International Law"; EASTBOURNE (Mr. Leslie Aldous on "Why an International Authority?"); BECKENHAM (Mr. Aldous on "World Citizenship"); WEST WICKHAM (Miss Freda White); and KESWICK Discussion Group (Mr. H. W. Howe).

There are further International Brains Trusts to be reported. At PERTH the audience listened to replies from a brilliant team consisting of Sir George Morton, Sir William Mackechnie, Rev. Dr. A. M. Hunter, Rev. S. H. R. Warnes and Miss Lewis.

At REIGATE the Brains Trust consisted of Mr. John T. Catterall, Miss Jean Aitken, Mr. Philip Carter, Alderman H. J. Hamblen, Mr. E. J. Lancashire and the Rev. P. B. Hawksridge (Question Master).

Visiting Canadian Forces in the South of England, Mr. Aldous was Question Master at a "Brains Bee" on Current Affairs organised jointly by the Army education authorities and the Y.M.C.A. The other members were Mrs. Ida Sindelkova-Young (formerly Secretary of the L.N.U. in Prague), Mr. H. W. Hawkins and Miss Judith Todd.

Mr. Catterall and Mr. Aldous were members of a Brains Trust held in the Y.M.C.A. canteen at an R.A.F. Station in the Home Counties.

Mr. Catterall's other engagements during March included NEW SOUTHGATE ("Framework of International Security"), WEST HARTLEPOOL ("Shape of Things to Come"), SCUNTHORPE Civil Defence Training Centre ("Russia"), and GREENFORD Discussion Group.

Among the ROTARY CLUBS which had L.N.U. speakers during March were ASHFORD (Mr. Paul Palmer); BRIXTON (Mr. Catterall); DERBY (the Dean of Chichester,

who also addressed a public meeting); EGHAM (Mr. Catterall); HULL (Professor S. Brodetsky, who also addressed a public meeting); ST. ALBANS (Dr. Z. Grabowski); and SLOUGH (Mr. Edwin Haward).

LAMBETH BRANCH has been keeping up its pioneer work in sending L.N.U. speakers to other organisations. In addition to its Annual Meeting, which was addressed by Dr. O. Falch (Norway), talks were arranged at Great Central Hall Methodist Mission, St. Saviour's, Kenyon Baptist Church, Emmanuel Youth Centre, West Norwood Sisterhood (twice), All Saints, Studley Road Church, Christ Church, Locksfield Methodist Mission (twice), Oakley Place Methodist Mission (twice), Moffat Institute, and the R.A.C.S. Brixton.

MITCHAM Women's Fellowship heard a talk from Mr. Aldous on Hot Springs and PENGE Youth Club one from Miss Hebe Spaul on "Russia."

HARROW BRANCH'S Annual Report shows that the total membership at the end of 1943 was 819—66 new members were recruited against 37 lost through death and removal. Mr. C. W. Judd, Secretary of the Union, spoke at the Annual Meeting on "The L.N.U. and the New International Authority."

JEDBURGH BRANCH, which in recent times has consisted of little more than the committee, has decided to make a big effort to catch the rising tide. As a first step, arrangements have been made to enclose copies of the L.N.U. Leaflet on the Moscow Declaration with a forthcoming issue of the local weekly newspaper. The editor, who has been most helpful, has published a leading article drawing attention to the existence of the L.N.U. and its principles, and is prepared to publish other short articles to help the Branch along.

In sending along a copy of the St. Martin's (Finham) News Letter containing an article on the L.N.U., the Secretary of the GREEN LANE BRANCH, COVENTRY, writes:—"There is quite definitely a rising tide of interest, which I am hoping will result in a largely increased membership."

WORLD AFFAIRS IN PARLIAMENT

By OWEN A. RATTENBURY

In the House of Commons debate on Civil Aviation, one slight passage occurred that illustrates the attitude of different groups to the League of Nations. There is a conventional, unreasoning attitude which takes it as a truism that the League failed, without asking how or why. If it had succeeded in the things in which it is now accused vaguely of failing, that would have been in the teeth of opposition from the very people who now fling the taunt about.

Whether Sir Thomas Moore is one of them I cannot say, but this is what he said in this debate:—

“One could feel that the proposer and seconder of the amendment were living in a world of fantasy in regard to this proposal of world ownership of civil aviation. It seemed as if the last twenty-five years had not passed at all, as if we were still living in the same idealistic atmosphere as that in which we lived when we gave every encouragement to the League of Nations, and as if we relied—just as we then did—on the co-operation of the world. Until the rest of the world co-operate, and we know that they are prepared to co-operate, we must not take the risks that we then took long ago and in which we failed so badly.”

Captain Bellenger, whose zeal for the welfare of soldiers wins him great respect from his political opponents, later dealt very effectively with this passage:—

“The hon. and gallant member suggested we were talking the same language as we talked twenty-five years ago when we spoke of the League of Nations. There is no finer instrument in international honesty to-day than the Covenant of the League of Nations, and sooner or later we have to come back to fundamental principles like that in international relations.”

Mr. Bowles, who introduced the motion, and Mr. Moelwyn Hughes, who seconded it, made a strong plea for full international control of civil aviation after the war. The mover was ridiculed by Mr. Quintin Hogg for having suggested in a previous debate that the directors should be nominated by small states. Mr. Aneurin Bevan welcomed the opportunity

of returning the attack with belligerent support for Mr. Bowles's position.

Help for Refugees

The debate with which I wish mainly to deal, however, occurred when Mr. Richard Law, on the Civil Estimates, raised the subject of refugees.

In 1939, he said, the House of Commons had been asked to provide £1,950 for the inter-Governmental Committee on Refugees, and in 1940 and 1941 on much the same scale. Now he was asking for £50,000, and that was only by way of instalment. Later they would be asked to underwrite £500,000 and the United States had guaranteed another £500,000. That was a measure of their seriousness in this matter. Before the war the problem had been one of great proportions, though they had been able to do much in mitigation of the monstrous cruelty of the Germans at that time.

Miss Rathbone, tireless as always in championing the refugees, was critical. She wondered whether it was symptomatic of the relative importance we attached to things that this matter of refugees was debated for a portion of a day and might involve the expenditure of £1,000,000 by Britain and the U.S.A.; whereas U.N.R.R.A. had a whole day and £80,000,000. She contrasted the little office with two or three typists and meagre expenditure with the millions of men, women and children threatened not merely with death, but with torture, and wondered how many of them could be rescued. What was to be done with them when they were rescued, and what after the war? The Inter-Governmental Committee could only act—as the League of Nations acted—through the individual Governments represented there. They should insist, she thought, that a similar organ to that set up by the United States should be set up here, with a full-time director in constant touch with the United States director. Many of these people, as she reminded the House, are non-Jewish, but the majority are Jewish whom Hitler threatens to exterminate.

The Jewish Problem

Two Jewish speakers followed—first Mr. Lipson, who said that but for the grace of God, the position might have been reversed, and instead of being able to help we might have been needing this help.

Mr. Silverman, although he spoke as a Jew, emphasised that it was by no means entirely a Jewish problem. The Geneva Convention did not apply to Jews as such, for they were not belligerents. Although Hitler had declared war on the whole of Jewry, it was not on a nation. Quoting some terrible extracts from a document about the extermination of Jews in Poland, he said this background would grow as defeat followed defeat for Germany. “As they retreat the last retiring German will kill the last available Jew.” Recalling the historic scene in the House when Mr. Eden announced the terrible facts about this German extermination plan, he wondered whether—even though the effect might be small—a similar call might be repeated. If only a few were saved it would be worth it. He hoped it was not true that the initiative in these matters was passing from London to Washington. Another very serious problem was the number of Jews who were stateless. It was literally true that those who were saved in the next few months would be the only ones who could be saved. “Do not let us have it on our conscience that there were people who might have been saved but who were not saved because we were not willing to take from our other pressing obligations the time, energy or machinery necessary to save them. If that time, energy or machinery were to delay victory by a single day, none of us would ask for it to be taken; but it is not correct to say that the only way of saving these people is by ensuring a quicker victory. . . . The very coming of victory may mean the extermination of the last remnants of the Jewish people in Europe. Well, if that sacrifice were necessary in order to bring freedom to the world, let it be made. . . . But no one is certain. . . . At any rate,

let it not be on our conscience that there were any lives at all that might have been saved that we neglected to save.”

Religion or Race

Lt.-Col. Sir Walter Smiles, speaking of the Jews, said he always thought the Jews were members of a religion and not of a race, and so suggested they should talk of Poles or Greeks and include the Jews in that. That was, of course, just what had been done. (It was strange that he should have forgotten Hitler's onslaught on the Jews as a race—to such an extent that one grandmother of Jewish race brought any descendant into his net, although in many cases they were Christians who had forgotten their Jewish origin). Mr. Graham White emphasised Mr. Silverman's very moving speech, and Mr. Astor added his plea, as did Mr. David Grenfell, on this St. David's Day, reminding the House that David was a Jew.

Mr. Law replied, hoping—though he admitted the alternative possibility—that Mr. Silverman's vision of the position of Jews in Europe would not be so completely realised. With regard to setting up a British committee similar to that of the United States, he said it was not necessary because to all intents and purposes the Foreign Office committee was in the same position. They had access to Mr. Eden, who was in the War Cabinet, with direct access on any matter that needed quick decisions. With regard to Mr. Silverman's suggested new declaration, he said that would certainly be considered, though our attitude on the matter had never been in doubt.

CONTINUING TERROR

HUMAN LIVES CAN BE SAVED is the theme of a new appeal which is being made by the *National Committee for Rescue from Nazi Terror*. A Survey and a Programme are contained in a 24-page pamphlet entitled “Continuing Terror—How to Rescue Hitler's Victims.” Copies of this pamphlet and full information about the work of the Committee may be obtained from its office at 30, Maiden Lane, London, W.C.2.

FRESHWATER MEMORIAL FUND

We publish below a *second list* of donations to the Freshwater Memorial Fund, received at Head Office up to March 24, 1944. As in the first list they are arranged according to Branches—the names of individuals will not be published.

£ s. d.		£ s. d.		£ s. d.		£ s. d.	
Addington, S.E.5	1 0 0	City	5 0	Hoddenhurst and Throop	5 0	Redland	5 0
Amble	12 6	Clayton-le-Moors	1 0 0	Holborn	1 16 0	Reigate	5 5 0
Amlwch	10 0	Clifton	10 0	Huddersfield	10 10 6	Rhos-on-Sea	5 0 0
Banbury	2 5 0	Coedpoeth	10 6	Hull	10 6	Richmond (Yorks)	
Banff	10 0	Cromer	10 0	Hyde (Cheshire)	1 1 0	High Sch.	2 0 0
Barlaston	1 1 0	Danbury	10 0	Ilford	12 6	Rottingdean	10 0
Barnet	1 0 0	Darwen	7 6	Ipswich	1 0 0	Rugby	1 5 3
Barn Green	5 0	Dinas Powis	1 3 6	Kensington	10 6	St. Austell	20 0 0
Bedford	3 19 6	Dorchester	1 14 9	Keswick	9 11 0	Salisbury	2 6
Betchworth	10 6	Ealing	1 0 0	Kew	1 0 0	Scarborough	10 0
Birkenhead	1 5 0	Earlestown	7 6	Kingston	10 0	Sedgley and Ganals	1 0 0
Birstall	15 0	Eastbourne	8 13 0	Kirkby Lonsdale	1 1 0	Sherborne	1 0 0
Bishopston	10 0	East of Scotland	1 0 0	Knebworth	10 0 0	Shipleigh	5 0
Blackpool	5 0	Edinburgh	2 15 0	Lakenheath	5 0 0	Shoreham	10 6
Bognor Regis	10 6	Epping	5 5 0	Leamington	10 0	Sidcup	1 0 0
Bolton	2 2 0	Essex Federal Council	10 0	Leicester	1 6 0	Solihull	5 0
Bournville Works	10 10 0	Exeter	2 2 0	Letchworth	5 0	Southampton	2 0 0
Bradford	1 1 0	Fleetwood	1 10 0	Malvern	1 0 0	Southend	1 0 0
Bramhall	2 2 0	Golders Green	1 11 0	Manchester	26 11 0	Stevenage	5 0
Brampton	10 0	Glasgow	5 12 6	Mansfield	10 0	Torquay	1 0 0
Brighton	10 0	Godalming	2 0 0	Merthyr Tydfil	2 6	Wadebridge	2 6
Bristol	2 2 0	Grange-Over-Sands	0 10 0	Monmouth Town	1 0 0	Warrington	1 0 0
Buckingham	1 1 0	Hallam	13 15 6	Newbury	10 0	Welsh H.Q.	1 0 0
Burslem	2 2 0	Hampstead	7 7 0	Newcastle (Staffs)	1 6 0	West Hampstead	1 2 6
Cambridge Town	3 12 0	Headingley	10 0	Niton (I.W.)	1 0 0	Weybridge	1 1 0
Camforth	2 2 0	Heanor	2 0 0	Olton	5 0	Wigan	1 5 0
Cardiff	10 0	Heaton	15 0	Oxford	10 0	Winscombe	10 0
Chelmsford	17 0 0	Hereford	10 0	Oxted	10 0	Withington	2 6 6
Chelsea	3 3 0			Paddington	2 2 0	Wood Green	10 0
Chester	2 2 0			Paignton	10 6	Wooldale	5 0 0
				Plymouth	10 0	Worthing	1 5 0
				Preston	2 6	York	1 10 0
				Putney	1 1 0	Unattached	56 3 6
						Czechoslovak L.N.U.	10 0 0
						Stop Press: Total (March 28th):	£631 12s. 5d.

MAIN CONTENTS

	PAGE
Abandoning the Atlantic Charter?	
<i>By a Member of the L.N.U. Executive</i>	1
I.L.O. Conference. <i>London Director Tells W.A.C.</i>	3
This Month's International Labour Conference.	
<i>(From Our Industrial Correspondent)</i>	4
Russia and the Moscow Declaration. <i>By Reg. Bishop</i>	6
The Case Against Munich: An Answer to Lord Maugham.	
<i>By the Earl of Lytton</i>	8
The World's Whitehall. <i>By Leslie R. Aldous</i>	10
Up and Down the Country	12
World Affairs in Parliament. <i>By Owen Rattenbury</i>	14