

HEADWAY

IN WAR-TIME

The Journal of the League of Nations

BRITISH LIBRARY

7 SEP 1943

OF POLITICAL AND
ECONOMIC SCIENCE

No. 48

SEPTEMBER 1943

PRICE 3d

EDITORIAL

5,1083

FROM IDEALS TO REALITY

Midway through August, the second anniversary of the Atlantic Charter fell at a highly significant and auspicious time.

When, amidst the dark tides of war in 1941, President Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill met somewhere in the Atlantic and put their signatures to their historic Joint Declaration, their action at that stage of the conflict was a superb gesture of faith in the future. It was, moreover, an act of creation. From that moment, the future which they envisaged became alive in the thoughts and strivings of millions of people throughout the world.

That future is not yet with us. And it is not enough to say that we are two years nearer the goal, for that postulates a totally inadequate standard for measuring the progress of great human movements. Although, in the long run, we shall probably achieve considerably more than what Mr. H. G. Wells once described as "a poor human evasion of perfection's overstrain," finality is not to be expected in mankind's endeavours to create the kind of international society of which prophets and philosophers—and practical statesmen as well—have dreamed. Our spur, though we may never "arrive," is the certain conviction that by travelling and working hopefully we may achieve much.

Victory we recognise, as no more than a starting point for the long, slow road which humanity must tread if ever the broad principles of the Atlantic Charter are to be transmuted into reality. Without victory not even a beginning will be made. This year, on the anniversary of the Charter, that prerequisite of its fulfilment was inexorably coming to the stage not of "if" but "when." The fall of Mussolini, the prototype of modern Dictators, had shaken the structure not only of Fascism in Italy but of all Axis pretensions. Closely bound up with this, of course, were the new achievements of Allied arms—the Sicilian prelude to storming the Axis "fortress" of Europe, the unhalted Russian drives on the Orel and Kharkov salients, the increasing power of Allied air warfare, successes against the U-boat campaign, and even signs of well-planned offensive action against Japan in the East. The relentless pattern into which the United Nations were shaping events could not be denied. It was not surprising, therefore, that the Atlantic Charter should seem more closely and immediately related to current events than it was at its birth two years before.

Practical Politics

Speeches and newspaper articles

mirrored the growing realisation that the principles of the Atlantic Charter can, and should, increasingly be discussed in terms of practical politics. *The Times*, for example, on August 11 and 12, prominently published two long articles giving a detailed analysis of the significance of the political and the economic clauses of the Atlantic Charter after two years. A correspondent wrote to us that they might well have been prepared in the office of the League of Nations Union. Most of the ground, certainly, has already been covered in HEADWAY from time to time by Mr. Arnold-Forster and other contributors. But it is nevertheless good that the question of "Peace Aims and Pledges" should have been dealt with so comprehensively in an influential newspaper.

On the political side, the Union cannot but welcome the recognition in this and other quarters that steps must be taken to fill in the outline of the "wider and

permanent system of general security," and that the prospects of an efficacious "permanent system" must depend partly on the impartial application of sanctions in the years immediately after the war against acts of aggression from whatever source. As regards the economic side, it is true that more steps have been taken to prepare the application of Points 4 and 5 than of any other part of the Charter. *The Times* specially mentions the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, the Hot Springs Conference on Food and Agriculture, and the Keynes and White currency plans. It also quotes Mr. Eden's statement that he would like to see the I.L.O. "become the main instrument for giving effect to Article 5 of the Atlantic Charter." "Freedom from want"—although the application of the economic clauses begins at home—will not be achieved by any nation in isolation.

SHOULD THE LEAGUE AND THE L.N.U. DISAPPEAR?

By DR. ALEXANDER KUNOSI

(Former General Secretary of the Czechoslovak League of Nations Association)

Lately there have appeared in sections of the British Press attacks on the British League of Nations Union, the logic of which I find it hard to understand. The L.N.U., as I read the charges, is guilty of having fought the evil forces and evil thoughts in the pre-war period. Recognising that the evil was strong, very strong, the Union should have been realistic and joined the evil!

I believe that the L.N.U. has, all the time, been right in its policy, and has fought bravely—even if not always successfully—on the right side.

We, on the Continent, looked on this great movement of the British people for

peace and collaboration with intense admiration. It was an example and a source of inspiration to everybody on the Continent who struggled against those who, in our own countries, proclaimed the evil right just because it was strong.

Very well do I remember how the "Peace Ballot" encouraged our movement for international collaboration. The results were achieved mainly by the unstinting efforts of the L.N.U. for collective security. The stand taken by Lord Cecil, Lord Lytton and Gilbert Murray of the L.N.U. sometimes made the peoples of the Continent forget the disappointments caused them by the governmental policy of Great Britain.

A Great Service

Without exaggeration I can certify that the 20 years' work of the L.N.U. did a great service, not only to the cause of collective security and peace in Europe, but equally to Great Britain. Because, in spite of the mistakes of British foreign policy, the peace-loving peoples of Europe continued to believe that Great Britain might become the most constructive force for peace.

Recollections of this huge and courageous movement of the L.N.U., among the peoples of the Continent, are an important factor in the resistance against the Nazi New Order and encourage them to turn with hope and confidence to Great Britain.

After the War

In the post-war period, I cannot help feeling, the L.N.U. will again have an historical role of first-rate importance to play. After the war there will be tremendous problems, social and economic, to solve everywhere. This will bring the serious danger that all peoples will be so much involved in attempts to reconstruct a peace economy, and in the consequent internal and political struggles, that it will be extremely difficult to capture their interest for what may seem to many to be remoter problems of international relations and future international collaboration.

In this country, too, people will be inclined to forget again the interdependence of the problems of national reconstruction here and the problems of national reconstruction in other nations. They will forget that interdependence doesn't stop at national boundaries, that national economy has become part of a world economy, and that international collaboration is the road by which the welfare of the individuals of the different States can really be secured.

Who will effectively remind the people of Great Britain of these facts if not this great movement of the British L.N.U., which is really, so far as I know, the only important organisation able to arouse the interest of the people of this country in international problems.

Again, it is the only force in this country, I am sure, which will consciously be ready to fight the difficulties besetting a

post-war co-operative system. That it will rise to this great responsibility and will be equal, as in the past, to its task I have not the slightest doubt.

War-Time Achievements

Unfortunately the public knows all too little about the Union's fine work in setting up, during this war, the London International Assembly—the greatest international organisation in London, by which alone it has already proved that it will be ready, after this war, to give all its strength to the building up of a more co-operative European continent and a peaceful world.

May I also mention the fine work of the Council for Education in World Citizenship, which was also set up by the L.N.U. and is another proof of its vitality and determination to fulfil the task of keeping alive British public opinion concerning the problems of international collaboration? After this war, I hope, the work of this Organisation will have an effect over the whole Continent.

Coupled with the Union in the attacks which I mentioned, the League of Nations itself has to disappear—not the spirit of war and power politics. Now there is no doubt that, after the last war, States were not willing to surrender to an International Authority the necessary control in many fields, and the necessary spirit of co-operation was very often lacking. At the same time, the conviction was, and I believe still is, very widespread on the Continent that the League of Nations was a recognition of the need for a central system in international life, and that the League made an excellent start. It is probably correct to say that even to-day the peoples of the Continent are convinced that machinery like the League has proved itself indispensable and that something like it will have to be continued.

As a guest in this country, I feel rather uncertain whether I should intrude into this discussion between British people on this subject; but I also feel that, as a man who has collaborated for years with the British League of Nations Union and who is very much concerned with the subject of this discussion, I must give voice to my sincere reaction to this attack on the League of Nations and the L.N.U.

WORLD AFFAIRS IN PARLIAMENT

By OWEN RATTENBURY

Mr. Churchill's speeches on the War Situation are not discussed in the House of Commons. They are just a declaration of what has happened and how we stand at the moment. They are couched in language that is always well phrased, and carefully thought out. The latest of these speeches, we were told by Mr. Eden subsequently, was "a carefully considered statement on our policy towards Italy. Much thought and work went into that statement. . . . That statement stands as our policy."

Other statements, however, have been open to the public. To some degree it has been thought that General Eisenhower's statement to the Italian people rather conflicted with that of Mr. Churchill. There are political implications that are inherent in the situation. The newspapers comment on those political implications. They comment on the Prime Minister's speech—generally in a favourable way, but sometimes critically. Are, therefore, newspaper editors more entitled to comment on the political situation than Members of Parliament when sitting in their places? That is the issue that is troubling some of the members. And that is what appeared to be behind Mr. Greenwood's request that a special day should be given to discussing the war situation, or that some means should be found for it before the House adjourned. That request was refused. To quote Mr. Eden, again referring to the Prime Minister's statement: "It is quite impossible for me or for any other member, or for the Prime Minister, to get up and try to make another such statement, to try to improve upon it, to touch it up or modify it. That statement stands as our policy, and we have thought there was little value in having a debate to which the Government could not contribute."

An Outspoken Critic

Mr. Aneurin Bevan nevertheless raised the matter on the Consolidated Fund Bill Third Reading and a debate ensued. Mr. Bevan rejoiced in the great strength of the Government arising as it did primarily out

of the very favourable course the war has taken. So the Government had an immense advantage where their military achievements were creditable. But that did not apply to their political policy, and his friends now fighting on Etna would reproach him on their return if he said nothing about it. What was the political background of it all? The first thing in war is to keep the good moral health of your own people; and the establishment of Admiral Darlan and, following him, General Giraud in North Africa as the proteges of the British and American Governments did a good deal to disturb and bewilder public opinion in Great Britain. (As subsequent speeches showed there was much resentment at coupling Darlan's name with General Giraud—a resentment that seemed to confirm the criticism about Darlan, while dissociating Giraud from complicity.) He further thought damage was done to our relations by making it appear that the North Africa policy had been imposed on us by America. There were menaces, too, in the way the Fighting French movement had been treated. A suspicion existed that the reason why General de Gaulle did not find favour in British and American Governmental quarters was because associated with him were the underground Left movements in France. He hoped that the authentic representatives of the French underground movement would remain in England.

Then Mr. Bevan proceeded to voice concern about the Sicilian position and A.M.G.O.T. Why could not the House of Commons be told what were the principles of the scheme? Why make a scapegoat of General Eisenhower? He proceeded to attack Badoglio and King Victor Emmanuel and to criticise the apparent wish to accept them as representative of Italy. What would be the reaction of the people of France, Yugoslavia and Hungary? To be anti-Fascist in Sicily is regarded as a crime by many of our people there, where the Fascist Carabinieri are still allowed to carry on. For the future peace of Europe, it is essential that there should be no Fascist or neo-Fascist

regime in Italy which denies to the Italian people the full fruits of the revolt in which they are at present engaged.

The Pledge of Freedom

Mr. Arthur Greenwood said that he thought a debate in that assembly might inspire other members of the United Nations and might let the United States people know that this country believes in the pledges which have been given in our name, of which the primary pledge was that of freedom. He suggested that there must be no departure from the repeated declarations that surrender must be complete and unconditional. It was important that people having thrown off the yoke of Mussolini should be our friends and not sullen non-participants in the war. He spoke of his personal knowledge of the underground movements—movements of people who, in the darkest days have still kept in their souls the flame of liberty, fighting not under conditions of battlefield, not subject to intermittent blitzes, but hour by hour, moment by moment, living under the greatest terror the world has ever seen. If we could help them, fortify their spirits, give them new hope, we were doing a great deal to win the war. If the people in the North of Italy could be given this new hope, then we had won a great ally. These underground movements were pretty well in touch with each other. What was going on in North Italy was better known in S.E. Europe, in Poland and in Germany than it was here. It would be an immense inspiration to them if, in our conduct of operations in Sicily and Italy, we showed that we meant to fulfil the Atlantic Charter and bring to these people at the earliest day the freedom they so richly deserved.

Mr. Ivor Thomas followed after others had spoken and made a speech showing very considerable knowledge and appreciation of the Italian people. He gave as a condition precedent for democracy to be established in Italy the freedom of assembly and freedom of the press which had been absent for 21 years. The newspapers must be free to publish freely and comment on political matters. He urged that distinguished anti-Fascist exiles should now be allowed to return to their country and in fact invited to do so. He mentioned Count Sforza, Don Sturzo, Pro-

fessor Salvemini, Signor Borgese and Signor Emilio Lussu. He alleged that this was not the policy of the Government, that all political activities were to be forbidden, and added that no good could be served by creating this political vacuum in Sicily. He went on to say that the House of Savoy was not comparable with the House of Windsor, and that the general question was really an issue between the whole Labour Party and the whole Conservative Party.

Mr. Eden's Reply

The Conservative speeches were mainly a rebuttal of the more extreme statements of Mr. Bevan, which were repudiated with some force by both Flight Lieutenant Raikes and Mr. Quintin Hogg. Mr. Eden's speech acknowledged the sincerity and depth of Mr. Ivor Thomas's speech. He agreed that Italy must be left to choose her own Government. His complaint about Mussolini was that he was not negotiable. With the departure of him and his regime, he was only too ready, providing we could get what we wanted for attacking Germany, to aid Italy. The Government had tried through the years to carry the House with them, and if the House ought to be summoned to meet again during the recess, they would not be so foolish as to abstain from doing so. That did not abrogate their responsibilities, but it did mean getting the endorsement of the House for their policy. On all military matters the Prime Minister had always carried his military advisers with him. He thought there was great confusion in Mr. Bevan's thought in linking Darlan and Giraud. He could not imagine any two men more antipathetic. There was no greater hater of Germany than Giraud. His main mind was on fighting the Germans. That would not be quite true of Darlan. He thought that now Giraud and de Gaulle and their committee were beginning to function, our purpose should be to strengthen their authority. A.M.G.O.T. was a purely military organisation under political authority and direction and before the invasion of Sicily directives were given to General Eisenhower by the British and American Governments. There was certainly a ban on political activity but a battle was going

on. Surely they would not suggest that it was a good time to have a General Election in Catania. Broadly speaking the regime set up would try to deliver the people of Sicily from the Fascist regime and to restore to Sicily, as they hoped to restore to Italy, their freedom as a nation.

Unconditional surrender accepted from any group of people in charge of the Government of Italy he did not regard as recognising them in the least. If by their recognising Hitler in that way to-morrow, they could achieve unconditional surrender he would be extremely pleased.

A LOOK AT THE INTERNATIONAL HORIZON—II.

By HUGH VIVIAN

In the first article of this series we considered, very briefly, some of the possible forms which the future international machinery might take, and we reached the conclusion that the best approach to post-war problems of international security would lie in the revival of the League of Nations, suitably and drastically modified. Let us, this month, pursue our conclusion a little further and consider, in rough outline, what relations we in Great Britain must contemplate with foreign States.

There will undoubtedly be many great obstacles, particularly in the early stages, to the overcoming of those national prejudices, even among the United Nations, which are objectionable from an international point of view, and to their replacement by a finer spirit, in which national pride may find a fuller glory as nations vie with each other in co-operation and contribution rather than in destruction and dishonesty. The incident which recently occurred between Russia and Poland, and the difficulty which the leaders of combatant France are experiencing in reaching agreement even among themselves, will serve as blunt and disagreeable reminders to any over-enthusiastic individuals who would have us imagine that our path will be easy.

The War-time Example

But, just as there are great dangers and difficulties, there are also unprecedented opportunities. We have, at the moment, all the United Nations, taken from all parts of the world, comprising the vastly greater part of its population, speaking many different tongues, and co-operating

in a common task. All are united; many have learnt bitterly and vividly the consequences of selfish, isolationist national policies in commerce and politics. We have our Atlantic Charter, our Washington Declaration, our Anglo-Russian Treaty and our Anglo-American Lend-Lease Agreement; we have the Agreements between Greece and Yugoslavia, and between Poland and Czechoslovakia, signed by their free Governments in London, and paving the way to something approaching modest Federation. We have many tentative international proposals, such as the British and the United States' plans for a monetary agreement to facilitate the clearing of international balances. Two of the most hopeful moves in recent months have been the United Nations Conference on Food and Agriculture at Hot Springs, and President Roosevelt's announcement of plans for a United Nations Administration to deal with immediate post-war relief to the devastated countries of Europe and other parts of the world. We have also numerous international committees and Assemblies, both official and unofficial. It should not be forgotten what a prominent part the League of Nations Union has played in encouraging discussions of post-war problems among the representatives of our Allies in this country.

There have been many examples, during the war, of the magnificent spirit of co-operation between the British Commonwealth, the United States, Soviet Russia and China, those four great Allied Powers upon whom so much will depend after the war, and whose lot it may well

be to form the framework upon which our international structure will be built. Mr. Stalin has expressed satisfaction with the results of our Prime Minister's visit to Moscow, and he has said that the ideological differences between the national systems of our two countries shall be no barrier to our co-operation. Many contacts have been made between the British Government and that of our great Ally, the United States of America, in which latter country the shock of war has produced a strong reaction against isolationism.

Holding on to Progress

Is all this progress, then, to come once more to nothing? It is up to us, here in Britain, to play our part in seeing that it does not.

What of the enemy countries? That in itself is a very complex topic, upon which many diverging views have been expressed by eminent and righteous men of all political creeds, but some reference must be made to it here.

Most of us will welcome the assurances given by Mr. Churchill and President Roosevelt after the Casablanca Conference, that our "Unconditional Surrender" policy does not entail the annihilation of the peoples of enemy countries—in itself an impossibility—but only the overthrow of national régimes in those countries dedicated to the subjugation and destruction of other nations. But that is by no means to say that we can dismiss the problem with a naïve reference to "Fascist régimes," or that we can quickly take, say, a pseudo-democratic or a Communist Germany into our confidence again. Frederick the Great was no Nazi, nor was Bismarck, nor Wilhelm II, and we shall have to look deeper than that if we are to put a stop to the German people's habit of continually choosing the vilest and most disreputable of their citizens to be their political leaders. Nor is there any power of Black Magic in the words "Prussian" or "Prussianism." Hitler is not a Prussian; nor are most of his confederates.

Re-education

The Axis Powers, particularly Germany and Japan, will be in need of complete re-education after the war. That is a fact which is even more important, if no less certain, than the fast approaching punishment of their present guilty leaders. And Re-education in World Citizenship, a problem and a necessity for all of us, will be a task immense indeed for a nation like Germany, which knows, and has known, no law but that of the mailed fist.

Not until we have tangible proof that we have succeeded in this policy of re-education, closely bound up as it is with the all-important "will to co-operate," shall we be justified in according to the Axis Powers the same rights and responsibilities in our international organisation, as will be given to other nations. Still less shall they be allowed the means of conspiring for a third World War, in which, with the luck attributed to a third attempt, they might well succeed.

Apart from that, the enemy countries should be thrust back within their own frontiers, at the Armistice, pending the more permanent readjustment of national boundaries which must follow at the Peace Conference. They should be made to repair, as far as possible, the wanton damage done to the countries which they have ravaged; they should be made to pay for the costs of any occupation of their territories which may be necessary; and they should make amends, not in foolish monetary reparations, but in kind and in toil, as and when they are able. Finally, they should be allowed, in proportion to their good conduct records, to share in the benefits and duties of the new international order, so that they will be able to find little excuse for a return to power politics.

Our Address:

HEADWAY
LEAGUE OF NATIONS UNION,
11, MAIDEN LANE, W.C.2.

THE NANSEN MEMORIAL MONUMENT

By LAURENCE HOUSMAN

(INTRODUCTION: *I am very glad to endorse all that is said in the splendid article which follows. I hope and believe that the plan for an International Nansen Memorial will be carried through. The power of such symbolic work to change the thinking of human beings, and thereby to change the course of human history, cannot easily be measured. In the years which follow the war, it must be of most significant importance.*

We must all be grateful to Professor Muller-Blensdorf for his conception of this work, and for his strenuous and persistent efforts to carry it through.

PHILIP NOEL BAKER.)

This is a short statement of what was originally proposed, of what has already been done, and of what it is still hoped to do for the completion of the Nansen Memorial Monument.

Let it first be clearly understood that, though the Memorial is named after one man, it is intended to be international in character. It bears Nansen's name only because Nansen was so great and true a representative of all that it will stand for—courageous achievement in the past, courageous good will for the future, faith for the whole human race.

A Great Organiser

At present the great hope of the world for the international organisation of Peace has gone down in failure. But, in the early days of the League of Nations, when it was functioning actively and successfully for the relief of the vast amount of suffering left over from the last war, Fridtjof Nansen stood foremost as a great organiser for the rescue of Europe's starving millions.

Already one of the world's most famous men for his great and adventurous achievements in scientific exploration, he earned and won in that last work of his life a yet higher and nobler reputation; and we had before us the example of a strong and courageous man of action, with a great heart and a great mind, full of mercy and loving kindness, standing in the ruinous breach made by war in the Comity of Nations, and by his single authority and unflagging zeal doing more than any Government for the re-establishment of peaceful intercourse through mutual service wherever the need for service was greatest. To him the world

owes much—in him has lost more than it knows: for had our statesmen and politicians had hearts like this, we should not to-day have been at war.

What he proved himself to be in those last years, he had always been. When he and his shipmates returned from the North Pole, the men of the crew spoke in high terms of respect and gratitude of all those who were placed in authority over them; but when they spoke of Nansen they said, "Nansen was an angel."

An International Memorial

And because he was such a man, good as well as great—as great in spirit as in action—a scheme was set on foot shortly after his death, while Europe was still uneasily at peace, to set up in his own land a memorial, not national, but international in character, to what he and men like him have stood for in the history of our race.

The spirit of Exploration and Discovery have been one of the great driving forces of humanity all down the ages. But so long as the products of these explorations and discoveries are appropriated for the enrichment of separate nations, so long as colonial expansion means not the raising of backward races to a better and freer standard of life, but their exploitation for the white man's benefit, so long will these advances in material prosperity make not for the co-operation and community of nations, but for rivalry and division and competition against each—not for peace but for war. And because in Nansen's life there was no such narrowness of purpose, but its very opposite, his Memorial must be—as he would have wished it to be—an international one; not to himself alone,

but to all those who stood, as he did, for the advancement not only of human knowledge and human control over the secrets and forces of Nature, but for their application to the common good. Wealth in its best sense—that which makes for the common weal—is the right and natural aim of socialised humanity; but it must be for the good of all. The wealth of a section, based in any degree on the denial or negation of wealth for the remainder, undoes its value; wealth that is privileged is wealth corrupted. It is the glory and the power of Discovery thus freely directed and dedicated that the Nansen Memorial seeks to express.

Preparations for this Memorial were nearly complete when war broke out, and the work had to be suspended. As originally designed, it was to form the crown of a rocky island standing at the entrance of Bergen harbour, which had been granted for that purpose by the City authorities.

Keeping the Idea Alive

That scheme, under the change of world conditions which the war will have brought about, may no longer be possible of fulfilment or even desirable: a country, sparsely populated, lying on the borders of Europe, may not be the right place for it. That Norway was Nansen's homeland makes the wish that it should be natural to his own countrymen; yet, if that wish prevailed, it might make the Memorial less international than national; and the first and most important thing about Nansen's life was that he became a great Internationalist. And so, in presenting the scheme for the Memorial to a wider public, its promoters and its designer no longer claim that the original plan should hold good.

Whether Geneva, or Jerusalem, or Jericho becomes the planned centre of Peace and Reconciliation for our much-troubled and divided world, when wiser counsels prevail, there most appropriately will stand memorials of those who have willed and worked for the welfare and advancement not of their own countries alone, but of the whole human race. And there, some day, it is hoped that Professor

Ernst M. Blensdorf's finely planned memorial to all world-discoverers, with Nansen at the head of them, may find its permanent form in stone and on a fitting scale of magnificence.

"My scheme for this Memorial," writes Professor Blensdorf, "had received wide support from prominent men in many countries several years before the war. Only when the war is over can it be revived and the work on it begun. But in the meantime I ask that it shall not be forgotten, and that its realisation shall be the desire (as it is also mine) of those who see in the ideals for which it stands the only hope for the world's future."

The main purpose of this article is to give confidence to all those who are in sympathy with the ideals which the Memorial is intended to express, and are willing to help in its fulfilment, that Professor Blensdorf has already proved himself the right man for the work. Let us hope that, when the world returns to peace, a place may be found for it.

(Editorial Note: Professor Blensdorf, whose work for the Nansen Memorial Monument is outlined in the above article, left his home in Oslo when the Germans invaded Norway, reaching England after an exciting and strenuous journey. For two months he travelled northwards along the Norwegian coast in little fishing boats, dodging the German occupying forces. In Tromsøe he found the last Norwegian warship bound for England and, through the good offices of the Norwegian Foreign Minister, Professor Halvdan Koht, who knew him well from his Nansen Monument work in Oslo, was taken on board and arrived safely in England.)

Professor Blensdorf is now teaching art at several schools in Somerset, thus replacing other teachers who have been called up. Many of his large monumental sculptures in Europe have been destroyed by the Nazis. Besides teaching, Professor Blensdorf is continuing with his sculptural work, some of which (chiefly in wood and terra-cotta) can occasionally be seen in the Leicester Galleries.)

UP AND DOWN THE COUNTRY

The Lord Mayor of York presided over the Annual General Meeting of our YORK BRANCH. Major-General J. W. van Oorschot, speaking on "Holland's contribution to international fellowship after the war," said that his country along with others would have to play its part in creating a new world order and, in the struggle for world peace, must abide by the Atlantic Charter.

At the Annual Meeting of the SELBY BRANCH, considerable interest was aroused by the Union's *Annual Report* for 1942, especially those sections which showed that many League activities were still continuing. The members felt that it was most heartening to know that so much was being done, in the midst of war, to keep alive international co-operation. The Branch's own report was also encouraging. At the various meetings held, reconstruction after the war had been discussed from very many angles. A series of meetings during the winter months is to be arranged, some of which will probably be held on Sunday evenings.

Dr. Liba V. Ambrosova spoke on "Czechoslovakia Looks at the Future" at the August Buffet Lunch organised by the LONDON REGIONAL FEDERATION. The candour and honesty with which she faced her country's post-war problems, deliberately eschewing all wishful thinking, made a profound impression upon her audience. At the outset she expressed her conviction that Czechoslovakia's future would be free, internationally co-operative and democratic; but issued a warning against assuming that this goal could be easily achieved. There were three important factors on which assumptions could reasonably be based—guidance from the past, guesswork (and it could be no more since important sources of information had been dried up by German repression) as to what Czechoslovaks at home were thinking, and planning for the future by those over here. On one inevitable tendency Dr. Ambrosova spoke very frankly—hatred of the Germans in the occupied territories was bound to express itself in terms of narrow nationalism. Further, the people of Czechoslovakia would be very cautious in giving support to any settlement until they

saw what the Allies were actually going to do. What she thought the Czechs most wanted in our New Order was some form of international justice, signs of world settlement in the social and economic field, restitution as far as possible for damage suffered, and immediate material relief when their country was liberated. She warned the audience that the Czechs were a proud people, and would resent relief if it were flung at them as charity; but they would welcome all help to put them on their feet again given in a progressive, forward-looking way.

Senator Henri Rolin, President of the Belgian League of Nations Society, will give the talk at the next L.R.F. Lunch, to be held in the Y.W.C.A. Lounge on Tuesday, September 14, at 1 p.m.

A particularly successful gathering was held recently in the rural area of PEASLAKE. The village hall was filled to its utmost capacity to hear Senor Salvador de Madariaga and (we learn from Mrs. Pethick-Lawrence, Chairman of the Branch) the whole neighbourhood for miles around was thrilled with his address. It was full of information and ideas, as well as wit and eloquence.

The Rev. Dr. James Reid of Eastbourne preached at the Annual Service of the STREATHAM BRANCH, held in St. Leonard's Church. Stressing the need for continued belief in the League of Nations, for something mighty was bound to come of it, he said that we must get rid of the idea of national sufficiency, which was a danger to the whole body politic. Further, none of us must yield to the temptation to be lazy over matters connected with the development of the new world.

WALTHAMSTOW BRANCH held a very successful meeting in the Greek Theatre, County High School, at which Mr. John T. Catterall spoke on "The Future World." His speech was arresting all the way through, and many intelligent questions were put afterwards. Colonel S. S. Mallinson presided, and Mr. L. Spicer, prospective Liberal candidate for the Division, moved the vote of thanks.

OXTED AND LIMPSFIELD BRANCH heard a talk on "Soviet Russia Fights for Peace."

from Mrs. Beatrice King, Chairman of the Women's Anglo-Soviet Committee. The questions at the end were the best proof of the deep interest aroused.

Meeting under the chairmanship of the Rural Dean (Canon C. C. Griffiths), HASTINGS AND ST. LEONARDS BRANCH heard an account of the Union's General Council Meeting in London from the Rev. A. B. Taylor who had attended as Branch representative. An interesting discussion followed, in which the Branch Chairman, the Hon. Secretary (Mr. H. A. Hughes) and others took part.

The KINGSTON BRANCH during the past few months has run, in addition to its Brains Trust for which there is now a demand for a "repeat performance," an excellent series of meetings addressed by well-known speakers. They have included Dr. Gilbert Murray on "Starving Europe," Professor Namier on "The Future of the Jews," and Mr. Gollancz on "Hitler's Persecution of the Jews"—this last attended by 600 people in the parish church.

After Mrs. Riley's visit to WEYBRIDGE the organiser wrote:—"Mrs. Riley was exceptionally fluent and interesting, and held a bigish audience of soldiers and civilians spellbound."

We wonder if any Branch has done more than LAMBETH to carry the Union's message to other organisations in its area, in the spirit of the resolution adopted at the Conference of Branch Secretaries during our General Council. Within a few months Union speakers have been supplied at 25 meetings connected with Churches, Co-operative and other Women's Guilds, and similar organisations. This magnificent activity is due largely to the efforts of Mr. J. Barry, the Branch Secretary, who has shouldered all the organising and much of the speaking involved.

There is a big variety in the organisations addressed by Union speakers in the past month. The WEST NORWOOD BROTHERHOOD heard Mr. Catterall on "Foundations of World Co-operation," and he also addressed an Air Raid Wardens' meeting at HAMPTON HILL and an open air meeting in HYDE PARK. Mr. Leslie Aldous, Editor of *Headway*, gave a talk on "Hot Springs and After" at the WEMBLEY SIS-

TERHOOD, and another on "Language and the League" to the ILFORD ESPERANTO SOCIETY. He put the Union point of view at a discussion on "Looking Ahead" arranged by FEDERAL UNION YOUTH. Mme. Langhorne (Fighting France) spoke at a women's meeting at Kenyon Baptist Church, LAMBETH, and Mme. Dash at St. THOMAS'S WELFARE CENTRE. Mme. Munkova (Czechoslovakia) visited the Studley Road Sisterhood, STOCKWELL.

ROTARY CLUBS which have had L.N.U. speakers during August include:—ASHFORD, Mr. Catterall on "The Collapse of Hitlerism—What Then?"; ENFIELD, Mr. Gustav Stern on "Czechoslovakia and Post-war Settlement" and Mr. S. L. Hourmouzios on "Greece and Post-war Settlement"; MORDEN, Mr. Catterall on "The Atlantic Charter"; ROCHESTER, Mr. Aldous on "Social and Economic Reconstruction"; and STAINES, Mr. Jaya Deva on "China and the Far East."

The St. MARTIN-IN-THE-FIELD Sub-Branch of our Westminster Branch has sustained a heavy loss in the death of *Miss Constance Graham*, who had been Hon. Secretary since its foundation. When Mrs. Drury-Lowe, founder and Chairman, left London early in the war, Miss Graham carried on virtually single-handed. Her devotion and loyalty to the League never failed. She will be greatly missed, not only at St. Martin's but on the Executive Committee of the Westminster Branch, of which she was a faithful and hard-working member.

Headway Language Group

News has reached us of the progress of the "Headway Language Group," which was started by one of our keenest branch workers. Correspondence Courses are offered to beginners in French, German, Russian, Spanish, Latin and Classical Greek. Those who have studied through this Group have found satisfaction in reading about the League in two languages at least! Further information may be obtained from M. Darnley Naylor, B.A., c/o Barclays Bank, 158, Henleaze Road, Henleaze, Bristol.

PRUSSIAN AND GERMANS

By GORDON DROMORE

We are over the watershed now and our feet set on the downward though difficult slope to victory. So it is of crucial importance that we should try to make up our minds over the answers to questions such as "Was Weimar a genuine Republic?" "Did Germany realise that more than any other country or any other thing she was responsible for bringing the last war on the world, or feel sorry for it?" "Is there not a sinister continuity about Germany's military traditions and her foreign policy which they inspired?" For, whatever defeat falls on the German forces, the problem of the German strength will remain.

Many books—good and not so good—have helped to throw light on these questions. At the present moment two make special claims for earnest consideration* One is a Report by a very able Chatham House Group, fully up to the high standard we expect from the R.I.I.A. The other is a booklet by Sir Geoffrey Knox, who brings to the task a diplomatic career marked by pre-eminent gifts of judgment and a long and outstandingly successful experience of international administration as member and President of the International Commission in the Saar. Both bear directly on key problems of post-war Germany.

Before Hitler

The portrait of the Weimar Republic which Sir Geoffrey gives us has all the marks of being genuine. Weimar was, in fact, largely a façade for Prussian militarism, which got off relatively lightly in the last war. Power was, as always, in the hands of the dynamic minority representing Prussian ideas and methods. In everything which touched the *Reichswehr* the various Republican Governments followed the wishes of the Nationalists. No measure was passed to which the *Reichswehr* could have objected. Besides the Army and the Police (Germany

*THE PROBLEM OF GERMANY. (Royal Institute of International Affairs. 2s. 6d.)

THE LAST PEACE AND THE NEXT. By Sir Geoffrey Knox. (Hutchinson. 1s.)

has inevitably been overpoliced), two other powerful forces in the State—the senior grades of the Civil Service and the Lutheran clergy—were (and are) steeped in Prussian and Pan-German traditions. And, to finish off the picture, there was the volcanic growth of great private armies—over 500,000 strong by 1923. No real democracy could breathe under these grim conditions; least of all in Germany when it is remembered that the German army has always had an exceptional place in the German heart, so that it is no mere paradox to talk of Germany as an army with a country; and that German disgust seldom translates itself into action against constituted authority, and one can count on the majority "melting into conformity, the natural spirit of the German."

Thus, for our plans of tomorrow, it matters tremendously that it was Prussian militarism which in the years between the two wars dictated Germany's attitude to foreign affairs, and gave Hitler not his popularity but his power. A competent witness is Dr. Stresemann himself who, on the eve of final negotiations for Locarno, wrote to the Crown Prince explaining Germany's tasks for the future. The letter, Sir Geoffrey points out, might equally well have been the work of Frederick the Great or Bismarck or that self-made Prussian, Adolf Hitler. Hitler came to power on exactly the same Prussian policy.

Part and parcel of this militarist policy was the campaign of propaganda started in 1920 to win sympathy for the supposedly sad case of Germany, and directed westwards with a special eye to England, where it was regurgitated with bright silliness by highbrows and a mass of sentimental but inexperienced people. But its success was less due to the persistence and skill that go with stupendous advertisement than to the fact that we grossly neglected to counteract it until too late.

The Dividing Line

Sir Geoffrey goes on to deal refreshingly with the common habit of dividing Germans into two camps, into good or

bad, very often with the implication that the former are of a socialist persuasion. (How many of those intellectual, artistic and internationally "sympathetic" Germans whom one met after Versailles were, one wonders, Jews?) Such a division misses a vital point altogether. There is a dividing line; but it is not political, but racial, a line between Germans and Prussians, following closely the geographical line of the Elbe. It is not the Nazi corner boys who have brought the second world war upon us, but Prussia. A review of Prussia's acts shows not what are good or bad Germans—we can leave that to Providence—but which is the most dangerous element; for that is what we have to defend civilisation against. Prussian, German nationalism, Thomas Mann declares, is the most dangerous kind in the world, because it consists of mechanised mysticism. In this sentence is an explanation of the past and a pregnant warning for the future.

What are the United Nations to do with these Germans? Both books under review have suggestions to make as to lines of approach and more constructive solutions.

New Outlook Possible

The Chatham House Group insist on the absolute necessity for force, to bring about Germany's military disarmament in the strict sense. "It is the one domain," they write, "in which force is surely capable, given the determination to apply and maintain it, of reaching its object." For at the back of their study is the assumption that the second world war will appear to the German War Party to have been on balance a favourable operation, proving the colossal weakness of Europe, the dreadfully "delayed action" awakening of America, the possibility of neutralising Russia. At the same time they believe a new German outlook is possible, though it will be a slow business. But it must be spontaneously German, helped thereto more by the actual workings of experience and new environment than by precept. Hence the transcendent importance of the Four Freedoms, the Atlantic Charter and amplifying agreements; for though military victory will not itself create a better state of affairs, it will offer an opportunity to create one.

A Detailed Programme

Sir Geoffrey Knox's ideas of a peace settlement present perhaps a more detailed programme. Here it is. What we have got to realise is that to-day we are irrevocably an integral part of Europe. So our business is to devise effective ways by which Europeans one and all can live together in amity. This cannot come about unless the disturbers of the peace are dealt with so that they cannot begin again. Thus our first aims must be lasting disarmament and demilitarisation of Germany—with no possibility of slacking off till the job is done. All the alleviations and advantages—for example, economic—granted to Germany in the Peace Treaty should be made dependent on full execution of this disarmament. Otherwise, there should be a minimum of interference in German internal affairs. It is too early to define territorial arrangements; but they should be guaranteed for all, Germany included, and must have stability, i.e., must be unquestioned until they have had fair and proper trial. (Germany, in the past, put over the erroneous idea that the Covenant was designed to remove grievances. It was meant to right wrongs—a very different thing.)

On the economic side, it would be wise to impose no servitude except restitution of what she has actually stolen. In general, the aim should be, if Germany is really ready to collaborate, to admit her as an equal partner in the post-war comity of nations. In particular, the League of Nations or a League must be re-created. Its effectiveness will depend more on the spirit which is brought to work it than on the texts, though Sir Geoffrey is strong on the point that the rights and obligations of members should be more closely defined and more mandatory. If we keep our eyes open to facts and our feet on solid ground we can win through, this time, in peace as we shall in war.

APOLOGY TO DEVON

A slur on the fair name of Devon appeared in our July issue, when this county was listed among the small number not represented at the General Council Meeting. TORQUAY BRANCH, it has been pointed out, was very ably represented. The Editor has ordered sackcloth and ashes for one.

FROM FIELD-MARSHAL SMUTS

The Executive Committee of the Union sent a message to Field-Marshal Smuts warmly congratulating him, as a founder and fervent supporter of the League, on his magnificent victory in the recent South African elections.

We are glad to publish the following reply received by Lord Lytton, Chairman of the Executive, from the Field-Marshal:—

*"Sincere thanks for kind congratulations. Have every hope*that tide of victory now beginning to flow will also carry cause of world peace, for which League has stood, safely into harbour.*

"Kind remembrances to all my old friends in the Union.—SMUTS."

BOOKS OF THE MONTH

APPEASEMENT'S CHILD. By Thomas J. Hamilton. (Gollancz. 7s. 6d.)

To American newspaper correspondents we owe perhaps the most illuminating pen pictures of conditions in war-time Germany. Mr. Hamilton, until a year or two back Madrid correspondent of the *New York Times*, has now performed a similar service with regard to Spain. His objectivity and obvious desire to give even the devil his due make his record of events, and the conclusions which he draws from them, extraordinarily valuable. Conditions in Spain, verging on starvation for the masses, are appalling. Though the country's plight may be attributed in part to the feckless temperament of the people, Franco's blundering efforts to impose a totalitarian economy have made confusion worse confounded. What is often forgotten is that the German military machine is the product of *German* (and not Fascist) efficiency. When Fascism is attempted in a country like Spain, it makes inefficiency worse.

On the Non-Intervention policy of Britain and other Powers during the Civil War, Mr. Hamilton shrewdly comments that "no country can afford the luxury of a policy based on mere likes and dislikes." More recently numerous interrelated factors have served to keep Spain a non-belligerent; but the author believes that, if Spain were not so "hard to handle,"

Hitler would have walked in long ago. Without altering his opinion that Sir Samuel Hoare will have much to answer for at the bar of history, Mr. Hamilton squarely admits that he has fought a valuable delaying action lately—though whether he is not still at heart an appeaser is another matter. There is much said about German influence and long-range preparations both in Spain and, from that base, in Latin America. If Hitler should decide that the time has come to march, a fifth column of immense power will be waiting.

CHINA AMONG THE NATIONS. By H. R. Williamson. (Student Christian Movement Press. 6s.)

Of well-informed and informing books about China there cannot be too many. Dr. Williamson's is the ripe fruit of a sojourn of thirty years in "the Flowery Kingdom of the Middle Way." His plan is governed by the Confucian principle of "enquiring of the past that you may know how to act in the present." In the earlier sections, which tell something about China's noble heritage of learning, philosophy and culture as well as her historical development, the treatment is scholarly but never dull. This leads on naturally to a survey of present-day life and problems. The author firmly believes that, with her traditional background of respect for human personality allied to modern pro-

gress, China will be an ideal partner in international conferences of the future. If we give her the help which she so urgently needs, she in turn will contribute something of immense value towards the creation of a truly civilised world.

AN INTERNATIONAL COLONIAL CONVENTION. (Anti-Slavery and Aborigines Protection Society. 3d.)

This pamphlet sets out principles of colonial administration, which it is suggested should be applied to all colonies, and proposals for international co-operation to further the objects in view. So that plans may be based on sound principles, the need for "fact-finding" before the final peace settlement is stressed, though it is pointed out that much relevant material is already to hand. International administration is ruled out on account of serious practical difficulties, but international co-operation must be sought to furnish an acceptable form of supervision. One important suggestion is for an international conference to settle the principles of administration to be applied to all colonies, which should be included in the peace settlement. The draft convention itself, put forward as a guide, is comprehensive, covering social and econo-

mic conditions, approach to self-government and international supervision as well as general principles. In the main, the principles here set out have long been part of British colonial policy—they have been accepted and applied by this country. Most commendable is the studious moderation of this pamphlet; and Union Branches which are studying "Colonial Settlement" might well discuss it in conjunction with the Union's own Report.

RECOMMENDED

- U.S. FOREIGN POLICY: SHIELD OF THE REPUBLIC. Walter Lippmann. Hamish Hamilton. 6s.
 THE MAKING OF THE INDIAN PRINCES. Edward Thompson. O.U.P. 20s.
 THE FOUR EMPIRES. A Discussion by Lady Rhondda. Time and Tide. Bloomsbury St., London. 6d.
 THE TRANSITION FROM WAR TO PEACE. A. C. Pigou. HOW BRITAIN IS GOVERNED. R. B. McCallum. Oxford Pamphlets on Home Affairs. 6d.
 POST-WAR EMPLOYMENT. E. S. Conway. Cape. 8s. 6d.
 ONLY AN OCEAN BETWEEN. A comparison between U.S.A. and Great Britain. L. S. Florence. Harrap. 6s.

FROM "HEADWAY'S" POST-BAG

Union Finance

SIR,—Mr. Pritchard's letter in the current issue of HEADWAY, on the subject of Union Finance after the war, was very pertinent and timely.

Having spent about 20 years in an attempt to assist a London Suburban Branch of average position and success, I make no apology for raising one aspect of the matter which has always been less seriously thought about than has been necessary, viz., the great proportion of membership subscriptions which have been much smaller than could easily have been paid.

The era of munificent gifts is probably ended. This fact enables us to prove that we are a truly "Democratic" Society (with a large "D"), including all classes and people of "no class"—in morals and mind, what is class?

I submit:—

1. A communication be sent to all Branch Secretaries asking that all subscriptions under 10s. annually should, wherever possible, be doubled.

2. Or, a circular enquiry of Secretaries as to the best way of making the attempt.

3. The doubling of half the membership subscriptions would be a result of substantial and, I hope, permanent importance. Forest Hill. THOS. HILDITCH.

SIR,—Some years ago the General Council decided that the minimum subscription which would entitle members to receive HEADWAY should be 5s.

During the short time when the Union no longer controlled HEADWAY a number of persons were able to get HEADWAY for 2s. 6d. and to become members for 1s. We have therefore returned to the same minimum rate of 3s. 6d., which the Council considered too low.

The difference between 3s. 6d. and 5s. per annum to the individual member is not much and probably the majority would be able, and, I believe, willing, to increase their subscription to 5s.

Should the majority of these members make the increase it would be a great help to the Union.

We shall certainly require a larger revenue if we are to succeed in our aims.

I trust that members will agree to make this increase and so help to achieve the objects of the Union.—Yours,

Hampstead.

W. T. PRITCHARD.

"Paradox of Peace"

SIR,—Miles Juvenis in the current issue of HEADWAY writes: "Our . . . being so ill prepared is . . . proof that the war was none of our making." This disclaimer of responsibility is far too sweeping.

Our unpreparedness in the matter of war material was far less serious than our failure to collaborate with the other nations in Europe whose interests were best served by the maintenance of peace. Had our drift away from the principles of the League been avoided, beginning with Manchuria, Abyssinia, and Spain, we should, with all our weakness, still have formed part of the stronger coalition, which would, but for our collaboration with the Axis powers, have included a Liberal Spain.

Our armament would have sufficed, had we not been lacking in statesmanship wise enough to approach the problems presented in Europe in the spirit of the Covenant of the League. We are now (except for the loss of Spain and the loss of the power of the smaller countries as well as major military powers such as Czechoslovakia to give active help) exactly where we would have been in the matter of understandings and alliances had the policies urged by the League of Nations Union from time to time been followed and we are at war instead of being, as we would have been, at peace. To that extent the war was of our making.

M. RAMSAY SIBBALD.

Hoylelake.

SIR,—The excellent article "Paradox of Peace" contains one passage that ought not to pass unchallenged. It says: "Our sequence of ignominious failures to appease is sufficient to show that we accepted war only when no other road lay open to honourable peace."

The honourable road of collective security that lay open to us in 1931 is not mentioned. And yet our failure to implement that scrap of paper at a time when Germany was disarmed and Hitler a shadowy figure without power, was the reason why we, later, took refuge in appeasement and compromise. The clear lesson to be learnt from the miserable futility of those inter-war years is surely that because the Great Powers were unwilling to realise that peace is indivisible, and that an act of aggression anywhere is a threat to the whole community of nations, we turned our backs upon security, and took the path that inevitably led to World War No 2.

Streatham

M. GLADYS STEVENS.

Russian Policy

SIR,—Mr Beverley Baxter, in his recent attack on the League of Nations in the *London Evening Standard*, recalls how the L.N.U. condemned Russia's attack on Finland in 1939 and continues by saying how wrong L.N.U. policy was at that time now that Russia's action has been justified.

I found myself at variance with the policy adopted by the L.N.U. at this time because, having followed the great efforts made by the government of the Soviet Union to help in the building of the collective security system before September, 1939, I felt that there must be a very good reason for Russia's attack on Finland and hesitated to pass judgment before the reasons were made clearer.

Now that the reasons for the attack have been made clear (an attack which would never have taken place if the Western democracies had assisted in the building of a system of collective security), should not the policy adopted by the L.N.U. at that time be reconsidered in the light of more recent events?

York.

NORMAN R. KEEDWELL.

[Attention is called to Michael Foot's reply to Beverley Baxter, published in the "*Evening Standard*" on the following day, 21/7/43.]

MAIN CONTENTS

	PAGE
Editorial: From Ideals to Reality - - - - -	1
Should the League and the L.N.U. Disappear? By Dr. Alexander Kunosi	2
World Affairs in Parliament. By Owen Rattenbury - - - - -	4
A Look at the International Horizon—II. By Hugh Vivian - - - - -	6
The Nansen Memorial Monument. By Laurence Housman - - - - -	8
Up and Down the Country - - - - -	10
Prussians and Germans. By Gordon Dromore - - - - -	12
Books of the Month - - - - -	14