HEADWAY

IN WAR-TIME

The Journal of the League of Nations Union

No. 50 NOVEMBER 1943 PRICE 3d

EDITORIAL

WORKING OUT A PEACE POLICY

"The time will soon come," declared Mr. Churchill in his message to the Foreign Policy Association in the United States, "when the free citizens of each great democracy will have to choose and range their strength behind whatever international policy appears to them best designed to ensure the future security and prosperity of their country and the world." That is an admirable statement of the case for the spadework on which the League of Nations Union is engaged at the present time. In only one respect might it be suggested that this call to action could have been given greater point and punch. Seldom, indeed, does one feel tempted to improve upon the phrasing of one who chooses his words so carefully as the Prime Minister. Yet in this instance, a strong argument can be made out that *the time has already come* for public opinion to develop increasingly definite conclusions concerning post-war international policy and organisation aiming at world security and prosperity. Such, at least, is the conviction which the L.N.U. has not disguised. If there is to be any hope of this war being the last, sooner or later—as the Prime Minister rightly urges—the people of this country and the other United Nations must take their stand. The Union's view is that it should be sooner. To wait until the end of the war will be too late.

Words and Deeds

One criticism levelled at Allied statesmen, with more insistence as victory comes nearer, is that, in the matter of world settlement after the war there have been too many fine speeches unsupported by relevant action. In part, recent moves like the Hot Springs Conference and the project of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration have been satisfactory as far as they go. They have brought welcome evidence that some of the most immediately urgent post-war issues are not being completely neglected. All that is to the good. But an uneasy feeling persists that these approaches to specific problems do not go far enough, that they cover too narrow a field, and that the whole scope of post-war planning in the international sphere should be expanded and the *tempo* speeded up.

For this reason, the Three-Power Conference of Foreign Ministers which, at the time of writing, Mr. Eden and Mr. Cordell Hull are attending in Moscow, is being watched with the liveliest interest and anticipation. We shall know little about the actual proceedings and day-to-day progress until the promised state-

ment is issued at the end of the meeting. None will quarrel with the expressed desire of our Russian allies, shared by Great Britain and the United States, to devise military measures for shortening the war. It is also hoped that serious attention will be devoted to policies for dealing with the liberated regions of Europe. At the same time that the larger issues are not being neglected is suggested by a timely reminder in the Soviet official newspaper *Izvéstia*, that it is necessary to prepare now for the solution of the many problems of the post-war period, notably the political and the economic.

Whatever the fruits of this meeting, all will hope for a rapid extension of this kind of collaboration, and that it may soon include a meeting between Mr. Churchill, President Roosevelt and Mr. Stalin.

Crystallising Public Opinion

Meanwhile, on both sides of the Atlantic, statements of peace aims by outstanding personalities continue. They are welcomed as reflecting large sections of public opinion, and helping to give a lead to those who have not yet made up their minds.

Two almost simultaneous speeches by Mr. Wendell Willkie (at St. Louis) and Mr. Sumner Welles (in New York) are specially significant for their appeals to the American peoples to look beyond the mere winning of the war. Mr. Willkie, the Republican, asked for a "declaration of intention" from the United States, Britain, Russia and China as a preliminary to the formation of a common council of the United Nations. Mr. Welles, the Democrat, urged more specifically that American interests could never be safeguarded unless the United States joined with other nations of the earth in creating "that kind of free world, organised under law and made safe by armed might when necessary against law-breakers, which men and women have envisioned for centuries past, and which they have so far fruitlessly sought to attain." He went on to discuss in some detail the implications of such a policy.

In our own London Guildhall, Field-Marshal Smuts gave one of those masterly surveys which stir the imagination. Most of it was devoted to the war, and he constantly stressed the time factor. But he concluded by insisting that "the peace will be an integral part of the war, that the winning of the war will be vain unless the peace is also won." Our reparation policy would have to begin with the essential work of international relief and reclamation. "But more difficult problems lie ahead in connection with the peace—above all the problem of aggression, the basic problem before our race and the future of our civilised society. It is the last obstacle to be overcome in our long upward climb from our primeval savagery. . . . That last battle in the west, in our western civilisation, our race must win or die. We have reached that stage when the issue has to be squarely joined with the earlier, darker rule of force, and aggression—war as an instrument of national policy—has to be finally abjured."

"Let it be our will and firm resolve that this war shall be the last," concluded General Smuts. "On that basis alone of an unshakable determination can the future organisation for security become effective. Only the will to peace can make our machinery for security function properly. So long as the essential will to peace is there, it will not be difficult to establish the machinery; without the will the way will not be found. The Atlantic Charter already contains the sketch for our future blue-print of security, and our rich and bitter experience will enable us to complete the picture. In that will alone can be our peace, the peace which will lead to the consummation of all we have longed for and fought for in the struggles of our race. Let the greatest war in human history become the prelude to the great peace. To make it such would be the greatest glory of our age and its noblest bequest to the generations to come."

RELIEF AND RECONSTRUCTION

By LESLIE R. ALDOUS

WHEN HOSTILITIES CEASE: Papers on Relief and Reconstruction prepared for the Fabian Society. (Gollancz. 4s. 6d.)

This is an important book, and no review can be anything like a substitute for reading it. One point is worth underlining at the start: All the expert contributors to this symposium, intensely individualistic as they are in their views, agree on the threefold necessity for planning now, for having a clear conception of the relation between short-term relief and long-term reconstruction, and for central control by an international authority.

Mr. Noel-Baker, in his forceful Foreword, urges that the Armistice will bring the greatest opportunity for collective progress that mankind has ever had. Violence, it is true, does breed violence; nevertheless, after this war, there will be a deep and powerful reaction against violence, which must be capitalised and organised.

Especially commendable is *Mr. Leonard Woolf's* thoughtful introduction, which shows clearly that relief will be effective only if it is a prelude to reconstruction. Agreement on long-term international economic and political policy is indispensable. Of Mr. Woolf's contribution, no better verdict could be given than his own summing up of the other papers: that "it enables the ordinary citizen who is not an expert to see clearly the main outlines of the problem." "The citizen who has read this book," he truly comments, "cannot evade responsibility by the plea of ignorance, for he knows the facts, the problem, and the policy of action which the Government of his country should adopt. It remains, therefore, for him to see that his Government adopts it." There is truth, too, in his concluding contention that "it is time that we realised that democracy in the relations of States to one another is just as necessary for civilisation as it is within the national state." Later, Mr. Arnold-Forster, touching upon a similar point, insists that advance "will require resolute and sustained democratic leadership by the heads of states; it will require, not less, faithful service by all of us." A gradual process often inconspicuous, rather than sudden dramatic leaps, is what he envisages.

Peace should grow out of reconstruction, says *Dr. Julian Huxley*. New types of organisational machinery, as he shows, have been created to meet definite needs. The success of "special purpose" League agencies is one signpost for the future. For winning the war, it is essential to have a platform of values, of which the Atlantic Charter is a partial expression. To this *Professor H. J. Laski* adds that, if we can agree upon a system of common values, the machinery required is simple in outline and obvious in principle. He suggests an International Commission, with a Director comparable to the Secretary-General of the League in its prime, and drawing upon the experienced personnel of the League (e.g., the Health Section). *Mr. W. Arnold-Forster* makes out an unanswerable case for the continuation of international controls and sketches their application over a very wide field—food, "collective defence against epidemics," repatriation, radio, economics, narcotics, ocean-going shipping and civil aviation. "A vast fund of assent" will have to be enlisted to build up, in varied ways, "world government for certain purposes."

Coming on to more specific problems, *Professor John Marrack* deals with "Food for Starving Europe" His detailed consideration of the aftermath of the last war leads to the conclusion that nothing less than an agency aiming at freedom from want in respect of food will be needed this time. In the matter of "Post-War Medical Relief," *Dr. Aleck Bourne* shows that, with so much to be done, priorities will be inevitable—probably supply of food and control of malaria and typhus must come first. One international body must take over central direction, and to him the

League's Health Organisation is the obvious choice. "Relief Measures for Agriculture" are adequately outlined by *Mr. John Hammond;* and lastly, *Mr. Kenneth Brooks* discusses what he calls "the biggest human problem," i.e., "Re-establishment of Displaced Peoples." His collection of figures is illuminating, and also appalling. In the main, he expects better results from industrial rather than from agricultural settlement, and cites the lessons from League loans in the past. What can be done at once will be conditioned by other factors, e.g., epidemics and consequent restriction of movements of populations, feeding and transport. But it must be remembered that, during the past 25 years, an enormous body of experience has been built up; and the nucleus of an organisation exists in the Office of the League High Commissioner for Refugees, the Inter-Governmental Commission set up at Evian, and the League's International Labour Office.

CO-OPERATION AND POWER

By GORDON DROMORE

From Mr. Walter Lippmann, one of the most experienced American writers on international affairs, there comes a challenging book, AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY (Hamish Hamilton, 6s.). Let us have no reticence about it. The book is of capital importance. Vast numbers of Americans have read it, and it is discussed to-day through the length and breadth of the land. British readers have now the chance—say rather the duty—to get to grips with this analysis of American foreign policy. No book can help them more to understand the great debate going on in America on a post-war policy which the great majority of the people can approve and support.

On two key points Mr. Lippmann brings to bear acute judgment and a wealth of realistic evidence. A nation's foreign policy, he declares, is solvent when its foreign commitments are balanced by *power* adequate to protect them. The element of power plays an essential (though by no means the only) part in international co-operation. And he has no doubt as to America's *real interest* in international co-operation, which is not identical with what many Americans have believed and do believe it to be.

The review of America's early foreign policy is extraordinarily revealing. The Founding Fathers, we find, knew all about the real background to American security, which was a matter of political power; in other words, the strength of the British Navy. Monroe secretly obtained the full approval of Canning before he gave his Message to Congress and the world. The trouble was that the facts about this approval were never made public, nor clearly understood as time went on. Thus, in subsequent years, we find America, again and again, especially in the Far East, extending her commitments without any corresponding extension of her own power to secure them.

All was sunshine in the garden, as long as the British Navy could guarantee peace. But two wars exposed the insolvency of America's foreign policy. In the first the German menace (an example to be followed by Japan) to British sea-power, in the second the advent of air-power, revolutionised the centre of gravity of America's security. In each case national realisation of this fact was what really brought America into the fight. The true "defensive region" of American security was now the land mass of North and South America—with the corollary that its strategic defences must take in the sea approaches in both the Atlantic and the Pacific. One searchlight flooding the real danger to America's imagined security was the fact that most of South America below the Brazil bulge can now be reached more easily from Europe and Africa than from North America. At the back of this historic process lies the question of power. And power, for all the blindness of isolationism or the equally obstructive shortsight of pacifism, remains something which *counts*—for good as well as for ill. "It is nothing but an illusion fostered by false

reading of history," says Mr. Lippmann, "which has led so many to think that America has ever been able to stay out of any great war in which there was at stake the order of power in the oceans which surround America."

How, then, can America restore her foreign policy to solvency? Our author has no qualms about her healthy self-interest in the matter: and it is interesting to note how his views broadly dovetail in with important recent expressions of opinion in the States—as, for example, by Mr. Wendell Willkie, Governor Dewey, Mr. Sumner Welles and Mr. Cordell Hull.

America should take her stand, openly, as a partner in a "nuclear alliance", composed of Great Britain, Soviet Russia, and China: "nuclear" because it would be the effective power centre round which the other nations—as, for example, the "Atlantic Community" extending from Norway to France and Spain—could be grouped as opportunity presents in a pooled system of common security.

Positive predictions about the position of Russia may be less easy to make. But our author believes that peace "depends on whether the States on Russia's western borderlands will adopt a policy of neutralisation, and whether Russia will respect and support it." Western coalitions, under any guise, against Russia or the old insanities of a *cordon sanitaire* lead straight to a third war.

Mr. Lippmann's book, it will be realised, is not directly concerned with the non-security side of the post-war world—with, for example, the structure of international society wherein nations can live a tolerable life. A "nuclear alliance" is the necessary beginning and foundation of peace. At the same time, we are not allowed to forget that "the experience of history supports the conclusion that power can endure only if it gives and maintains laws within which men enjoy the liberties they regard as more important than life." The rock bottom principles of international relations are not overridden by power. But they cannot yet do without it.

FRESHWATER MEMORIAL FUND

In July of this year the League of Nations Union sustained a heavy loss in the sudden death of Major Freshwater, Deputy-Secretary of the Union from 1920 to 1938 and Secretary from 1938 until the day that he died in harness. Thoroughout his long and devoted service with the Union, Major Freshwater was always intimately associated with the work of the Branches. From Branches and members throughout the country enquiries have been coming in as to whether the Union intended to set up a National Memorial to Major Freshwater.

The Executive Committee has been considering this matter, and it is now proposed to inaugurate a Freshwater Memorial Fund at the General Council Meeting in London during December. Subscriptions will be publicly invited, and all Branches will be asked to make the Fund known to their members.

In planning this Memorial, the Executive has endeavoured to draw up a scheme which would be in harmony with Major Freshwater's own inclinations. He himself laboured constantly to increase the membership and influence of the Union and its Branches. Thus it is proposed to use the Fund to provide, each year, Fresh water Travelling Fellowships and Bursaries and a Freshwater Memorial Shield, to be awarded to the Branches most deserving of recognition for their membership and work.

The above is only a brief outline of the scheme, which will be fully discussed at the General Council Meeting.

The NATIONAL PEACE COUNCIL (144, Southampton Row, W.C. 1) announces the publication of three new pamphlets in its "Peace Aims" Series: No. 20, THE RENEWAL OF CIVILISATION, by *Christopher Dawson* (5d. post free); No. 21, PLANNING FOR ABUNDANCE, by *Joan Robinson, E. F. Schumacher, A. A. Evans, Nicholas Kaldor* and *P. Lamartine Yates* (1s. 1½d. post free); and No. 22, LONDON-WASHINGTON-MOSCOW—PARTNERS IN PEACE? by *Harold J. Laski* (7d. post free).

A LOOK AT THE INTERNATIONAL HORIZON—IV.

By HUGH VIVIAN

The will to co-operate and faith in final success—as was pointed out in the first article of this series—are the crucial factors in any scheme for successful international collaboration. Of such vital importance are these factors that, before progressing further to consider any of the details of the future military, political and economic world set-up, we must pause to look at the means for ensuring that such will and faith be maintained. It is hopeful that the spirit of collaboration is evident to-day among the United Nations in an unprecedented degree — the unanimous resolutions passed by representatives of some forty different Governments at Hot Springs offering striking proof of that. But how are we to guarantee the survival of this spirit in, say, ten years' time, when memories of blitz and concentration camp, and the common peril which drew these nations together, have begun to fade into the dim and distant past?

The answer to this question is to be found in one word—Re-education.

Religion

First, there will be a need for a revival of religious education among the peoples of the world; especially among those so-called Christian peoples who, as it might seem to others, have always been first to grasp any opportunity for jumping at one another's throats. How wisely did Napoleon observe, "*Si vous ôtez la foi au peuple, vous n'aurez que des voleurs de grand chemin*"! The maintenance of religion is the task of the churches; but it is also the interest of the statesmen. Any educational scheme, whether national or international, which neglects the religious aspect, will be foredoomed.

World Citizenship

Secondly, there will be a need for Re-education in World Citizenship. This will apply not only to the Axis Powers, but, in varying degree, to every nation, if the peoples of the world are to progress at last from those selfish and short-sighted nationalistic policies which have been increasingly apparent since the Industrial Revolution. It must be administered, both nationally and internationally, among the Axis Powers, among the other nations of European stock, and among the more backward peoples of the earth, some of whom will shortly be enjoying democratic self-government for the first time.

Germany will, without doubt, prove the hardest nation to re-educate, partly because of the pernicious education in the doctrines of race superiority and war-worship which has become deeply rooted. It is comparatively easy to start the education of a people from scratch. A far harder task lies in front of us in trying to obliterate for ever from the minds of the German people the lies and the savageries which have for so long been instilled into them by Huns, Prussians and Nazis. Unless this task can be accomplished, however, their re-education along modern democratic and peaceful lines can never become a practical possibility. Thus the impression which seems to be gaining ground in many quarters—it was not absent from the recent Trades Union Congress—that our troubles will be half over as soon as the Nazi and Prussian leaders have been overthrown and punished, is both false and dangerous. For one thing, it completely overlooks the lessons which Germans themselves, whether out of stupidity or villainy, have drummed home so harshly and so often during the past century.

The Case of Japan

Scarcely less of a problem will be the re-education of the Japanese. True, Japan has only comparatively recently adopted the aggressive nationalism of the self-styled *Herrenvolk*, so that it might be thought that she could scarcely be in a position to set the world ablaze without the assistance of the great European Power whose unscrupulous and brutal methods she so successfully copied and even surpassed! We may note in passing that competent American observers, such as Ambassador Grew, are not inclined to take too complacent a view of the future *vis-à-vis* Japan. Her geographical position, and the fanatical religious faith of her people which teaches them to worship the Mikado, and to regard death in his service as martyrdom, are two factors which make an aggressive Japan, even without allies, a menace to international security in the East.

So we may agree that, with Japan as with Germany, the task of re-education will be hard. But it must not be forgotten that, unpopular though they have made themselves, the Japanese possess characteristics which offer hope that they may yet be induced to devote their great energy and industry to the requirements of peace. For instance, they are said to be good imitators. We may find them, in the light of experience, eager to copy Britain instead of Germany. In such an event, we must not be backward in providing the right kind of tuition.

From Without and Within

Germany and Japan will, in the early stages of the peace, need a great deal of international control and supervision of their educational systems. The experience of the Weimar Republic shows us only too plainly that we cannot afford to leave such a vital matter immediately in the hands of the German and the Japanese Governments, ostensibly democratic though they may be. Nevertheless, any successful attempt at re-education, particularly of a proud and arrogant people, must come largely from within. There are, undoubtedly, minorities even in Germany and Japan who are politically civilised, and we must look to these for co-operation in the tasks of re-education until the still far-off day when they may be able to take over control.

Other Nations

What of the other nations of the world —the advanced, the backward, and those whose educational systems have been destroyed by the Axis Powers? Most of them have comparatively clean records; even so, they still have much to learn and put into practice. It is particularly incumbent upon those who have reached a high standard of democracy to attain a corresponding standard of education, in order that they may fulfil their responsibilities and duties in this most difficult form of government, and serve as models for the less advanced nations. Right policies are the fruit of right education. Never again must democratic peoples languish in such a state of political and economic ignorance as tolerated and acquiesced in the mental confusion which the world witnessed during the inter-war period.

Ample scope, indeed, will there be for an International Educational Organisation, functioning along similar lines to those of the I.L.O. In this connection, the first report of the Joint Commission of the Council for Education in World Citizenship and the London International Assembly is worthy of far greater study and publicity than it would so far appear to have received. At the same time, every Government will need to set up better national machinery for Education in World Citizenship—and for the study of foreign languages and customs, so that their nationals may benefit more fully from the vastly increased facilities for air and other transport which will soon bring the peoples of the world still closer to each other. The better the peoples can learn to know one another, the easier will be the task of the educationist.

WORLD WAR AND WORLD ORDER

By K. D. COURTNEY

One remarkable difference between this war and the war of 1914-18 is that from its very outbreak discussion began as to what were its causes and how in the future war could be prevented. During the first World War few voices were raised on the subject of prevention of war until about the year 1918, when ideas for the League of Nations began to take shape; and the change in this respect measures perhaps the distance we have travelled in the last 20 years and the effects of the consistent education on international affairs which has been carried on. Certain it is that from September, 1939, onwards a tremendous discussion about the problem of post-war settlement has engaged attention in Great Britain and above all it is noticeable that the question asked was not "Is there to be a system of international co-operation?" but "What form is that international co-operation to take?" The need for international co-operation has in fact been taken for granted.

Early Gropings

During the first months of the war discussion centred a good deal round the obvious fact that the League of Nations had not prevented war, and there was a tendency to condemn the whole organisation, ignoring both the reasons for its failure to prevent war and the remarkable successes it had achieved in other fields. It was during this period that the conception of Federal Union was put forward, and secured a good deal of support from those who believed that world government was the only solution, and from those who, regarding the League of Nations as a back number, eagerly seized upon something new without grasping its implications.

In spite of the difficulties created by the blackout and all the restrictions of war time, these discussions were continued throughout the first winter of the war during the period when the military front was comparatively stable. At the end of that time the lines along which opinion was divided began to emerge.

On one hand there was the question of the nature of the new international organisation. Should it be a Federation of some kind or a Union of States on the lines of the League of Nations? On the other hand there was the question of the sphere in which it should operate. To begin with, should its basis be ideological or geographical? Should it depend upon the kind of government in the countries concerned and include only democracies? Should it take the British Commonwealth as its nucleus? Should an attempt be made to establish an Anglo-American organisation? Should the new International Authority be world-wide, or should it be organised in groups of States or in continental regions?

Events Modify Ideas

In the meantime world events began to occupy the stage and to play their part, as events inevitably do in forming the shape of things to come. It is in the light of these events that we must view the first efforts at sketching a future World organisation.

In the spring of 1940 the conflict became enormously enlarged with the German invasion and occupation of Norway, Holland and Belgium. Then came the catastrophic fall of France, and Great Britain was left almost alone to face the might of Hitler Germany, now joined by Fascist Italy. The invasion and occupation of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Norway, Holland, Belgium, France and eventually Greece and

Yugoslavia brought to our island the exiled Governments of these countries as well as the remnants of their armed forces and a host of refugees. Free France set up her own Committee, and in the same way reconstituted her fighting forces. Thus, in course of time, Great Britain became the headquarters of the Governments of nearly all the allied nations and what had been scattered and disorganised groups of refugees became well-organised national units with their own armed forces and in several cases their merchant services, all making a highly important contribution to the war effort.

America was not yet numbered among the allies, but the growing interest of her people in the struggle for democracy led by Great Britain was an important factor in the support of the allied cause. Many people in U.S.A. and elsewhere had believed that Britain was bound to be defeated after the fall of France, but the "Miracle of Dunkirk," the winning of the Battle of Britain, and the courageous civilian resistance to the blitz in 1940-41 appeared to have an almost electric effect on American opinion, which culminated in public support not only for the use of U.S.A. as the "arsenal of democracy," but also for the abandonment of the Neutrality legislation and the acceptance of the Lend-Lease Act.

Two Turning Points

I have sometimes thought that in the spate of great events which have succeeded one another in the past few years, we are a little apt to forget the almost decisive effect of the Lend-Lease Act on the course of the war, and so on the course of history. Great Britain could not have continued either to supply all her own armament or to pay cash for those produced in U.S.A. Without Lend-Lease it is difficult to see how she could successfully have continued the struggle against Germany, heavily armed as the Axis was and able to command the resources of the conquered countries. The Lend-Lease Act therefore marks a turning point in the war.

Another turning point, as catastrophic in its way as the Fall of France, and as decisive as the Lend-Lease Act. was the entry of Russia into the war in the summer of 1941. Hitler's fateful attack on Russia and Russia's heroic resistance may well be regarded as the beginning of the end for Germany, and it brought a mighty ally to the side of Britain.

Atlantic Charter

In the political field, also, events of importance were taking place. The August of 1941 brought the Atlantic Charter, surely a unique instance in history of an agreement between a belligerent and a non-belligerent as to the objects for which a war is being fought. Less spectacular but significant were the Polish-Czech agreement and the Greek-Yugoslav agreement in January, 1942, and in the same month the acceptance by all the allied nations, including Russia, of the terms of the Atlantic Charter. Then in June, 1942, came the highly important Anglo-Soviet agreement with its pledge of co-operation for twenty years and its undertaking of mutual economic assistance after the war.

Finally, we have to record the last great military event, the entry of the U.S.A. and Japan into the world war on December 7th, 1941, perhaps the most colossal event of all in this amazing sequence. From now on the war was to become in every sense "global" and China took her rightful place as one of the great leaders in a titanic struggle.

What a change between June, 1940, when Great Britain was practically alone in the fight, and December, 1941, when we see ranged against the Axis Powers (now including Japan and Italy as well as Germany) the whole strength

of the United Nations, numbering among them the valiant fighters of the occupied and invaded countries as well as great and undefeated countries like Great Britain, the United States of America, Russia and China.

A New Alignment

A new world-wide grouping of the anti-Axis forces has thus emerged in these years of struggle—the United Nations. It is in the light of this situation that we must ask ourselves how the various schemes for world organisation which were being discussed in the early days of the war fit in to this new alignment of nations.

First let us consider Anglo-American co-operation: essential as it is both in the conduct of the war and in the maintenance of peace, it cannot alone suffice either for the prevention of aggression or as a substitute for a world system of international organisation; it is significant that little has been heard for some time of this project which at one time received a good deal of enthusiastic support in Great Britain, though less, perhaps, in U.S.A. The same argument applies to proposals for making the British Commonwealth the main bulwark in any new international system. Moreover, several members of the British Commonwealth of Nations have become during the war more aware than they were before of the links between them and America, and of the importance of the Pacific area, so that the indivisibility of the world in peace as well as in war is being brought home to them just as it has been brought home to U.S.A.

Schemes for Federation

It is impossible in a few words to do justice to the various schemes for federation which have been put forward since 1939. The ideological basis popularised by Mr. Clarence Streit in his proposal for a Union of 15 democratic states has receded somewhat into the background. It raises a number of questions which have not received any satisfactory reply. For instance: How are you to define democracy? Is there any definition which will provide a reliable criterion for admission to a peace-keeping organisation? How will you deal with States which change from one class to another? Is political exclusivism a satisfactory basis for world co-operation?

As for a Continental or more specifically European Federation, it suffices perhaps to say that whatever the merits of such a scheme it does not seem to correspond to the needs and wishes of the countries of Europe. Invaded, occupied, tortured as they are, their first desire is to re-establish their own national identity,—their "nationhood" as it is described by President Benes. They recognise the necessity for a further reduction of national sovereignty as well as the need for a political and economic understanding with their neighbours—the Czecho-Polish agreement and the Greek-Yugoslav agreement are both evidences of this. But a European federation is certainly not regarded by the countries of Europe as a system which will meet their needs in the immediate post-war period, though it may well be that spontaneous groupings of certain countries may lead to a much closer union than was possible in the past.

Then there is the proposal put forward with much eloquence and ability for some system of World Federation baser neither on geography nor on ideology, but treating the world as a unit and all the members of the human race as citizens of a federated whole. Whatever attraction this scheme may have for the theorist, it has little basis in practical politics, and as the realities of the war are coming home more and more in each country, and as the question of world organisation after the war becomes more and more a question which must be solved in the immediate future, there is a growing realisation that federation on these lines is not a system into which a world, torn to pieces by global war, can suddenly move.

Pattern of Co-operation

The emergence of the United Nations has produced yet another pattern of international co-operation. It has involved the setting up of a number of joint agencies through which the United Nations collaborate in the war, and this has led to the suggestion that future world co-operation might be based upon common action to deal with practical necessities, and that the new international system should be a functional order apart from any pre-arranged constitutional framework. The joint agencies produced by the necessities of war include, among others, the Combined Food Board, the Combined Raw Materials Board, and the Combined Shipping Adjustment Board. Recently the necessities of peace have also been foreseen in the setting up of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration with a definite constitution and an administrative system for dealing with the vastly important problems of relief and recovery in the immediate post-war world. It is natural that such developments should lead to the suggestion, especially in U.S.A., that U.N.R.R.A. might be an example of the lines along which co-operation could be built up after the war. Such proposals are interesting and indeed attractive. No doubt agencies for international action for practical purposes in the post-war world will play a highly important part as the world becomes more and more integrated. But without some definite political agreement their existence would be decidedly precarious, and, above all, their successful functioning would inevitably depend upon a reliable system of security against war.

There remains the conception of a Union of States on similar lines to those of the League of Nations, and it would seem that the thought of responsible statesmen in all the United Nations is tending in this direction. Such a Union could include within its orbit the functional activities to which reference has just been made; it could include groups of states which desire to come together either for ideological, geographical or economic reasons. It could include the scheme put forward by Mr. Churchill for a Council of Europe and possibly of other continents. Above all, its task would be to provide security recognised as the greatest need in the post-war world, and without which all other schemes for economic developments and for the welfare of peoples are built upon sands.

Such a Union of States, while it would aim at universality, might well start with the United Nations as a nucleus, and it is obvious that the Axis Powers could not be admitted on a basis of equality until they had given evidence of their reliability.

Global war has taught us that security must also be global, and although it may well be that certain nations by reason of their command of industrial wealth and of raw materials may be obliged to take the lead in guaranteeing security, yet clearly every nation which wishes to have its peace assured must play its part. Security is, in fact, the essence of world co-operation.

Our Address :

HEADWAY

LEAGUE OF NATIONS UNION,

11, MAIDEN LANE, W.C.2.

UP AND DOWN THE COUNTRY

DR. GILBERT MURRAY, O.M., had what he described as "a wonderful meeting" at PETERSFIELD, the Town Hall being packed to capacity. A specially gratifying feature was the large number of young people among the audience. The ovation accorded Dr. Murray was only surpassed by the outburst of applause at the end. Although on the outbreak of war some people cursed the League of Nations for not preventing it, pointed out the speaker, it was now being recognised that, to prevent war in the future, the peace-loving nations must get together, must be united, decide to stop aggression, decide to co-operate in this way or the other—in fact, all the "League" programme under a slightly different name, with (he quite recognised) some improvements. Dr. Murray concluded a brilliant sketch of post-war problems with the reminder that we should have the great privilege of helping nations in distress, rebuilding them, restoring their self-confidence and hope; and also of helping to establish a union of really united nations, which would not break up but would maintain peace and justice throughout the world.

For the visit of Mr. Vernon Bartlett, M.P., our HARROW BRANCH had Harrow Speech Room full (about 900 people). Mr. Bartlett was, of course, excellent; and the splendid platform supporting him included the Head Master of Harrow (in the chair), the Head Master of Malvern, the chairman of the Urban District Council, and the Branch President (Mr. R. M. Baldwin). There was only one disappointment: The sirens sounded just as new members were being recruited, and, in the natural anxiety of people to get away, "we only succeeded" (writes Miss Leeds, the Branch Secretary) "in getting 16 new members, but I hope others may still come in."

"How can we make a League of Nations in some form effective after the war?" This question was frankly and ably answered by Miss K. D. Courtney at a meeting of the STREATHAM BRANCH. After stressing the need for a certainty of security, she added, "We must get ourselves into an international frame of mind, and get our friends into an international frame of mind also." Mrs. Stevens invited all present to attend the forthcoming meeting of the Streatham Debating Society, when the League would be the subject for debate.

At the October Buffet Luncheon arranged by the LONDON REGIONAL FEDERATION, the audience was stimulated and encouraged by the thought-provoking address given by Mr. Geoffrey Mander, M.P. "*We* were not *all* wrong," was his theme. More glamour, he thought, must surround the future International Authority to enhance its appeal to popular sympathy. Personally he hoped that the idea of making the Ruhr the headquarters of the International Police Force, and taking over the industries situated in this area, would be fully explored.

The next Buffet Luncheou will be on Tuesday, November 16. The subject will be "What of Italy's Future?" and the speaker Dr. Magri.

Mr. W. J. Brown, M.P., was a star attraction at a meeting arranged by the RUGBY BRANCH at the Lawrence Sheriff School. His subject, "The Place of Broadcasting and the Press in the Post-War World," gave great scope for a challenging address.

At a meeting of the TEES AND CLEVELAND DISTRICT COUNCIL, Mr. Jaya Deva opened a discussion on "Problems of the Far East."

At a One-Day Conference held in BURY, under the chairmanship of Mr. L. F. Behrens, a wide range of political, economic and social problems was covered. Discussions were opened by Professor J. R. Hicks, Mr. T. E. A. K. Jackson and Mr. H. A. Phillips. Mr. Behrens also addressed a Union meeting at WITHINGTON.

Brains Trusts continue to be popular at HAMPSTEAD. The latest organised by our local Branch had the following platform:—Miss Freda White (Great Britain), Mrs. J. H. Street (U.S.A.), Mr. Gustav Stern (Czechoslovakia), Dr. M. J. Sudjic and Mrs. Nevenka Gulliland (Jugoslavia). The FEDERAL UNION Branch also ran a Brains Trust on the subject "After AMGOT, what?," with Mr. Leslie Aldous (L.N.U.) as one of the members.

Mr. W. H. Harding, our local Secretary, and other members of the WALLINGTON BRANCH, attended a Federal Union Brains Trust, and put some pertinent questions which the members of the Trust admitted to be "very difficult." Our Wallington Branch started off its Winter Session with a Youth Rally Debate on the "Re-education of Germany," opened by Miss L. E. Charlesworth, Headmistress of the Sutton High School. In December the Branch will have its own Brains Trust, with Miss Freda White and Mr. Jaya Deva among the members.

SELBY BRANCH'S Discussion Group opened its Winter Session with two meetings during October, the first introducing the general subject of "The World We Want," and the second dealing with "Immediate Post-War Problems." At subsequent meetings "The Peace Settlement," "Maintaining Peace," "Consolidating the Peace," and "International Re-education," will be fully covered.

We await with interest the results of a stirring appeal launched by the Rev. V. D. Davis for the revival of BEACONSFIELD BRANCH. The eight-page leaflet which he has circulated is a convincing and well-reasoned document, frankly facing the war-time difficulties which have paralysed the Branch, but arguing, with a wealth of telling quotations, that the time has manifestly come for new and more determined effort. It is hoped to call a General Meeting for the election of officers and committee, "for service with renewed and increasing efficiency in the New Year."

Mr. John T. Catterall, the Union's staff speaker, finds the spirit of the meetings which he is addressing now almost without exception encouraging. They leave him with a distinct impression that the tide is again beginning to flow in our favour. At EDMONTON he spoke on "Russia," at NELSON on "China and her Place in Future World Affairs," and at NAILSWORTH on "The Collapse of Hitlerism—what then?"

Under the chairmanship of Mrs. Pethick-Lawrence, amid the peaceful surroundings of PEASLAKE, Mrs. M. Gladys Stevens gave a talk on "OUR Part in World Order."

YEADON'S Fifth Joint Service was addressed by Canon T. J. Williams.

Branches addressed by Allied speakers included HARROGATE ("Major Colbert," Fighting France), BLACKHEATH (Mlle. Marie Harbley, Fighting France), and BECKENHAM (Miss B. Barclay-Carter, U.S.A.).

ROTARY CLUBS continued prominent among other organisations which had visits from L.N.U. speakers. The October list included:—ASHFORD and STAINES (Mr. T. Filipowicz on "Poland"); BARNES (Mr. Catterall on "Winning the Peace"); MAIDENHEAD (Mr. O. H. Larsen on "Denmark"): SLOUGH (Mr. Aldous on "Hot Springs and After"); and ST. ALBANS (M. Henri Rolin on "Belgium").

LAMBETH BRANCH had a remarkable month as regards the number and variety of local organisations addressed by Union speakers. The following list would require some beating: Mostyn Road Methodist Church (Major-General van Oorschot); Kenyon Road Baptist Church, and Dulwich Road Sisterhood (Mrs. Nevenka Gulliland); West Norwood Brotherhood and Mostyn Road Women's Meeting (Mrs. Riley); St. Thomas's Welfare Centre (Miss S. Teichfeld); St. Paul's Youth Fellowship (Miss E. Waite); Lyham Road Methodist Mission (Mr. Robson); and St. Saviour's Women's Fellowship and Girl Guides (Mr. Reichenstein).

Mr. Catterall visited HORSHAM BROTHERHOOD and the A.R.P. Wardens' Discussion group at HAMPTON HILL. The Editor of HEADWAY gave addresses at WEALDSTONE BROTHERHOOD, St. George's Women's Meeting at BRENTFORD, and the Essex Church Hall Women's Meeting at KENSINGTON. At CLAPHAM, the Rev. A. Allon Smith addressed the Rochester and Southwark Diocesan Group on the present work of the League and Post-War Settlement.

It is with deep regret that we learn of the death of *Mr. H. Frith Allbrook*, one of the founders of the NORTH HACKNEY BRANCH, who served it faithfully first as Treasurer, then as Secretary. One of his last acts was to give advice for the carrying on of the work of his old Branch, so that it might be ready to play its part in winning the peace.

WORLD AFFAIRS IN PARLIAMENT

By OWEN RATTENBURY

When the Prime Minister made his announcement about the new treaty with Portugal, this was really one of the most pleasant surprises that he has ever been able to spring upon the House of Commons. His opening sentence was so entirely unexpected that it was greeted by a burst of laughter from the members opposite. The words were:—

> "I have an announcement to make to the House arising out of the Treaty signed between this country and Portugal in the year 1373 between H.M. King Edward III and King Ferdinand and Queen Eleanor of Portugal."

To make a solemn statement about something which happened 600 years ago seemed comic. The House is so accustomed to some lively passage or aside from Mr. Churchill in any part of his speeches that members are always on the *qui vive* for the sheer fun of it. Such features are the condiments that help to make his most serious speeches specially palatable. Whether the condiment is best described as mustard, pepper, salt, or even vinegar depends on the occasion. In this case the statement was perfectly serious, as the House soon realised as he went on. Perhaps it needed the maps published in the Press in order that one should realise how very important it was. Apprehensions had been rife in many quarters as to what might happen to the Azores. President Roosevelt, it will be remembered, many months ago spoke of possibilities there. What he hinted at has not been necessary because the matter is so satisfactorily settled by agreement between Britain and her oldest ally.

The League Alive

That the enemies of the League of Nations realise that its days are by no means over is perhaps best indicated by the recrudescence of attacks on this organisation. Major Petherick (U., Penryn and Falmouth) was responsible for one such attack in a question and supplementary which Mr. Richard Law, answering for the first time as Minister of State, countered very satisfactorily. The question was an enquiry as to how many States were still members of the League, and how many had paid their contributions. The answer was 45 States in 1942, of which six had paid in full, four had made token payments, six had made payments in respect of arrears, and three others payments for specific purposes.*

The reason for the question came in the supplementary. Said Major Petherick:

> "Would not my hon. friend agree that this shows a deplorable state of affairs? Is it not time that this moribund and still expensive concern was wound up?"

Mr. Law replied:—

> "No, Sir, I cannot altogether agree with my hon. and gallant friend. The Government have made it clear on more than one occasion that we do attach considerable importance to the technical services of the League and that it would be a great pity if we allowed it to lapse now."

As if to comment on this, there was another question on the paper on the same day. Mr. Rhys Davies asked for a list of the countries affiliated to the I.L.O. Mr. Law gave the list and also a list of the 35 countries which had sent delegates or observers to the Bermuda Conference. Then Mr. Parker asked why the I.L.O. had not participated in the Bermuda Conference on Migration, the Hot Springs Conference on Food and Agriculture, and the Washington discussions on monetary stabilisation; and whether the Government intended to use the I.L.O. in connection with important questions of post-war reconstruction. In his reply, Mr. Law pointed out that, as the Bermuda Conference was exploratory between the British and United States Governments, there was no need for the I.L.O. to be there. The I.L.O. had accepted an invitation to submit papers for study at Hot Springs. The Washington discussions had been on monetary stabilisation between the Treasury departments of the two nations. On the last part of the question, he emphasised that it was the desire of H.M. Government to associate the I.L.O. wherever practicable with post-war reconstruction work.*

* *Mr. Law was basing his reply on the most recent information available which—because of war-time difficulties of communications, delays in receiving contributions owing to the difficulty of transferring money abroad, and so on—was still incomplete. We understand that a more up-to-date financial report, shortly to be issued by the League, will show a better situation even than that indicated by Mr. Law.*—ED.

* *The "Manchester Guardian" has recently been concentrating attention on this important question. Mr. Jef Rens, of the Belgian Commission on Post-War Problems, contributed an article in which he laid great stress on the active participation of the I.L.O. in the preparatory work for peace, for two reasons—because that is its natural role, and because it is the only international body in which the representatives of the smaller nations and the workers' associations can express their views and make themselves heard. The responsibility for the neglect of the I.L.O., after its auspicious "new start" in war-time, he attributed partly to the Great Powers for deliberately ignoring it, partly to the smaller Powers for acquiescing, partly to the lack of interest among trade union organisations, and partly to the I.L.O. itself for allowing itself to be pushed on one side. The "Manchester Guardian" backed up this article with an able and well-informed leader. Friends of the I.L.O. joined in a vigorous correspondence, in the course of which Mr. Pierre Krier (Minister of Labour, Luxemburg) wrote of the I.L.O.'s good record of experience and efficiency.*—ED.

Ethiopia

The description of the King of Italy as "Emperor of Ethiopia" in recent official documents led to no fewer than seven members putting down questions about it. Mr. Law's explanation attributed the blunder to pure inadvertence on the part of a minor official. Immediately, he added, the allied liaison officer had been instructed to tell Marshal Badoglio that such a title was inadmissible.

Mr. Harvey's question about slavery in Ethiopia was answered by Mr. Law's statement that very active steps had been, and were being, taken by the Ethiopian Government to give effect to the Emperor's decree. Since June, 1942, 149 persons had been tried by the High Court for slave offences. Of the 119 convicted, 11 had been sentenced to death and 50 had received sentences of over five years' imprisonment.

On Generals Roatta and Ambrosio there were four questions, the strongest being that of Mr. Mander, who asked for a demand for their surrender as war criminals. Mr. Law refused to condemn them without full investigation, but said that, if the allegations proved to be well founded, appropriate action would be taken.

FROM "HEADWAY'S" POSTBAG

"Faith and Works"

Sir,—The October issue is extraordinarily interesting. The review of Lionel Curtis's *Faith and Works* praises nationalism; the article called *This Sovereignty Business* denounces it; and a correspondent, Mr. Scott, appears to take a middle course.

In view of the fact that Sir Norman Angell many years ago showed clearly that the direct cause of war, over and above all indirect causes, of which the economic and psychological are the most obvious, was national sovereignty (nationalism in the sense referred to), is it not curious that we should be in any doubt about the matter now? Have we thrown over Sir Norman simply because he is not with us at the moment to remind us of the basic reason for our existence as a Union?—the prosecution of propaganda against national sovereignty.

The matter is serious and cannot be trifled with. If we are going to recommend nationalism (as opposed to praiseworthy cultural patriotism) we are betraying the root principle of the League itself; if we want to know the answer to Mr. Dromore's sovereignty business problem we might as well observe it staring us in the face in the strangely mixed but unbreakably united country in which the League has its permanent seat.

We know that the Swiss solution cannot possibly be duplicated on a Wellsian world scale for a long time, so we must do our utmost with the most strengthened forms of the second best — confederation — possible, plus aiding and abetting any small pieces of the ideal which may be obtainable. In face of Sir Norman Angell's standing exposition of the subject, can any true supporter of him and the League lay his ultimate ideals on the second best and favour nationalism after Manchukuo and Abyssinia?

WILLIAM A. H. WELSMAN,
Member, Bath and Brislington Branches.

(We are glad to announce that Sir Norman Angell is again with us for a short spell. During his fleeting visit he has attended meetings of the Union's Executive and other Committees, and has addressed the London International Assembly. He has willingly agreed to write an article for HEADWAY *before his return to the United States.*—ED.)

Sir,—Your reviewer of *Faith and Works* is hardly fair to Mr. Curtis, who only looks for a merger of the American and British Commonwealth for defence in the far distance. Mr. Curtis's view is that the peace of the world had long depended on the British Navy, and it is obvious that to-day Great Britain alone cannot maintain the security of the British Commonwealth and the world, that it is also clear that leading Dominions must unite in some closer bond with the Mother Country and reserve to a common democratic administration the defence of the community to which doubtless democracies like Holland and Belgium might unite.

To my mind Mr. Curtis's book should be studied as a valuable contribution to the necessary readjustment of the British Commonwealth of Nations after the war. It is obvious that the Covenant of the League failed to give any security, and I should like to know how peace is to be secured in the future. It can only be by giving all nations a greater interest in peace than in war.

I believe that whatever common international body be created there will of necessity be also the need of a re-consideration of the relationship of the component parts of the British Commonwealth and the Western Democracies, and also a vast extension of international functioning organisations to cover the whole web of life in accordance with the trend of the world in our time from "mights" to "services." We are having, and shall have, a re-surging of national life, and the international framework must provide the means for the fullest expression of that life in daily co-operative action so that all may have a fair share of the world's opportunities. There must be a coming together of the peoples and an abolition of the antarkic state which breeds war as a result of this co-operation. The I.L.O. was one such functioning body, but all the intellectual, commercial, and industrial life of the world should be embraced by a number of democratic international bodies in which nations would take varying responsibilities according to their national interests.

London, S.W.16. E. C. ELSMORE.

"Prussians and Germans"

SIR,—I would like the opportunity to thank your correspondent, Mr. Harold Picton, for his letter in October number. It is extremely valuable to have the information he gives from an eye as well as a mind observer. I had the privilege of attending a Boeke Conference at which—as I imagine—the last German delegation was permitted to attend. Some of the men and women in this particular German representative representation, as one might put it, were as thoroughly democratic in their ideas as any I have met in Great Britain, and I have met a great many, especially during my sojourn in the army and my attendances at conferences of various kinds. It was a positive inspiration to come in contact with these upright, fearless and liberty loving people. I often wonder with some feeling of horror what has befallen them during the Hitler regime. There can be no doubt whatever that there are many thousands of Germans from all the "airts" who will co-operate loyally and usefully in the post-war period and who will be quite capable of regenerating their erring fellow countrymen. No importations will be required for the new education of German youth. It is sheer effrontery on our part to suggest that we in Britain can take any effective part in this work. It will take us all our time to set our own house in order.

Dundee. A. G. BLACKWOOD.

MAIN CONTENTS

Printed for the LEAGUE OF NATIONS UNION, 11, Maiden Lane, W.C.2, by ST. CLEMENTS PRESS, LTD., Portugal Street, London, W.C.2.