

20 JUN 1945

S 1083

HEADWAY

The Journal of the League of Nations Union

No. 69

JUNE 1945

PRICE 3d

VISCOUNT CECIL

CONTRIBUTES HIS

FIRST THOUGHTS AFTER VICTORY

(MAY 8, 1945)

We have been told that the military resistance of the Germans has ceased. No doubt a regular Government has not been re-established and there may even be fighting here and there, as well as in the Far East. But the European War is over and every man, woman and child in this country must be thankful. That must be our first and deepest feeling. After five-and-a-half years of horrors—growing worse almost all the time—God has given our country a measure of rest. "Grant us Thy peace," we say in our services and I doubt not those who hear me, or most of them, have continually repeated that prayer privately.

People and Leaders

If we have not yet reached a full peace we have gone some steps towards it—and undoubtedly we have Victory. For that too we thank God, and also for the wonderful courage and endurance shewn by our fighting forces and by the masses of the people at home. That is a great thing—a very great thing. No doubt we have had splendid leaders both here at home and in our battles abroad—Soldiers, Sailors and Airmen; and it was indeed a special blessing that we should have had four such chiefs as Roosevelt, Stalin, Chiang and Churchill. Perhaps the greatest of them was the one who in all the excitement of the war never forgot

to plan for Peace. Roosevelt has gone—a model of courage and humanity. But the other three remain and they have been joined by General de Gaulle, not unworthy of his companions. It is surely a cause of the deepest gratitude that just when they were wanted these men were there, our own Prime Minister among them, proclaiming with matchless eloquence the greatness of our cause and inspiring us all to go forward into battle when to many our cause seemed well-nigh lost.

When We Stood Firm

Truly those few months of 1940 are something to look back upon. Great though Churchill was, he could have done nothing without the support of the people. It will be always one of the glories of our history that, faced with the long prepared strength of Germany, as well as Italy and their satellites in Europe, with France overthrown and the smaller countries in Europe occupied, without a single active European ally, our people and our airmen stood firm and drove back the enemy from invading our shores. It was a magnificent achievement leading up eventually, and through many changes and chances, to the victory which we have now attained. Not, indeed, without terrible losses and vast efforts. We shall not forget them. They were the price—and a fearful price—of our success.

The Tasks of Peace

And now we must ask ourselves with great seriousness what we are going to do with this victory. First of all we have to feed the hungry and clothe the naked. There are many millions of them. Some are, or have been, working as slaves for the Germans—under terrible conditions and in defiance of all rules of international law. They must, of course, be liberated and returned to their homes. That will be a considerable labour. I see that it is said there are seven or eight millions of them, apart from prisoners of war. Then they will have to be fed and it is doubtful if in all the world there is enough food for everyone. Besides these there are the many millions in the countries occupied and devastated by Germany. We don't know yet what are the numbers. But we do know that in many countries like Holland and Greece and Belgium and Norway, not to speak of the immense tracts in the centre of Europe, the population is nearing the starvation point—indeed has too often passed it.

Then we have to set up again in many places the machinery of Government so that the peoples may begin to feed and clothe themselves and start again all those activities which their German masters arrested. We should not despair of being able to face these things. Still less should we underrate the enormous difficulties that lie before us. I have only touched on some of them. No doubt there are many others. *Beyond and above them is the urgent necessity of taking adequate steps to prevent some aggressive nation of the future repeating the recklessness and wickedness of the Nazis.*

Using Our Victory

It is on that point particularly that I should like to say a few words. There are some people who think we should use our victory to promote national progress, to increase the riches of the world. No doubt something—perhaps much—may and should be done in this direction. But there is little ground for believing that riches bring happiness or even peace by themselves. They are rather the result of peace than its cause. Then there is another school which holds that the great thing is to punish Germany and hold down

its people by force. No doubt it is right and necessary that those who have been directly or indirectly guilty of the cruelty and horrors of which we read should be tried and punished with all justice and severity. It would be a scandal if they were allowed to escape, as happened at the end of the last war. But even if we were to shoot thousands of them I doubt if that would prevent future war. I hope more from the moral effect of shewing to the world and even to the Germans themselves the incredible wickedness of which they have been guilty. For we shall have no secure peace until the mass of mankind realise the loathsomeness of war and are ready to take all steps to extirpate it.

The Organisation

That means, in the first place, the establishment of a just and vigorous international organisation to maintain and enforce peace. As you know, a scheme is being worked out with that object and I will not discuss its details to-day. But I do wish to impress upon you as far as I can two things.

The first thing is that the scheme must have good foundations. It must be based on the great truths of Christian morality, on Freedom, Justice and Good Faith. St. Paul rightly says "Other foundation can no man lay than Christ Jesus." He was speaking of the life of the Corinthian Church. But it is equally true of the international community. Until that is realised, we shall be building on sand. Therefore, we must take care not so much with the details of the organisation as with the spirit that underlies it and, above all, we must see that it is used with fairness and impartiality.

Spirit of the People

And the second and last thing I want to say is that this is not a matter only or perhaps mainly for Governments. They will have to consider the framing and execution of the plan. But its operation will depend far more on the spirit of the peoples. It is nowadays public opinion on which everything depends and certainly not least the effectiveness of whatever machinery is established for peace. Believe me, an incomplete scheme strenuously and unflinchingly supported by the

determination of the peoples of the world will do far more for peace than the most perfect scheme conceivable which has behind it only the indifference or apathy of the nations. *That is where you and I come in. For the nations consist of*

people like us. We in the end may have to bear the responsibility for an even more desolating war than this one unless we insist that a proper organisation for ensuring peace is created, and that it is vigorously and courageously employed.

"THE WORK, MY FRIENDS, IS PEACE"

By FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

On the eve of his death President Roosevelt wrote a speech on the theme nearest his heart—abiding peace. It was never delivered. By courtesy of the U.S. Office of War Information, we are able to publish this unspoken speech in full.

Americans are gathered together this evening in communities all over the country to pay tribute to the living memory of Thomas Jefferson—one of the greatest of all democrats—and I want to make it clear that I am spelling the word "democrat" with a small "d." I wish I had the power, just for this evening, to be present at all of these gatherings. In this historic year, more than ever before, we do well to consider the character of Thomas Jefferson as an American citizen of the world.

The U.S. and World Affairs

As Minister to France, then as our first Secretary of State and as our third President, Jefferson was instrumental in the establishment of the United States as a vital factor in international affairs. It was he who first sent our navy into far distant waters to defend our rights, and the promulgation of the Monroe Doctrine was the logical development of Jefferson's far-seeing foreign policy.

To-day this nation, which Jefferson helped so greatly to build, is playing a tremendous part in the battle for the rights of man all over the world. To-day we are part of the vast Allied force—a force composed of flesh and blood and steel and spirit—which is to-day destroying the makers of war, the breeders of hatred, in Europe and in Asia.

Corsairs, Old and New

In Jefferson's time our Navy consisted of only a handful of frigates headed by the Gallant U.S.S. Constitution, "Old Ironsides," but that tiny navy taught nations

across the Atlantic that piracy in the Mediterranean—acts of aggression against peaceful commerce and the enslavement of their crews—was one of those things which, among neighbours, simply was not done.

To-day we have learned in the agony of war that great power involves great responsibility. To-day we can no more escape the consequences of German and Japanese aggression than we could avoid the consequences of attacks by the barbaric corsairs a century and a half before.

The Greater Conquest

We, as Americans, do not choose to deny our responsibility nor do we intend to abandon our determination that, within the lives of our children and our children's children, there will not be a third world war. We seek peace—enduring peace. More than an end to war, we want an end to the beginnings of all wars, yes, an end to this brutal, inhuman and thoroughly impractical method of settling the differences between governments.

The once-powerful, malignant Nazi state is crumbling. The Japanese war lords are receiving, in their own homeland, the retribution for which they asked when they attacked Pearl Harbour. But the mere conquest of our enemies is not enough. We must go on to do all in our power to conquer the doubts and the fears, the ignorance and the greed, which made this horror possible. Thomas Jefferson, himself a distinguished scientist, once spoke of "the brotherly spirit of science, which unites into one family all its votaries of

whatever grade, and however widely dispersed throughout the different quarters of the globe." To-day science has brought all the different quarters of the globe so close together that it is impossible to isolate them one from another. To-day we are faced with the pre-eminent fact that if civilisation is to survive we must cultivate the science of human relationships and work together, in the same world, at peace.

"Make this Work Endure"

Let me assure you that my hand is the steadier for the work that is to be done, that I move more firmly into the task, knowing that you—millions and millions of you—are joined with me in the resolve to make this work endure. The work, my friends, is peace. More than an end of this

war, an end to the beginnings of all wars. Yes, an end, forever, to this impractical, unrealistic settlement of the differences between governments by the mass killing of peoples.

To-day, as we move against the terrible scourge of war—as we go forward toward the greatest contribution that any generation of human beings can make in this world—the contribution of lasting peace, I ask you to keep up your faith. I measure the sound, solid achievement that can be made at this time by the straight edge of your own confidence and your resolve. And to you, and to all Americans who dedicate themselves with us to the makings of an abiding peace, I say: *The only limit to our realisation of tomorrow will be our doubts of to-day.* Let us move forward with strong and active faith.

EDITORIAL

THE SAN FRANCISCO CHARTER

Mr. Anthony Eden was asking a little too much when he appealed to the San Francisco Conference to finish its work within a month of the opening. The month, as we write, is up, but the Conference still has work to do. Miss K. D. Courtney, Vice-Chairman of the Union's Executive, is at San Francisco, watching the proceedings from the Press Gallery. For her impressions of the Conference, however, HEADWAY readers must wait until the next issue. Although she reports by cable a speeding up since the Whitsun weekend, the results are still too piecemeal to allow of a connected account of what has been achieved at San Francisco.

Newspaper Impressions

How has San Francisco struck the ordinary newspaper reader? He has probably dismissed it as "just one of those conferences." Or else his casual, roving eye has gleaned a hasty impression of talk, muddle and bickering.

Admittedly it has not been an easy Conference to follow, especially from a distance. Day-to-day reports in the papers have switched about from one angle under discussion to another—from voting and the veto, say, to regional arrangements or

trusteeship, with phrases about "strategic areas" thrown in to make it harder. "How can we understand what it's all about?" we heard one reader complain. "There's no beginning or end about the reports—they're all 'middle,' in fact."

A Busy Workshop

So might a bewildered onlooker feel in a busy workshop, amidst the heat and noise of unfamiliar technical processes. In the San Francisco workshop, the job in hand is the construction of a new and improved League of Nations. Already, at Dumbarton Oaks, the old League had been taken to pieces, for thorough scrutiny and expert examination. Quite a lot of the parts, found to be still serviceable, were brought along to San Francisco. Cleaned and polished, they will help to build the 1945 model. Some adjustments and new parts have also been suggested. The designers and mechanics from nearly fifty nations, who are to be the shareholders in the new company, have been examining every feature of the proposed machine. At the moment the parts are still lying all round them. Some have been generally accepted, a few rejected, and others are still the subject of earnest argument. Well

might the layman scratch his head in perplexity. But the expert knows that much of the apparent confusion is only on the surface. Soon the parts will be assembled into a smoothly-running machine.

That, roughly, is why the Charter of the new international organisation is still, at the time of writing, in the "bits and pieces" stage. But the actual assembly is often the quickest part of the job.

Conference Procedure

At the start a good deal of time had inevitably to be taken up with the preliminaries inseparable from any international conference. There was President Truman's broadcast address, in which he welcomed the delegates as "architects of the better world." There were the speeches that everybody wanted to hear—from Mr. Stettinius, Mr. Molotov, Mr. Eden, Field-Marshal Smuts and a few others. There were the speeches that had to be made and listened to. Then certain other questions—like the admission of White Russia, the Ukraine and Argentina, and the temporary exclusion of Poland pending the formation of a representative Government—had to be settled before the Conference could really get down to business.

The Conference set up a "Steering Committee," consisting of the chairmen of all the national delegations. To deal as methodically as possible with the various amendments, the work was subdivided according to subjects. There were four main "directive" Commissions. Under these were twelve committees, working separately, to shape the different parts of machinery. The results of these labours in the various fields would finally be brought forward for assembly by the Conference as a whole.

No complete summing up of the Conference, we have seen, is possible at the moment. Mr. Eden's interim report, on his return to London, was that good progress had been made, better in many respects than had been anticipated. He felt confident that the remaining difficulties would be overcome, and that the final Charter would be "a much better document than that of Dumbarton Oaks."

Union Suggestions

Meanwhile some of the "improvements," which have been talked about at

San Francisco and are likely to find a place in the Charter, are of interest to the League of Nations Union.

The Union's suggestion that the Charter should begin with a Declaration, setting forth the fundamental ideas of the United Nations, was one that H.M. Government viewed sympathetically. At San Francisco, this idea of starting with a clear statement of principles found such general favour that Field-Marshal Smuts was asked to draft a preamble.

The Union, in its recommendations, stressed the very great importance of the Economic and Social Council. Steps are being taken, in the drafting at San Francisco, to give it a clearer and higher status.

The Union also drew attention to the fact that, in the Dumbarton Oaks plan, no mention was made of any body to take over the duties of the Permanent Mandates Commission. At San Francisco, the question of "trusteeship" has been right in the limelight and it seems certain that some relevant provisions will be made in the Charter.

As regards the Security Council, the Union made reference to the special position of "Powers of middle size." At the Conference, these "Middle Powers" (including members of the British Commonwealth) have eloquently pleaded their claims. Their ability to contribute something special to the preservation of peace, it appears, will be recognised in the arrangements for appointing the six elected members of the Security Council.

Regional arrangements have been very keenly discussed. The problem has been how best to fit them into a world system.

The biggest stumbling block is still voting in the Security Council and the veto that could be exercised by a Great Power. The Union, it will be remembered, never liked the Yalta compromise and hoped that it would be further considered at San Francisco. At our General Council, the debates revealed the further danger of a "hidden veto," which a Great Power not directly a party to a dispute might exercise to prevent action. That "hidden veto" is causing a good deal of argument at San Francisco. There have been signs that the Yalta compromise will be changed a little and changed in the right direction as desired by the smaller Powers.

PUBLIC OPINION AND THE CHARTER

By PHILIP NOEL-BAKER, M.P.

(In a Message to L. N. U. All-Party Conference at Derby)

Six months ago the Foreign Secretary presented to Parliament in a White Paper an official "Commentary on the Dumbarton Oaks Proposals."

In paragraph 5 of that Commentary, he said: "The experience of the League of Nations was, of course, always in the minds of those who prepared the document, and there is in structure a considerable likeness between the Covenant and the proposed Charter. An Assembly and a Council with permanent and non-permanent members, an international court of justice and a Secretariat are the main organs of the new as of the old organisation. These organs have, in fact, developed over a long period of years, though they were first given definite form in the Covenant, and they must be the main elements of any international body of this nature."

Everyone who understands the subject will agree that Mr. Eden was profoundly right when he wrote these pregnant words. The new international institutions now being discussed in San Francisco will grow out of, or will be built upon the experience of the League of Nations, just as the League grew out, and was built upon, the earlier rudimentary international organisations of The Hague.

If we are to use the new institutions to save mankind from another total war, we must learn the lesson of the League. No honest man who knows the history can believe that it was the legal shortcomings of the Covenant, or defects in the constitution of the Council or Assembly, or the unanimity rule, or the attitude of the smaller powers, which led to the failure of the League. As Mr. Churchill said the other day: "This war could easily have been prevented if the League of Nations had been used with courage and loyalty by the associated nations." This war came because the Governments of the Greater Powers failed to uphold the Covenant, to fulfil their solemn and undisputed pledges,

when, over Manchuria and Abyssinia and Spain and Czechoslovakia, aggressors challenged the law of the Covenant. This war came because the peoples of the Greater Powers allowed their Governments to break the pledges they had made.

It is, of course, important that the Charter which emerges from the debates in San Francisco should be legally and technically as complete and satisfactory as it can be made. It is important that the new institutions should carry on all that was good—and there was very much—in the rules and the procedure and the customs of Geneva. But no proper constitution, no machinery, can save us if the Governments and their peoples follow the policy of appeasement of aggressors once again. For that danger, there is one safeguard only—an informed, organised and vigilant opinion led by such bodies as the League of Nations Union used to be. As Mr. Stettinius said in San Francisco: "There can be no end to the tyranny of fear and want unless the world organisation commands the allegiance of both the mind and the conscience of mankind."

But the World Organisation can only command the allegiance of mankind if mankind knows what is going on. It is of the highest importance that the San Francisco Conference, and its Committees, are to meet in public. Public debate, as Lord Cecil said in 1920, was "the life-blood of the League"; it is the life-blood of our British Parliament; it is, in every country, the life-blood of the democracy which the Fascists of all countries have striven to destroy. The peoples have a right to know what the Governments are doing in their name, and on what grounds decisions are made. That right extends to every issue of foreign policy to-day. There is no longer any place for the secret huckstering and blackmail of power-politics. Public parliamentary debate is the instrument by

(Continued foot of page 7)

ALL-PARTY CONFERENCES

BIRMINGHAM

An All-Party Meeting in the Birmingham area was arranged by Northfield, King's Norton and Selly Oak Branch jointly with the Bournville Works and Bournville Town Branches. Mrs. Laurence Cadbury presided. Captain R. Blackburn, prospective Labour candidate, whilst supporting Dumbarton Oaks in general, seemed to stress the importance of close co-operation with Russia. Mr. B. S. White, prospective Liberal candidate, thought the proposals a considerable advance on the League of Nations. Mr. R. K. Canning, who in the absence of Major Peto, M.P., spoke for the Conservatives, urged the tremendous importance of public opinion behind the new proposals.

BURY

Bury's three prospective Parliamentary candidates for the first time shared the same platform at the all-party meeting arranged by our Bury Branch in the Athenæum. The Mayor, who is President of the Branch, described the creation of an organisation to ensure world peace as the most vital and urgent task of our time. "It is the duty of every citizen to see that the horrors of the past six years do not occur again."

Mr. G. J. Kerrich, Chairman of the Withington Branch, first expounded the essence of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. Councillor Hand (Labour) welcomed the

(Continued from previous page)

which, in international as in national affairs, a system of law and justice can be built up and protected against attack.

But publicity by itself is not enough. To be effective, opinion must be informed and organised. That is why the League of Nations Union has still a vital function to perform. I hope that, in the future, the Union will attract all those, of every party, who are firmly resolved that the new peace system shall be upheld. I hope it will attract no others. If it is strong and united and single-minded, it can make Great Britain what Great Britain ought to be, the moral and political leader of civilised mankind.

scheme, but pointed out the danger of the Security Council becoming a great Power directorate and regretted the tendency to regard social and economic questions as somewhat secondary. Mr. James (Liberal) thought that on balance there had been no real advance on the League of Nations. This country should listen to the criticisms of the small nations. Mr. Fletcher (Conservative) put in a plea for less criticism and more waiting to see how those who have the burden of working out the balance of international affairs pursue their task.

At the conclusion the Rev. J. W. Maw, Chairman of the Bury Branch, expressed his complete satisfaction with the meeting both on the platform and with the attendance.

HARTFORD

The third of the series of meetings organised by our Hartford Branch, at which the prospective Parliamentary candidates for the Northwich Division of Cheshire have spoken, was the largest and most successful. Possibly the advent of the General Election helped to attract a capacity audience to the Hartford Church Hall. At all events the speakers arrived to find people standing round the walls and at the back. Mr. J. L. S. Steel, as President of the Branch, invited Brigadier John Foster, the prospective Conservative candidate, to express his views on the conduct of foreign affairs. The speaker, in stressing the importance of the San Francisco Conference, referred to the recommendations which the L.N.U. had submitted to H.M. Government. The fact that so many of these proposals seemed likely to appear in the final Charter was, to his mind, a great tribute to the farsightedness and objectivity of the Union. His appeal for support of the Union was supplemented by Mr. Leslie Aldous (Editor of HEADWAY), Dr. R. O. Gibson (Chairman of the Branch), and Mr. Knight, who proposed a vote of thanks. At the end Miss Robson, the Branch Secretary, had a busy time taking subscriptions.

Next evening a first step towards reviving the neighbouring Weaverham Branch was taken when Mr. Aldous spoke on "San Francisco and the Future."

DR. JOHNSON ON THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

By W. A. PAYNE

It is interesting, and perhaps profitable, to consider what great men of the past would have thought of some of our modern international problems. With this purpose in view, the reader is asked to imagine that a really constructive secret weapon has projected Dr. Johnson and the faithful Boswell into the twentieth century, and that what follows is Boswell's account of one of their conversations.

BOSWELL: A perusal of the publishers' lists suggests that many books are now being written on "the problem of power."

JOHNSON: A multiplicity of books is not necessarily conducive to intellectual comprehension.

BOSWELL: Most of them do but expatiate on Lord Acton's apothegm: "All power corrupts; absolute power corrupts absolutely." Pray, Sir, what do you think of this dictum?

JOHNSON: Lord Acton was a prodigiously learned man, but we must remember that he is here speaking epigrammatically. Sir, he exaggerates in order to impress us. Is the policeman more corrupt than the criminal whom he apprehends, and does not St. Paul command us to obey the powers that be?

BOSWELL: But is not Lord Acton thinking of the abuse of power by an irresponsible authority?

JOHNSON: Why, to be sure, Sir, but he speaks of absolute power. Absolute power is as chimerical as absolute motion. Besides, Sir, a recognition of human inequality and a respect for authority are requisite for the stability of society. Depend upon it, when power becomes oppressive, the people will rise and extirpate the tyrants.

My veneration for Dr. Johnson did not prevent me from expressing my disagreement with this exposition of a *laissez-faire* policy, for it was clear that Dr. Johnson had not been informed of recent international events.

I then told him how it was that a great nation had been so controlled by a group of tyrants that the very desire for freedom had been extinguished, and the civilisation of Christendom threatened with ruin. "Such catastrophes arise," he said, "when the lust for domination overthrows

the restraints of common morality" and he then quoted with great effect the following lines from Shakespeare:

"O, it is excellent

To have a giant's strength; but it is tyrannous

To use it like a giant."

"But, Sir, it is useless thus to contemplate the malady unless we can prescribe a curative to alleviate it."

I told Dr. Johnson that a remedy had indeed been prescribed in that excellent institution, the League of Nations, of which I was myself a humble supporter, and whose claims I expounded for his approval.

Let it be admitted, I said, that like all human schemes it was full of imperfections, yet no more rational plan for the preservation of the treasures of civilisation had yet been produced. Surely it merited the support of all men of reason and good sense.

It was not to be expected that the great Cham of Literature would show spontaneous enthusiasm for the sentiments I had so inadequately expressed, yet his manner was so cordial and earnest that he was clearly not unimpressed by my arguments.

His parting words were a truly Johnsonian utterance and a further proof, if indeed such were needed, of the perspicacity of this extraordinary man.

"Sir," he said, "confabulations between contiguous countries for the preservation of peace are highly to be commended."

Our Address:

HEADWAY

11, Maiden Lane, London, W.C.2.

Telephone:

TEMple Bar 6140.

The future of SECURITY

A Broadcast Discussion between Lord Winster, Carl J. Hambro, and Sir Arthur Salter, M.P. In the Chair: Edward Montgomery

Edward Montgomery: Let us begin by considering the problem of security, which is a question partly of opinion, partly of fact. Now is this a permanent problem, or does it change with conditions? In other words, are we faced in 1945 with the same sort of difficulties that existed in 1918 in creating a machine to prevent war, or are the difficulties themselves of a different nature?

Lord Winster: I should say that essentially the problem remains the same, but the methods by which it can be solved have become very much more complicated. There are new weapons to consider; and there is the principle of total war, which has led, I think, to a breakdown in human morality on the whole subject of war. So any charter which aims at preventing war will have to take account of bombing aeroplanes, rocket-bombs and, possibly, other and much worse things that the scientists may even now be inventing. War having become so much more complicated, the charter will have more holes to stop. What we have to contemplate is the possibility of the knock-out blow delivered without any warning whatsoever. Flying-bombs and rockets have been quite a nuisance, coming singly; and they have been the first of their kind. What will happen if their later developments arrive in battalions?

Montgomery: Of course that might mean that the attack would be so overwhelming, and so quick, that no conceivable provisions could be made in advance.

Winster: Yes, but the knock-out blow is a thing that cuts both ways. You can hit back at an aggressor, if you want to, just as quickly and overwhelmingly as he can attack his victim. The fact that total war can become so swift and so annihilating—that in itself and not morality at all may convince the nations that war does not pay.

Montgomery: You don't suggest, do you, that the surprise attack can be forestalled?

Winster: No. And that's another of the differences between 1919 and 1945. The old idea was that armaments could be supervised. Even after the last war that was not too easy. But it is even worse now, because the new weapons are precisely the sort that are most difficult to supervise. A nation cannot build half-a-dozen battleships without being noticed. But a good many modern weapons can be camouflaged at every stage: design, development, trial and production. And it is not only the making of armaments that counts to-day. War has largely passed out of the

hands of the armament firms into the hands of the scientist, and who is going to supervise the scientist? That would be a difficult job for the most efficient intelligence service.

Carl J. Hambro : There is one more difference, I think. In the war of 1914-18 many far-away places—Greenland, Iceland and distant islands of the Pacific—could remain outside the sphere of war. We have seen in this war that they may be vital points for controlling the airways and supply lines of the world. A modern war is not only totalitarian ; it is global. In the whole of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals the word “neutrality” never occurs at all. Before this war Belgium and Holland made the last stand on behalf of neutrality as a policy ; in both cases it failed.

Sir Arthur Salter : I agree. I think that any country that accepts membership of the new organisation must give up any right to be neutral in a future war.

Montgomery : Well, let us come to the new organisation itself. Who met at Dumbarton Oaks? What did they decide? How far does it bind us? What still remains to be done? And what hopes have we that the new proposals will have profited by the lesson we learnt in the past twenty years? These are your questions, Sir Arthur.

Salter : Well, Dumbarton Oaks is the name of a large house in Washington. In this house, officials of four Governments—the United States, Great Britain, Russia and—later—China, met last summer to discuss plans for what we may call a new League of Nations. They drew up what they called “tentative proposals” which did not commit even the four countries, much less the other United Nations. Then at the Conference in the Crimea last January President Roosevelt, the Prime Minister and Marshal Stalin endorsed the proposals generally, made one important addition about voting procedure, and decided to invite all the United Nations to meet at San Francisco on April 25 next. The Conference will then try to agree on a new Covenant or Charter. They will take the Dumbarton Oaks proposals as a basis, but may of course make some changes. And even when a new Charter is drawn up, it will still need to be ratified in the different countries.

The new scheme is very much like the old League. We do not know where its headquarters will be : that will have to be decided later. But there will be as before an Assembly, including all countries who are members ; a smaller Council, consisting this time of five great powers as permanent members and six small countries who will change from time to time ; a Court of Justice ; and an international secretariat. But the powers are different, especially the powers of the Council. The Council will have full responsibility for dealing with immediate threats of war. And it has some powers for taking immediate action which the council of the League did not have. Members are expected to pledge themselves beforehand to take the action decided on by the Council ; to be prepared, for example, to cut off supplies to an aggressor country ; to state beforehand what military forces they can furnish if called upon ; and in particular, contingents of an air force are to be kept immediately available. And there

also to be a permanent committee of the General Staffs to keep all arrangements in a state of readiness for instant action. This is what is meant by “putting more teeth” into the new League.

Hambro : I think that we should not only look to the Council. Under the new plan any member of the organisation has the right to bring before the Assembly any question relating to the maintenance of international peace and security. And even if the General Assembly cannot on its own initiative make recommendations on questions which are being dealt with by the Security Council, it can discuss them and it can adopt resolutions of principle. In the League of Nations the Assembly, from the very start, had a power which its founders had never planned. The Assembly became the world’s most important public forum, where even a veiled threat to a small and weak state could be exposed. It was the only place where an appeal could be made for moral principles in international affairs over the heads of the governments themselves. The General Assembly of the new organisation will be the safeguard of liberties—if delegations have the moral courage to speak openly and frankly and if they realise the dangers of intrigue.

Salter : Yes, the Assembly can mobilise and express public opinion—I fully agree with that. But don’t let us forget that it has not, and is not meant to have, any executive power in a crisis.

Montgomery : Before we go on to discuss the criticisms of these proposals, Sir Arthur, do you think there is any other basic fact about them that we ought to know?

Salter : Well, I have been pointing out the difference between the Dumbarton Oaks scheme and the League. But there is one fundamental similarity. They are both inter-state organisations. That is, they are designed to secure co-operation between independent sovereign states. Now there are a lot of people who think that you ought to aim at a League where the states are bound together in a totally different way, rather in the same way as the States of America—a federal organisation. And for one would agree that, when you can get it, a federal system is better. It is much less likely that one State of America will attack another State than it is that one state-member of the League will break away and quarrel fatally with a fellow member. That is obvious. But, desirable as this is, it can only grow gradually—perhaps by a system of small regional agreements. And meanwhile, we must have an inter-state organisation to keep the peace. Dumbarton Oaks contemplates Regional Associations settling local disputes, and giving mutual help, under the general control of the wider organisation. But I should personally hope some of these Regional Associations will go further than this and develop as federations.

Hambro : I think there is some danger in our emphasising the importance of regional arrangements at this moment. We are already facing a prospect of fragmentation before we have agreed on our principles of co-ordination. The regional arrangements must not be allowed to take us back to the old-time alliances, and it is well to bear in mind that certain “regional

arrangements"—some of the most interesting ones—are not **only** geographical arrangements between neighbour-states. For instance, the Oslo Convention between the Northern Countries and the Low Countries, whose "arrangement" was built on something more solid than geography—namely, on the same democratic instincts and traditions. And also the British Commonwealth of Nations.

Montgomery : Yes, and I'm not sure that British people sometimes do not underestimate that fact, living, as they do, inside the Commonwealth—the fact of this amazing aggregation of peoples of different colours, creeds and races, held together by a common way of life. But let me get back to the agenda. We have said something about the problem of security, and about the Dumbarton Oaks proposals themselves. Now we come to the third big question. Will the Dumbarton Oaks scheme provide us with the security we need? One criticism is that if the League failed, and Dumbarton Oaks is only the League revised, how can we hope for anything better?

Salter : The membership, with America and Russia, will be stronger. Because the new proposals put some new teeth into the League.

Winster : I hope they really are teeth—not a dental plate that can be taken out if you want to.

Montgomery : Whether the teeth turn out to be real or false, that is the most important of the differences between Dumbarton Oaks and the League. People used to criticise the old League because it asked for power to prevent aggression and now they criticise it in retrospect because it did not have the power. However, let us come to the principal criticism of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, the criticism dealing with the system of voting as proposed by the Big Three as a result of the Crimea Conference.

Salter : The Dumbarton Oaks Conference left the important question of voting procedure unsettled. At the Crimea the Big Three—Roosevelt, Churchill and Stalin—agreed on a proposal to be put before the San Francisco Conference. The essence of this proposal is that, on important matters, the Security Council can only act on the unanimous vote of the five Great Powers—America, Great Britain, Russia, China and France—in addition to two votes of the remaining six smaller countries. If one of the great powers is a party to the dispute, it cannot indeed put a veto on the Council discussing it and recommending a solution, but it can veto the enforcement of economic and military sanctions against itself. It is not quite accurate to say that a great power is judge in its own case, for the Council can pronounce a verdict on the dispute without it. But, while it is not a judge, it can stop the Council from using its police force.

Montgomery : That will certainly be the most criticised part of the present proposals, won't it?

Salter : It is already. And I think perhaps I had better state the case for and against as fairly as I can. The one argument runs like this : a true security system ought to give security to every member against every other, small or large. If the new League has more teeth in it, it can only

use them against small countries or countries which are not members. But it is comparatively easy anyhow to deal with quarrels between small countries ; and we cannot assume that there will never be a serious quarrel between the great powers which are now allies. Under this voting rule, Italy and Japan could have vetoed sanctions against themselves when they attacked Abyssinia and China. It therefore makes action impossible just when it is most needed.

On the other side, it is said that the rule only recognises the inescapable realities of the present position. If there should be a quarrel to the point of war between, say, America, Great Britain and Russia, or any two of them, the new League is bound to break down anyhow. It is better to make this clear from the beginning than, as before, to fail later after creating misleading expectations. We are not now creating, and cannot immediately create, a full-blown, ideally constructed, and fully effective international system. We are making a start only, and doing the best we can. The real responsibility will, and must, remain with the Great Powers for some years to come. I think that we must admit that we shall not get a true and complete international system until it has power to control great countries among its members as well as others. If, therefore, we accept the present rule, we must, I think, work continuously to create the conditions which will make it possible to make the change later. In a word, the task of creating a true security system is only beginning ; it is not completed by the acceptance of the present proposals.

Hambro : I agree that a strong organisation has to be built on facts and not on fiction. The Dumbarton Oaks proposals can be criticised from every theoretical point of view—but we *can* only start a new organisation by admitting political facts and trying to find a middle-way between perfection and realism. It is a purely fictitious idea to give all states an equal vote, to pretend that Luxembourg and the United Kingdom are equal, or that Norway and Soviet Russia should have the same influence in world affairs. It does not make sense—and it may be dangerous. In Norway we have a saying that when there is a dangerous crossing on the river it is safer not to have any rail than to have a rotten rail or a rail so weak that it will go down if you lean on it.

Montgomery : The idea of equal voting may be unsound, but why should it be dangerous?

Hambro : Because I think some quite dangerous delusions arise from the use of such phrases as "the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states." What we mean is equality of *justice*, equality before the law. There can never be any quantitative equality. If you keep up the illusion that all states should have the same power, even the same voting power, you only confuse a true sense of responsibility. Small states have a greater interest in preventing war than big countries. A war for them is not a question of more or less power, but of being faced with extinction. It is their life interest not to promote rivalries and distrust between the great nations but to promote confidence.

Montgomery : It is true that small states did occasionally intrigue or make trouble. But Abyssinia did not attack Italy in 1935 and Serbia

did not send the ultimatum to the great Austro-Hungarian Empire which started the last world war. However, there may be other criticisms which we ought to consider. Lord Winster, you may have some point to make about this question of international force—

Winster : Yes, I foresee some difficulties there. I don't, of course, damage the proposals because of these difficulties, but it is necessary to face them. The organisation will not automatically control any armed forces. Nations will be asked to earmark armed contingents to be at the disposal of the Security Council if asked for. But even when they are earmarked, they will remain under the control of their own governments: they will not be able to move until their governments order them. That is even true of the special air force that is to be kept in a state of instant readiness. Now in March 1939 when Hitler gave the Czech President the alternative of war or submission, he had, I believe, eight hundred bombers, with bombs in the rack, awaiting the order to demolish Prague. It would have been a matter of minutes. Is the new air force ready to move at an equal rate to counter a threat like that? Even given complete goodwill there must be delay in assembling these contingents for action. Some of the nations concerned would almost certainly be half-hearted or reluctant about the proposed action and then the delay would increase. Meanwhile, the aggressor would be acting swiftly.

Then the Chiefs of Staff Committee: that Committee will have to make world plans for action to cover an enormous range of possibilities in every part of the world. They will have to make those plans without knowing if the forces their plans require will in fact be forthcoming; or when, if forthcoming, they will be available. There are many other difficulties about combined training and manoeuvres and exercises which will be necessary if the combined action by the contingents of many nations is to be feasible and efficient.

And I foresee yet another difficulty: armed operations by the organisation will require merchant shipping for transport of troops and equipment. A nation which is preparing aggression will have been able to make plans far ahead for having the shipping it wants available; but with the other countries all merchant shipping will more or less be at sea carrying freight, and there may be very considerable delay before it is available. Those are some of the difficulties; they are formidable, and I foresee others.

Salter : I don't think the difficulties are as great as all that. If America, Great Britain and Russia decide, as members of the Security Council, to use military force against an aggressor, they will at the same moment have taken the decision to put their own forces into action in accordance with the general plan. They will not have to refer back or think again. And even if there should be some delay by the countries who are not members of the Council, the forces of those who *are* members will be powerful enough. It is true, too, that an aggressor can strike more quickly. That is one reason why we want regional defence associations. But what will really stop the aggressor will be the certain knowledge that even if he can win an initial success he will not be allowed to enjoy its fruits.

Montgomery : Sir Arthur, you have been defending the proposals pretty thoroughly throughout—have you no criticisms of your own?

Salter : Yes. I think there is one of some importance. The Security Council is to act 'when peace is threatened.' But supposing a great country bullies a small one, let us say a Germany bullies a Denmark. The difference in strength would be so great that perhaps peace would not be threatened because Denmark could not resist. The Council might therefore say "we can't act." This would mean that it would legitimise and even encourage the worst kind of appeasement. I don't think this is the intention, or, if the Atlantic Charter remains valid, that it would be the effect. But I think there should be some definite recognition of the right to justice of smaller countries. Perhaps the simplest method would be to include some part of the Atlantic Charter in the statutes of the new body.

Hambro : Or the United Nations' declaration that one of their peace aims should be to defend life, liberty and freedom of religion and to preserve human rights. In a nutshell, that is what nations have been fighting for.

Montgomery : Yes, and without something of that nature any world organisation would seem to be incomplete.

Now for one last question. The Dumbarton Oaks proposals are not supposed to be complete. What ideas have you about what should be added to them? One of course we have already mentioned—the need for regional agreements. What else is there?

Hambro : In my view, the thing that is chiefly lacking is this. The scheme is a way of preventing war more than a way of securing peace. To take only one example: I hope that the idea of supervising armaments will be taken a stage further than the armaments factory or the laboratory. Among the duties of the Economic and Social Council the supervision of education should not be forgotten. One of the first things the allied military administration had to do in Italy was to prepare new schoolbooks. For months the schools could not be opened because they could not use books that taught children that the enemies of God and mankind in Italy were the allied nations. The problem will be even more obvious in Germany. I do not mean supervision of schools, but of systems of education and such things as history textbooks. American teachers' organisations have recommended that there should be created an international institute of education for such, and other, purposes.

Montgomery : Yes. It might do us all good if we have an international committee of historians vetting our textbooks. The British and Americans, for example, would not then learn such fantastically different versions of the American War of Independence. Now, Lord Winster. Have you any final point?

Winster : Yes. Salter overlooks the fact that, having been chastened by six years of war, we are in a good mood now about these matters and ready to agree to much which will look different after a few years of peace. If

then any question arises of our armed forces being used in an international dispute there will inevitably be an opposition party, because there are still so many people not interested in countries about which they know little. What has been said here confirms the view that the new organisation is essentially one which depends upon three great powers controlling the world by imposing laws from which they themselves are largely exempt. Even this state of affairs depends upon the existing alliance between the three powers continuing. In the light of history this seems unlikely. As the war is forgotten, self-interest and nationalism will soon rear their ugly heads again. Dumbarton Oaks represents the best we can do at the moment and must, therefore, be supported, but Hambro is right: only a change of heart, not machinery, can bring peace. I hope that at San Francisco provision will be made for reviewing and revising the machinery after a period of years.

Salter: The real question is how we can secure a form of world government which will as effectively restrain criminal nations as national governments restrain individual criminals. San Francisco, we all agree, can only begin this task, and not complete it. We shall, all of us, in the years to come, have our part in helping to strengthen, and perhaps to modify, the new security organisation now being set up.

Hambro: I entirely agree. Whether we are more or less optimistic we have to admit that a new road has been opened. And it is all to the good that every nation sees the dangers along it. As Ibsen said: there is always a certain risk in being alive.

This Discussion is reproduced by kind permission of the contributors and with acknowledgments to the B.B.C.

Security has no future unless PUBLIC OPINION is behind all the efforts to ensure it. YOUR views are a part of public opinion. You can make them effective by

Joining the LEAGUE OF NATIONS UNION today
11, Maiden Lane, W.C.2

AN AIRMAN'S CHALLENGE

By the EARL OF LYTTON

FREEDOM FROM WAR. By Donald Bennett (Air Vice-Marshal). (Pilot Press, 45, Great Russell Street, W.C.1. 78 pp. 3s. 6d.)

In this issue of HEADWAY appear two statements purporting to define the objects of the war just successfully terminated in Europe. The late President Roosevelt, in the Jefferson memorial speech which he prepared just before his death, said "The work, my friends, is peace. More than an end of this war, an end to the beginnings of all wars. Yes, an end for ever, to this impractical, unrealistic settlement of the differences between Governments by the mass killing of peoples." Lord Cecil, on May 8th, said, "We shall have no secure peace until the mass of mankind realise the loathsomeness of war and are ready to take all steps to extirpate it."

Air Vice-Marshal Bennett in his little book, "Freedom from War," explains the surest way in which the object thus defined by these two Statesmen can be accomplished. So long as there are national armed forces there will remain a risk that

they will be used by ambitious statesmen, to attack their neighbours. The only sure way to prevent the recurrence of international wars is to abolish all national armaments and substitute as the guardian of the peace of the world one international armed force. This bold little book challenges the world to answer Lord Cecil's question, "Are you prepared to take all steps to extirpate war?"

The importance of the book is to be found in the fact that it is written by a young serving officer of high rank who has had experience of war—an air vice-marshal, the leader of the Pathfinders, with a remarkable war record of personal courage and brilliant achievement. No one can accuse the author of being a mere visionary without practical experience. So small a book naturally cannot cover the whole ground or explore all the difficulties of bringing about so radical a change in human custom and practice. There are many details to be filled in and some that will need correction. But the main theme stands out clear for all to answer. This thing can be done. Will you help to do it?

BUNA

As we go to press the Executive Committee, acting on the authority given by the General Council, has decided to set up forthwith a BRITISH UNITED NATIONS ASSOCIATION, in order "to ensure the whole-hearted support of the British People for a United Nations Organisation with such subsidiary agencies as may be found necessary

(a) for the just and peaceful settlement of international disputes and the use, if necessary, of collective force to prevent or suppress aggression;

(b) for promoting the moral and material welfare of all peoples and endeavouring to remove economic, political and social conditions which may lead to conflicts;

(c) for defending human rights and freedoms, developing, together with patriotism, a sense of the duties of World

Citizenship, and ultimately liberating mankind from war and the fear of war."

It is hoped that, in one way or another, arrangements may be made for all Branches and Members of the Union to become Branches and Members of BUNA. A detailed plan will be submitted to the General Council in July.

Should the name of the new international organisation now being formed at San Francisco be other than "The United Nations," reconsideration will be given to the title of the new Association.

POST-BAG

VE-Day, the San Francisco Conference and other factors have this month imposed a greater strain than ever upon HEADWAY'S limited space. Consequently it has not been possible to include the usual selection of letters from readers.

UP AND DOWN THE COUNTRY

Some magnificent work is recorded in the Annual Report of the WARWICKSHIRE AND BIRMINGHAM FEDERAL COUNCIL. Few areas, for example, could show a membership increase from 2,352 in 1941 to 3,442 in 1944. Many of the Branches, of course, have been active throughout the war, but at least three others have taken on a new lease of life during the past year.

Miss K. D. Courtney spoke on the Dumbarton Oaks proposals at the Annual Meeting of the GODALMING BRANCH, at which Brig.-Gen. Sir Osborne Mance presided. The Branch membership, it was reported, had in three years advanced from 196 to 251. Mrs. McKinnon Wood, the hon. secretary, concluded her report with the reminder that we have "to forget our tiredness and put everything we have into working for a real peace."

Miss Courtney's visit to the WEST WICKHAM BRANCH was "a definite step forward." Several fresh and also lapsed members were recruited.

Wretched weather did not prevent a good meeting of the STREATHAM BRANCH when Dr. Gilbert Murray spoke at the Liberal Jewish Synagogue on "The New League." Representatives of Anglican and Free Churches gave their support on the platform, and some new members were gained.

At the Annual Meeting of the HALLAM BRANCH, when Miss Nancy Stewart Parnell gave a talk on the San Francisco Conference, it was reported that, in 1944, 87 more subscriptions had been collected than in 1943—532 as against 445.

Membership doubled in the past year—that is the BINGLEY BRANCH'S achievement.

SHIPLEY AND COOLHAM BRANCH, which has just held its Annual Meeting, is one of the smallest in the Union. But all members are kept informed of events as they occur, in the belief that "even the small things count in the grand total."

A report on the first year's work of the revived DARTMOUTH AND KINGSWEAR BRANCH shows that a robust little membership has been mobilised and well catered for by meetings. Double membership is the immediate target.

Another revived Branch—CRICKLEWOOD

AND EAST WILLESDEN—has seen its membership grow from 15 to 56 in one year.

The Rev. James Reid, M.A., D.D., was the speaker at the Annual Meeting of the EASTBOURNE BRANCH. Good meetings and excellent Press publicity have helped to keep the Branch in the public eye. The present aim is for each of the 322 members to get in at least one recruit.

"On the victory trail" was the keynote of the Annual Meeting of the WISHAW BRANCH, when Ex-Provost Chambers looked forward to increased membership and Mr. Balmain asked for an infusion of younger blood.

BURY (LANCS.) BRANCH, which increased its membership by 36 last year, is unfortunately losing its secretary, Miss B. H. Roberts, who has taken up an appointment with UNRRA.

Addressing an audience of 400 at BOOTLE SECONDARY SCHOOL, Dr. Bryn Thomas got a rousing reception by speaking on "Three Men in a Boat" (Churchill, Roosevelt and Stalin), calling at Hot Springs (for food), Bretton Woods (for money), Dumbarton Oaks (for a chart) and San Francisco (for orders).

Mr. F. E. Pearson took an excellent Brains Trust team of five nationalities to STRATFORD ROAD BAPTIST CHURCH BRANCH. Following the Trust, the first Branch meeting since April, 1939, was held.

The CROUCH END Brains Trust attracted an audience of 220. Miss Freda White's appeal for members led to five enrolling on the spot and others promising to join.

Mr. Frank H. Harrod, Director of Education for Coventry, visited LEICESTER to talk to the local branch of the National Council of Women. At COVENTRY, he has recently addressed meetings of the Rotary Club, the N.C.W. branch and groups of the Guild of Citizens.

The VICTORIAN BRANCH OF THE AUSTRALIAN L.N.U. continues to produce excellent informative News Letters. The latest to reach us contains material on "What Shall We Do with Germany?" as well as recent statements by the British L.N.U. Executive.

SCOTLAND

The outstanding event of interest in Scotland during April has been the tour of Miss Courtney whose visits to Edinburgh, Dundee, St. Andrews and Comrie were most highly appreciated. She left behind her many new friends and a much encouraged membership. It is hoped that other members of the General Executive will visit Scottish Branches and continue the contacts so happily begun.

Miss Courtney was present also at the Annual Meetings of the Scottish National Council and the East of Scotland District Council, which she addressed. The following office-bearers were elected:—

Scottish National Council:

Honorary President: Dr. Barbour (Pitlochry).

President: Sir George Morton, K.C. (Edinburgh).

Vice-President: Dr. Nevile Davidson (Glasgow).

Honorary Treasurer: J. Walker, Esq. (Glasgow).

Honorary Secretary: C. G. Hawkins, Esq. (Edinburgh).

East of Scotland District Council:

President: Sir George Morton, K.C. (Edinburgh).

Honorary Treasurer: Miss G. M. Purdie (Edinburgh).

Honorary Secretary: Mr. C. G. Hawkins (Edinburgh).

Saltcoats: The first full meeting of the new Branch at Saltcoats took the form of a Brains Trust, led by Sir George Morton, and was most successful. There is every prospect of a strong and growing Branch in this area, and the courage of those who have commenced it should inspire some of our less energetic members to new effort. It is possible to begin a new, strong branch, for Scotland has done it.

The Congregational Union of Scotland at its Assembly meeting on May 1 passed a resolution, part of which is quoted below:—

"Backing should be given to those bodies of Christian opinion which seek to meet the immediate physical needs of the suffering

peoples of Europe and to encourage the establishing of conditions wherein freedom from want will be a reality for them. Christian Democracy based as it is on the supreme value of the individual, is an ideal of world importance at this time.

"We feel that a stable and ordered Peace can be developed only by the evolution of democratic states where a similar recognition is given to the sanctity of individual rights of worship, freedom of thought and opinion, without regard to race or creed—such states combining for mutual assistance and support.

"We urge that this is the vital contribution which our Union has to bring to the new order after the war, and that support should be renewed by our Churches to such societies as the League of Nations Union in study and preparation for this duty."

C. G. H.

SHEFFIELD

Miss Nancy Stewart Parnell was the speaker at three Annual Meetings in the Sheffield District in April—that is, of the **Sheffield, Hallam and Firth Park Branches**. She succeeded in conveying the issues at stake at the San Francisco Conference to the audiences, who showed so much interest that all the meetings continued for about two hours. New members were obtained, some of whom have already brought in others. Each Branch had collected a considerable number of new or lapsed subscriptions in the previous year.

The L.N.U. in the Sheffield district also organised a three-day C.E.W.C. Conference in April for the senior pupils of local secondary schools. In this they had the advantage of the whole-hearted co-operation of the local Y.W.C.A., who lent their attractive building, and, of course, the invaluable help of a number of schoolmasters and mistresses, who acted as group leaders, chairmen and so on. The attendance of 150 was maintained throughout the three days, though some students from outlying districts, which showed especial enthusiasm for the conference, were obliged to get up at 5 a.m. to attend. Eleven schools in this district now have C.E.W.C. societies and two others have formed Current Affairs groups as a result of the Conference. The interest of the students in lectures and discussions has also roused the interest of their parents.

G. M. W.

THE FUTURE OF THE UNION

By FRANK H. HARROD (Director of Education, Coventry)

1. The future of the League of Nations Union is wholly and entirely dependent upon the successful establishment of an effective world organisation for the maintenance of international peace and security.

2. Our members are, therefore, vitally interested in the results of the San Francisco Conference and their immediate duty is to spread individually and collectively the knowledge of the responsibilities and obligations that its successful conclusion will place upon the citizens of all "peace-loving" nations, with special emphasis on the particular implications on the peoples of the British Commonwealth of Nations.

3. **The Union stands at the supreme crisis of its history and now is the moment when the members must decide upon its future role and organisation.** The Special Committee of the Executive has given a fine lead in the publication of its interim report and the next General Council must put its seal on their efforts.

4. There are four questions of supreme importance to be decided:—

(a) *What part is the Union to play in the life of the Nation in the post-war period?*

(b) *How is it to enrol such a large membership that it will be strong enough to make its voice heard effectively in the councils of the nation?*

(c) *How is its membership to be organised on a broad democratic basis?*

(d) *How is an income adequate to the needs of its great work to be assured?*

5. The Role of the Union

This is admirably outlined in the Interim Report. Every member must be prepared to act with a missionary zeal determined that as far as in him lies he will work untiringly to ensure that every one of his acquaintance understands and is pledged to support the obligations incumbent on a member of a world organisation pledged to collective action against aggression and to social and economic world unity.

6. Membership

It is not enough that a member should merely pay an annual subscription and

then leave the work to others. Every member must be active, well informed and zealous, and branches must ensure that their members meet regularly and are given opportunities and obligations for service in furthering the aims of the Union. Service without sacrifice is of little value and, therefore, the minimum subscriptions should be sufficient to enable each member to receive regular periodical literature to keep him informed in international affairs and in the work the Union is doing. We ought to aim at a membership of millions, not hundreds of thousands.

7. Organisation

No national organisation can be strong unless its branches are well organised and active, have contact with neighbouring branches and have definite links with the national executive.

It was, therefore, encouraging that the Special General Council decided that Regional Councils on the basis of the Civil Defence Regions should be immediately organised.

To be effective, in my opinion, these Regional Councils must be composed of the elected representatives of each branch in the region and the Regional Council must send elected representatives to sit on the national executive or on a Headquarters Organisation or Administrative Committee.

Further, Regional Councils should meet quarterly to consider not only questions of policy but to receive reports from branches and from the regional representatives on Headquarters bodies.

Each Region should have a Regional Officer appointed and paid by Headquarters as a member of Headquarters Staff and a Regional Office financed by Headquarter funds. The Regional Officer should be the secretary of the Regional Council and be generally responsible to the National Executive for the effective and efficient organisation of his region and its branches.

8. Income

A great national organisation should be financed almost entirely by its members'

subscriptions and not be dependent on varying and uncertain donations.

I am, therefore, strongly of the opinion that the time has come to abolish the shilling subscription, which tends to place in the eyes of the member a low value on the organisation. What other great national organisation tries to exist on a subscription of less than a farthing a week! Moreover a shilling to-day has far less value than in 1918. I hold that the minimum subscription should be 2/6 but that the normal full subscription should be 5/-, with other rates at 10/- and 21/-. This would enable each member to be supplied with a News Sheet each month.

I am inclined to support a composite

family subscription based on one subscription of 2/6 and additional ones of 1/- for members of a family residing at the same address to which only one set of literature per month need be sent.

The Union is to launch a great campaign in June and to take to itself a new name and a new task. It will depend on the organisation of the new body whether it is able to play its proper part in the future. It will need strength, faith and courage to express unflinchingly its determination to uphold the rule of law in international relations and to condemn any attempt to compromise with its obligations for reasons of expediency or fear of consequences.

WORLD AFFAIRS IN PARLIAMENT

By OWEN RATTENBURY

The victory over Germany is a part of world affairs. The war that still persists with Japan is another. Amidst all the rejoicing over the first, one felt it was very wise of the Prime Minister to insist on the importance of the second. Even if there is no weapon that is likely to reach these islands from that far-off territory, the relief after our ordeal must not be allowed to make us forget that big issues are at stake in the East. Canada, New Zealand and Australia are too near to Japan for us to be indifferent about that. In the fighting we are still only just through Burma, with Malaya and Singapore, Hong Kong, and the East Indies—Dutch mainly—and French Indo-China still in Japanese hands. There is much to wipe out. One senses things from the gallery. One remembers the tremendous emotion when this territory was being taken—when Burma, Malaya, the Nicobars and the Andamans, Hong Kong and Singapore fell. And somehow that seems dead now.

But what a debt we owe to those Dominion troops who, even in the midst of the perils of their own country, came over to Africa and to this country and to Italy to fight for the homeland. Some members, I feel, have them specially in mind now.

The Royal Visit

We have had the rejoicing. We have

had the appropriate addresses of both Houses to their Majesties. We have had the State visit of their Majesties to the Royal Gallery to receive in person the appropriate addresses from the Lord Chancellor and the Speaker, and to give the appropriate reply. That has its world significance. As the King spoke of his allies, it was natural to reflect that they were both republics. Nothing in our democracy is more significant than the fact that it seems to be applicable in wartime alike to the very capitalistic republic of America and the very socialistic republic of Russia and to the limited monarchy of Britain. Perhaps the uniting link is the fact that all three systems are in being because in each case of the will of the people.

Our thoughts, too, have been on San Francisco. Mr. Eden was not in the House. Mr. Churchill was leading. Foreign affairs could come up, but the Prime Minister is far too loyal to the responsible Minister to usurp his place in his absence.

Jewish Refugees

There have been a few questions on Foreign Affairs. Mr. Churchill answered one on May 15. Mr. Hopkinson asked for the immediate repatriation of all Jewish refugees who had been victims of persecution in their country of origin. Mr. Churchill definitely said "No." Apart

from other considerations there were practical difficulties. It still remained the Government's desire that they should go back, but Europe was in a state of frightful confusion.

Mr. Silverman then suggested it would be a cruel procedure to take people who had lost everything—homes, relatives, children, all the things that made life decent and possible—and compel them against their will to go back to the scene of those crimes.

The Prime Minister: "I agree with that."

Mr. Locker Lampson: "It would be most unfair to send them back."

Mr. Silverman and Mr. Locker Lampson can always be trusted to speak of the distressed Jews with sympathy and understanding. Pursuing this question Mr. Locker Lampson, on May 16, asked for the Government's policy on repatriating Jewish refugees from Germany and in regard to Jews in Germany. Mr. George Hall replied that, with regard to the first part, it was too early to make a statement. With regard to the second it was their policy that all discrimination hitherto applied in Germany on grounds of race, religion or political belief should be abolished.

On the same day Sir Oliver Simmonds wanted to know the Government's policy with regard to conscientious objectors in the Allied Control Commission in occupied territory. Mr. Hall said it was not their intention to employ persons registered as conscientious objectors on this job. Sir Oliver wanted to get it made mandatory that no conscientious objector would be engaged for the purpose by any department. Mr. Hall replied that his answer covered all persons who will be so employed. One cannot think it likely that any conscientious objector would apply for such a position. Relief work is a different matter.

Russia's Silence

The Soviet sentence of one year on a Scottish sailor who was drunk and disorderly was criticised in a question. The answer to the effect that no reply could be got from the Soviet seemed more disquieting than their treatment of a violent

drunkard. In fact, one felt that members mentally linked it with Mr. Eden's difficulty in getting a reply concerning the Polish prisoners who, all the while, were under arrest for sabotage of the Russian war effort. Why should the Russians withhold such information?

The question about Archbishop Damascino's visit to the Dodecanese reminded members that possibly there were reservations in our communications with Russia on the Greek events—though it is likely that we were never asked any questions on the matter by the Russian Government. Mr. Hall, in effect, said that this visit to Rhodes was a sort of pastoral call which in no way affected the future status of the island. He knew nothing of any flag planting there.

Syria and Lebanon

One topical question came from Sir Edward Spears on the Lebanon and Syria. Sir Edward, since his return to Parliament from his duties in the Levant, is insistent on putting the point of view of these two former French mandated territories who have been made into independent States. He asked about a French man-of-war which had landed a battalion of Senegalese troops at Beirut, and had taken off French troops, while another ship was expected with more troops—Frenchmen this time. The Syrian and Lebanese Governments had made representations to H.M. Government about this and also to the French Government, said Mr. Hall. He understood that direct discussions were now going on with the French Delegate-General at Beirut. He had no exact information as to the number of troops and whether those taken away equalled those brought in. Commander Agnew wanted to know whether H.M. Government proposed to reply, and, if so, would they recognise the fact that Britain was one of the guarantee Powers for Syrian and Lebanese independence. Mr. Hall said they must wait the text of the communication so that they might know what it was. They would, however, consider it sympathetically.

BOOKS OF THE MONTH

MAKING PEACE. By Quintin Hogg. (S.C.M. Press, Bloomsbury Street, W.C.1. 96 pp. 2s. 6d.)

Writing in the S.C.M. series, "The Christian Looks at the World," Mr. Quintin Hogg, M.P., looks at the future of the world of nations against its historical background. Revolutionary political and economic changes have been brought by the machine, but the machine in itself is neither good nor bad. The author makes out a strong case against pacifism. It is simply not true that wickedness can always be restrained by non-violence and, if not true, it is immoral to teach it. All the more pity, then that the reference on p. 57 to "enthusiasts on bicycles peddling the Peace Ballot" appears to confuse this National Declaration with "the vicious circle of pacifism." It was just because some were not "content to watch blindly while the Axis grew" that the *collective security* Ballot tried to recall at least this nation to realities. Mr. Hogg does not regard Federation as an immediately practicable solution—the necessary sentiment, he wisely points out, cannot be engendered artificially. The Threefold Alliance seems to him the only possible nucleus of the International Authority of to-morrow. Perhaps because his book was written before Dumbarton Oaks, the picture that he gives of the new organisation is vague and incomplete, except for the suggestion that it should be the embodiment and continuance of all that was valuable in the work of the League.

REBUILDING EUROPE. By C. de B. Murray. (Grafton and Co., 12, Old Bailey, E.C.4. 172 pp. 7s. 6d.)

A shop window is not always a safe guide to the goods on sale within. This book, by its chapter headings, arouses expectations of a valuable contribution to the study of post-war problems. Alas, the author's obvious sincerity fails to redeem his muddled thinking, his erratic judgments on men, nations and events, and his tendency towards that peculiar form of colour blindness that sees in vivid extremes of black and white. His summing up of democracy in various countries is queer and not always consistent. Why, for instance, his prejudice against Czechoslovakia? In this, as in other matters, he

seems unconsciously to have absorbed the propaganda put out by Dr. Goebbels. His sneaking regard for the German educational system as second to none overlooks the fact that efficiency is not a virtue if it is dangerously misdirected. Certainly it will take more than the "generous idealism" of another Neville Chamberlain to bring Germany back into the fold. A substantial section of his book—according to Mr. Murray—was based on *A Great Experiment*. Seldom can Lord Cecil's classic have been read with so little understanding. Ignorance of the League's work in the past is matched only by obliviousness of its significance in the efforts which even now are being made to create a stronger organisation. The author's own proposals concentrate on economic justice and executive machinery to review existing treaties. Excellent as are these aims, are they enough to make the world safe from aggression?

WHAT IS A NATION? By Harold Stannard. (Royal Institute of International Affairs, St. James's Square, S.W.1. 58 pp. 1s.)

Greek thought, Roman practice, feudal sentiment, the Reformation and the Renaissance, all helped to bring about the development of the modern "nation." These factors, together with the influence of Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau on the conception of a contract between communities, are discussed by Mr. Stannard. There is something suicidal, he shows, about nationalism in its latest phase. Thus, although it is far and away the most powerful social impulse, it is almost universally discredited as the ultimate form of social organisation. Is it possible to get the necessary balance between liberty and order? The author leaves a number of question marks. Whether or not nations may become units of merely cultural significance is largely a problem for the younger generation to decide.

BY WHAT AUTHORITY? By Hugh J. Schonfield. (Herbert Joseph, 5, The Riding, N.W.11. 175 pp. 6s.)

Perhaps the most valuable thing that Mr. Schonfield does is to show the importance of meeting nationalism on its own ground. It is an over-simplification for

citizens of the United States or the British Commonwealth to think of the world system as an expansion of their own. Collective security—for which the United Nations' conception is a "hard-headed makeshift"—is the most realistic policy. The author is attracted to Functional Federalism, anticipated in much of the machinery of the League and in various United Nations bodies. Chiefly, however, his book is a call for the clarification of religious thought on world problems. He is concerned about the lack of morality in international affairs. World citizenship is an excellent ideal, but at present there is too much loose talk about it. He would like to see the mobilisation of spiritual forces in a Service-Nation.

PEOPLE, PARLIAMENT AND KING. By Hebe Spaul. (Lutterworth Press, Redhill. 79 pp. 1s. 6d.)

Miss Spaul is well known as the author of a number of books for children on the League of Nations and international affairs. Here she devotes her powers of simple explanation to describing the workings of political democracy in Britain. As learning to be a good citizen of one's country is the first step towards becoming a good citizen of the world, this guide deserves a wide reading public among young people; their elders, too, might learn a great deal from it.

BRETTON WOODS. By R. P. Schwarz. (Obtainable from L.N.U. Bookshop, price 9d.)

This reprint of an article from *The Fortnightly* puts forward with clarity and marked ability cogent reasons why the provisional proposals at Bretton Woods for an International Monetary Fund should not be accepted by the British Govern-

ment. In his view they would place us overwhelmingly at the mercy of American Finance and an economic system still addicted to *laissez faire* and allergic to the high degree of planning necessary for national and international reconstruction after the war. The dice, he argues, are definitely loaded on the creditor's side, and even the fund available under such conditions would be quite inadequate for the debtor. Without a reorientation of American policy, Mr. Schwarz is convinced, the Bretton Woods proposals would inevitably weaken debtor countries. And while the other plan for an International Bank is sounder and more workable, it cannot mitigate the defects of the Fund proposals.

It is only fair to say that other experts take a more favourable view than Mr. Schwarz, and to some extent have an advantage, since they insist on the necessity for co-operation between the countries concerned and at least produce a plan.

FROM THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION TO YALTA. By Pat Sloan. (Russia To-day Society, 150 Southampton Row, W.C.1. 24 pp. 6d.)

Mr. Pat Sloan's review of Soviet foreign policy has one main object—to demonstrate that, although disagreements between the United Nations may arise, these can and must be resolved in amicable fashion. In particular, the mischievous voices that mutter, "After Germany is finished, will Russia have a go at us?" should have been silenced by Teheran, D-Day and Yalta. He shows exactly why peace is, and will be, the supreme interest of the Soviet Union, who will consequently be eager to help in building up such a combination of peace-loving States that war is made impossible.

MAIN CONTENTS

	PAGE
First Thoughts After Victory. By Viscount Cecil - - - -	1
"The Work, My Friends, Is Peace." By Franklin D. Roosevelt -	3
Editorial: The San Francisco Charter - - - - -	4
Public Opinion and the Charter. By Philip Noel-Baker, M.P. -	6
Dr. Johnson on the League of Nations. By W. A. Payne - - -	8
An Airman's Challenge. By the Earl of Lytton - - - - -	9
Up and Down the Country - - - - -	10
The Future of the Union. By Frank H. Harrod - - - - -	12
World Affairs in Parliament. By Owen Rattenbury - - - - -	13