

29 JUL 1942

S 1083

HEADWAY

IN WAR-TIME

The Journal of the League of Nations Union

No. 34

JULY 1942

PRICE 3d

ANTI-LEAGUE OF NATIONS UNION PROPAGANDA

In view of the attempts being made to throw upon the League of Nations Union responsibility for the unpreparedness of this country for war, the Council desires emphatically to repudiate that charge and to point out that the L.N.U.—

1. Has never advocated the reduction or limitation of the armaments of this country except as part of a general treaty for international disarmament by all countries.
2. Has constantly urged that peace can only be secured through the prevention of aggression by the joint action of the peace-loving nations using force for that purpose, if necessary.
3. Energetically protested, through its President, against the slogan "We have kept you out of war," as setting up a false and misleading principle of Foreign Policy.

THE L.N.U. GENERAL COUNCIL

Once more in the now familiar Conway Hall the General Council of the League of Nations Union met on June 19, 20, and 21. Although there are few "high-spots" to be recorded, this 23rd Annual Meeting reached the highest level of our war-time meetings. Smooth-running discussions and the quiet earnestness and determination of speakers—these, perhaps, stood out as the general characteristics. Two welcome features were the representation of a number of Branches which had not been in evidence since the outbreak of war, and the useful contributions in debate made by some of the newcomers. On the other hand, there was no evidence that the experiment of meeting over the week-end resulted in a larger (or even a different) attendance than usual throughout the whole time. The numbers present at the respective sessions were as follows:—Friday afternoon, 150; Friday evening, 126; Saturday morning, 123; Saturday afternoon, 116; Sunday, 91.

Lord Cecil's Speech

LORD CECIL, in his Presidential address, said that the Council was meeting at a moment when the war situation could not be regarded as altogether satisfactory. Victory, he was as confident as ever, would be for the United Nations, but it would not be earned without considerable effort and losses. Nevertheless, with every month that passed, our opponents were becoming less and less united, while we were becoming more and more united. Loud applause greeted Lord Cecil's statement that the Anglo-Soviet Treaty was by far the most important of recent acts. This agreement for the conduct of the war and also for collaboration and co-operation during the peace had been warmly approved by the Government of the United States and other countries (including neutrals) throughout the world. In the United States, Mr. Sumner Welles, had been publicly expressing views on post-war settlement very similar to those of the L.N.U., and therefore (added Lord Cecil with a twinkle) "obviously right."*

There was now, he continued, general agreement that, in order to preserve peace in future, there must be international collaboration operating through some form of collective security. Secondly, economic changes must be made internationally as well as nationally, otherwise they were bound to be ineffective. Further, international disarmament was essential to the permanence of peace. He did not intend to develop any of these propositions beyond saying that you must have international organisation, and it must be done by as many nations as you could get to co-operate loyally and honestly. The insistence on the proposition that the smaller nations must be protected in their independence seemed to point to some organisation very much along the lines of the League of Nations. It would be best to take the League, make such alterations as might be found necessary in the light of experience, and proceed from that point.

Dealing with the immediate, troublesome job of restoration, Lord Cecil appealed for all generosity and moderation from the more fortunate countries like our own towards the less fortunate, particularly those nations which had only preserved their life by "organised disorder." The feeding of starving millions would be a tremendous task, despite the extensive preparations which were being made by Governments. Punishment of war criminals was most essential—it would be a disaster if the men who had been guilty of horrible crimes were allowed to escape.

With all these matters the first requisite was a sound, vigorous public opinion. "We in the L.N.U.," concluded Lord Cecil, "must rejoice at the increasing admission that our policy was right." In the House of Lords debate (see p. 12), nobody doubted that some form of League was essential after the war. The L.N.U. was planning to hold a big conference in the autumn to bring our ideas before as large a public as possible, and he urged all Branches and members to support it and make it a success. Collective security, economic progress, and international disarmament could be accom-

plished only by some organisation based on the three principles of Freedom, Truth and Justice.

Lord Cecil then asked leave to move an urgency motion, expressing the Union's gratitude for the Anglo-Soviet Agreement. It was carried enthusiastically. The text of this and other resolutions adopted by the Council will be found on p. 7 of this issue.

The Union Defends Itself

None of the business revealed the Council in more virile mood than the debate on "Anti-League of Nations Union Propaganda." LORD CECIL, leaving the chair to move the Executive's motion, referred to the charge that the Union had advocated unilateral disarmament, and was therefore responsible for this country's unpreparedness for war. This accusation was entirely baseless. We had always said that it was the duty of all members of the League to combine to resist aggression, and that, in the last resort, force might have to be used to keep the peace. At the time of the Peace Ballot, a favourite charge had been that it was a "Ballot of Blood." None of the questions in it could be twisted into advocacy of unilateral disarmament. Certain sections of public men, on the other hand, had justified an alternative policy by claiming, "We have kept you out of war." This pernicious slogan was tantamount to telling would-be aggressors, "You needn't be afraid of us. We are going to keep out of war whatever happens."

MR. J. R. LESLIE, M.P., seconding, reminded the Council that the L.N.U. had not only supported, but had wanted to strengthen the Covenant. We had never been a pacifist organisation. Those who blamed us suffered from a guilty conscience.

A wish expressed by MR. REEVE (Cromer) that the Union should be more "pugnacious" in this matter was echoed by other speakers. Branches were strongly urged to get something into their local papers and to write to their M.P.s. The Council considered the resolution of such importance that it is printed on the front page of this *Headway*.

War Criminals

The punishment of war criminals was another matter on which there was over-

whelming general agreement. MR. NOWELL SMITH introduced the Executive's resolution, which was seconded by ALDERMAN BEEVERS (Montague Burton Branch, Leeds). In answer to SIR GEORGE YOUNG, who thought that it would not be easy to arrange for the trials, MR. H. L. BULLOCK (T.U.C. General Council) pointed out that the difficulties were the very reason why the L.N.U. should pass this resolution. The chief argument against, advanced by MR. GUNDRY, was that this was not the business of the Union. MR. H. S. SYRETT stressed that the object of the resolution was not to advocate any policy of hatred or vengeance but to uphold the spirit of justice and respect for international law which had been outraged as never before. Lord Cecil added that, unless you could promise just retribution, there would be wholesale massacre; and the resolution was passed with only three dissentients.

Social and Economic Reconstruction

Social and economic reconstruction threatened to run away with the whole of a morning session, so great was the interest and earnestness of the Council members in this subject. MR. J. MACDONALD, in moving the Executive resolution, admirably summarised the statements of the Minister of Production, the Lord Privy Seal and the Foreign Secretary, and went on to assess how far the Government had attempted to carry out the policy outlined by these Ministers. There were the Atlantic Charter, Mr. Attlee's attendance at the International Labour Conference in New York, and the Anglo-Soviet Agreement. As the conduct of the war must be the most consuming preoccupation for the Government, he did not think that it would be wise to stipulate particulars and time in our resolution. That on the agenda was sufficiently comprehensive to meet the existing situation.

In the debate which followed, nobody quarrelled with what was in the resolution, but some wished to add more. An Edinburgh addendum, proposed by MISS MARY TWEEDIE, asked for the promotion of appropriate legislation now which would ensure better conditions for the depressed classes, but MR. BEHRENS and MISS COURTNEY pointed out that, with the exception of

* See page 14.

the word "now," it rather took away from the resolution. MR. NEIL McMILLAN (Paisley) deprecated the mistrust of certain speakers, and asked them to place themselves in the shoes of those who would have to carry out the policy. Another amendment, asking for the aims set out to be implemented by direct action now was proposed by MRS. E. M. WHITE on behalf of MR. H. H. ELVIN. It was lost, and the Executive resolution was then carried with the addition of the word "now."

Education

After the adoption of the Report of the Council for Education in World Citizenship, presented by MR. NOWELL SMITH, DR. MAXWELL GARNETT introduced his motion proposing the creation of an International Education Organisation. Such an interesting discussion developed that part of the debate had to be deferred until the concluding session.

Union Policy

Union policy, already discussed exhaustively at successive Council meetings, came in for comparatively little discussion this time. A proposal from Hull to the effect that the Statement of Policy should be rescinded and the Union go all out for the abolition of national sovereignty received scanty support. Similarly with a resolution from Beddington, Carshalton and Wallington in favour, among other things, of a "working arrangement" between the L.N.U. and Federal Union MRS. LAURENCE CADBURY (Warwickshire and Birmingham Federal Council) proposed an addition to "World Settlement after the War," which was accepted.

The Northamptonshire Federal Council's motion that the Executive should consider changing the name of the Union was overwhelmingly defeated. Strong feeling was expressed that, when the League was reconstituted or some new International Authority set up, then would be the time to make the name of the Union conform to that of the International Authority.

LORD LYTON, as Chairman of the Executive, reported on the action taken in respect of the resolutions adopted at the last Council meeting, and presented the

Annual Report. Stressing the importance of the conference which the Executive was planning for the autumn, he said that they on the Executive had derived so much benefit from the London International Assembly that they wished a larger circle of Union members to share that benefit. The Council showed special interest in Lord Lytton's account of the consultations which he had had with League experts on the technical aspects of the international force, and the representation of peoples rather than Governments on the International Authority. These questions were difficult and complicated; but he hoped to be able to make a fuller report in the future.

Lord Lytton informed the Council that advance copies of a new pamphlet on the Atlantic Charter could be obtained from the bookstall. The demand proved greater than the supply; but Head Office can now take orders for this pamphlet. Lord Lytton also mentioned the Report on "The Minorities Problem," which was subsequently approved for study by Branches and members.

Finance and Membership

MR. H. S. SYRETT, the Union's Treasurer, confessed to mixed feelings when he presented the Accounts for 1941. He hardly knew whether to be pessimistic or optimistic because, he said, "for the first time, at all events during my period of office, we are solvent." There was a small balance at the bank—not an overdraft. In 1938 when, he said, the Union was living beyond its means, there had been an overdraft of some £14,000. The present state of things was the result of serious economies and war-time efforts to cut one's coat according to the cloth.

Although, on the surface, the position seemed good, the reduction in the number of membership subscriptions collected was a most disquieting feature. He appealed to branches and members to tackle the problem seriously. Membership was the life-blood of the Union, "it is on membership that we depend for the support we require, not only financial, but political and in every other way." Had but the Union a membership of half-a-million, it would be in a far better position to impress its ideas on people. Income from donations, too, was less, deeds

obtained a few years before the war were running out, the Union had, as it were, been living partly on its capital. The day of big donations was past, it was the small subscriber on whom the Union must now rely, and it was more democratic. He wanted to see more 1s. members become 3s. 6d. members and more to become £1 members. He wanted, too, those who gave £1—or £50 or £100—a year to do so under Deed, thereby doubling, or at any rate greatly increasing, the amount the Union would actually receive.

Collective subscriptions from churches, clubs, workers', women's and other organisations, which had fallen off tremendously in the early part of the war had, he was glad to say, begun to increase.

Mr. Syrett's anxiety about membership was reflected in the discussion on the balance sheet, and later at the Conference of Branch Secretaries and other Workers which met under the chairmanship of MR. A. J. HOWE (London). Speaker after speaker stressed that, as PROFESSOR BRODETSKY (Leeds) put it, whenever real effort is put in to get members, it is always successful. In the experience of MR. E. PRIOR (Essex), when people were definitely asked for their subscriptions, in 99 cases out of 100 they would pay. MR. A. T. GRINDLEY (Aberystwyth) told how fifty letters personally delivered to newcomers had produced twenty-five new members. MR. C. HAUSER cited the extraordinary response which the Welwyn Garden City Branch had secured from a notice in the local paper. In fact, said MR. E. J. DENNIS (Hull), in this matter of membership, energy and enthusiasm were more important to the Union than the formal words of policy.

The Council re-elected the Rt. Hon. Winston Churchill Hon. President, Lord Cecil and Dr. Gilbert Murray Joint Presidents, the Vice-Presidents with the addition of the Moderator of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, Lord Lytton Chairman of the Executive, and Mr. H. S. Syrett Hon. Treasurer. The Executive Committee for 1942-43 and the Co-opted Members of the Council were also appointed; and the Annual Report and the Accounts for 1941 were adopted.

Views of Our Allies

Perhaps the most notable session of the

Council—an evening meeting at which distinguished members of the London International Assembly gave their views on "Some Post-War Problems"—has been left until the last. Already Professor Rene Cassin (Free France) had answered to the Roll Call, and a message of good wishes to the Council had been received from the Union's sister society in Sweden. Now representatives of our Allies filled the platform. DR. GILBERT MURRAY, who presided, said that they had come "so that when you hear their names in future you will know what they look like."

* First DR. ALEX. KUNOSI (Czechoslovakia) described how, in the London International Assembly, the Allies, meeting as individuals and in private, could freely discuss the setting up of a better world organisation. Continental democracy was now in exile, but it was planning to build a future in which exile would be impossible.

SENATOR DE BROUCKERE, "doing his best" (but an excellent best) in a strange language, said that everyone was now belatedly converted to the idea of collective security. The way to win the war was to show the people a definite aim of what we wanted to destroy and what we wanted to build.

There were no soothing words from COUNT BALINSKI (Poland). In his grim outline of Europe's needs after the war, he foretold a hard time ahead: "It will not be a peace which we shall enjoy." Britain's stand against Hitler had gained her tremendous prestige abroad, and everything depended upon her using this prestige in the right way.

MR. S. K. CHOW (China) showed that the problem of dealing with Japan in the East was similar to that of Germany in Europe. China was ready to play her part in tackling post-war problems. She looked forward to the establishment of some sort of an international authority and to a new economic order.

DR. S. N. GHOSE, a former member of the League Secretariat, strongly urged that India and Asia should be taken into consideration in post-war economic planning.

Free France was represented by MME. ROBERTS, who had recently got away from France after helping prisoners to escape. She painted a graphic picture of the appalling conditions in her country. Over here French people were being trained to

do welfare work in France as soon as Hitler had been driven out.

From DR. W. KEILHAU, Attorney-General to the Norwegian Forces, came a poignant reminder that the people who were going through unspeakable sufferings in the occupied countries would be entitled to have a say with us in post-war settlement. He pleaded for harmony between the political and economic organisations of the new world.

GENERAL DE BAER, President of the Military Court of the Belgian Army in Great Britain, gave a most able and lucid survey of the problem of punishing war criminals. Many of his audience must have been surprised to learn how much preparatory work was already being done over here—including that of the London International Assembly. It was essential, said the General, that these expert studies should begin now. The necessary provisions should be included in the *conditions of armistice*—and not left over until the Peace Treaty. The best treaty would be no good unless its conditions were drastically enforced. Machinery must be created in advance so that it could begin working as soon as the war was over.

DR. AMBROSOVA (Czechoslovakia) looked at the post-war world through the eyes of youth. After the tragic killing of spirit, they must be shown that Western Civilisation had some hope for them and that there was a way of living side by side in future. In a tribute to Dr. Murray, she spoke of "the divine sparkle of faith" which years ago he had given to students of many nationalities gathered in Geneva.

DR. J. M. DE MOOR, now President of the Dutch Court in Great Britain, outlined a flexible and dynamic international com-

ADMINISTRATION OF LABOUR. By F. Klang, V. Oustrata and A. Kunosi. (Allen and Unwin, 3s. 6d.) An essay on problems of social economy by three Czechoslovak students of public affairs. Under the new order of the future, Labour must be recognised as the main subject of administration. Recognising the close mutual relationship of production and consumption, we must advance beyond the Social Protective State. The international scale of the new administration is stressed.

munity of the future, based on legal institutions with a military organisation to back them up. "All of us," he said, "must devote our best abilities to the development of collective security."

Finally came MRS. SARGANT FLORENCE, "the last aeroplane in a high-powered fleet," to tell the audience what Americans were thinking and feeling about post-war reconstruction. Opinion in America had "moved a thousand miles in a minute." Thirty or forty organisations connected with Government Departments were engaged on planning, and the unofficial spadework which was going on was "positively staggering." Although the isolationists had not completely disappeared, they were not going to be the majority: "The majority are going to want to join in world organisation."

Expressing the debt of gratitude to the speakers which all present felt, MISS K. D. COURTNEY spoke of "a curtain being raised" by them. One corner, lifted, had shown the sufferings in occupied countries—another corner the hope in which we look to the future.

LESLIE R. ALDOUS.

THINGS TO NOTE

THE CHINA CAMPAIGN COMMITTEE (34, Victoria Street, S.W.1) is organising a mass demonstration on July 5 in Trafalgar Square to "strengthen our alliance with the Chinese people."

THE CZECHOSLOVAK-BRITISH FRIENDSHIP CLUB (19, Pembroke Villas, W.11) is holding a Rally and Garden Party in Kenwood on Sunday, July 12. There will be an attractive programme, and the gardens will be open from 11 a.m. onwards.

NEW TIMES AND ETHIOPIA NEWS (3, Charteris Road, Woodford Green) is arranging a conference on "Ethiopia" on Thursday, July 23, at Cowdray Hall, from 3 p.m. to 5.30 p.m. and from 6.30 p.m. to 9 p.m.

URGENTLY NEEDED.—Offers of hospitality or lodgings in non-protected areas for employed foreign refugees in need of rest or holiday. Replies, in first instance, to the Secretary, Regional Refugee Council, 27, New Inn Hall Street, Oxford.

GENERAL COUNCIL DECISIONS

Anglo-Russian Treaty

"The General Council congratulates H.M. Government on the conclusion of the Treaty with the Soviet Union, and regards this momentous alliance as of immense importance for the future peace of the world."

World Settlement After the War

The following was inserted in Clause 27 (line 5) of "World Settlement after the War," after the words "International Authority":—"such supervision to include close examination of existing stocks of raw materials (including oil) and machinery essential for building up a war economy. Failure to satisfy the International Authority in these respects should render the country concerned liable to the imposition of restrictive measures."

Minorities

The report on the Minorities Problem by the Executive was approved for study by Branches and Members, and will be brought before the General Council for further discussion at the next meeting in December, 1942.

War Criminals

"The General Council of the League of Nations Union, sharing with all humane persons their detestation of the cruelties practised by Germans, Japanese, Italians and others at the instigation and with the connivance of their leaders; and remembering the declared objects for which we are waging war; approve all practicable measures for the early apprehension, trial and punishment of the authors of such cruelties, with the object of preventing their future commission and avoiding acts of indiscriminate vengeance by the compatriots of the victims; and at the same time earnestly deprecates all utterances tending to inflame the spirit of mere vengeance and of racial or national hatred."

Representation on the General Council

To meet the war-time position of Union

membership and to avoid the disenfranchisement of some Branches under Rule 10 of the By-Laws and Rules of the Union, the Council decided that for the time being: "Each Branch shall have the right to elect to the General Council one representative if its total paid-up membership exceeds 50 but does not exceed 250; two representatives if its paid-up membership exceeds 250 but does not exceed 500; three representatives if paid-up membership exceeds 500 but does not exceed 1,000; and four if it is over 1,000."

Education in World Citizenship

(a) The Report on the work of the Council for Education in World Citizenship was approved.

(b) "The General Council of the League of Nations Union considers that the international authority which will be needed after the war should have as one of its organs an International Education Organisation representative of Governments, of public education authorities and governing bodies, and of teachers."

Social and Economic Reconstruction

"The General Council of the League of Nations Union, having heard with interest and approval the statements made by the Minister of Production on April 26th, the Lord Privy Seal on May 3rd, and the Foreign Secretary on May 8th, all of whom emphasised the necessity of planning ahead to prevent unemployment in the post-war world, urges H.M. Government to take effective steps now to realise these aims both in the economic and social field at home and in our international relations."

BOOK REVIEWS

Owing to great pressure upon our space in this issue, *Headway's* reviews of new books are unavoidably held over. The book notices next month will include a survey of the *Report on the Work of the League of Nations, 1941-42* (Allen and Unwin, 2s., obtainable from the Union's Book Shop).

ATLANTIC CHARTER

"A SYSTEM OF GENERAL SECURITY"

By W. ARNOLD-FORSTER

In two previous articles I have dealt, first with the three Points of the Charter that concern political liberation, and then with the two Economic Points. There remain three Points, all concerned in one way or another with Security.

Point VI says: "After the final destruction of Nazi tyranny, they hope to see established a peace which will afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries, and which will afford assurance that all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want."

Clearly, the tyranny of Hitler's "New Order" must be destroyed, and with it kindred tyrannies in Italy and Japan. Without that victory, there can be no order compatible with peace and freedom, such as the Atlantic Charter looks to. But of course it is not enough to destroy one selfish domination; we are challenged to build in its place a real Commonwealth. And we should be dopping ourselves if we pretended that the defeat of Nazi Germany will mean a "final" defeat of all that makes for tyranny. The guard against tyranny can never be relaxed; and the task of conceiving and nurturing new standards of liberty and equality is an unending challenge. When Lincoln called for "a new birth of freedom," he was thinking of standards that could be commended to a nineteenth-century America, a land whose foreign policy could still be isolationist, and whose social ethic was compatible with the most ruthless individualism and the most ruthless Capitalism if not with actual slavery. But when Roosevelt, Sumner Welles, Perkins and Winant contemplate a coming "century of the common man," they have in mind standards of freedom, especially economic

freedom, very different from those with which the peacemakers of the Civil War, or the First World War, could be content.

In aiming at a certain assurance of security, Point VI emphasises that this security must be *general*; it is to be open to *all nations*, and to "all the men in all the lands"—provided always, of course, that they accept the obligations as well as the benefits of the peace-keeping community.

Point VI emphasises, also, that this security must include protection not only against aggression but also against poverty and social injustice. Like any other such slogan, "Freedom from fear and want" may easily be derided; and the aim which it summarises is infinite. But it is a necessary part of peace-building, a part much too little regarded by the peace-makers of 1919. (In remedying that error after this war, let us not fall into the converse error of supposing that, if we take pains over the foundations of economic peace, the political foundations can safely be left to take care of themselves.)

Lastly, Point VI, read together with the rest of the Charter, implies a kind of security which can only be achieved and maintained by the *collective* action of peoples who are held together by sufficient community of purpose, and whose pooled power is adequate to prevent or overcome any challenging violence. With the experience of the L.N.U. behind us, let us not lightly assume that that indispensable community of purpose will be sufficiently widespread and sustained. It is not easy to hold, with full comprehension, to that knowledge for which Roosevelt prayed on United Nations day: "We are all of us children of the earth;

grant us that simple knowledge." But at least we may now be thankful that, after a decade during which the doctrine of collective security was shortsightedly repudiated, that doctrine is now being revindicated, though at bitter cost. To find a superb expression of the collective security doctrine, you have only to look back to the messages of Roosevelt, Churchill and Smuts on United Nations Day, June 14, 1942. To find a summary definition of what should be the collective aim, look at the Anglo-American Agreement of February 23, 1942 (the Master Lend-Lease Agreement to which certain other "like-minded" nations have since subscribed), which calls for "a just and enduring world peace, securing order under law to themselves and all nations."

Point VII: "Such a peace should enable all men to traverse the high seas and oceans without hindrance."

This point has been discounted by some critics as being merely an empty phrase, put in as a concession to American sentiment about "Freedom of the Seas." I think it means something substantial. The Point does not say that all men, unconditionally, shall be free to use the seas: it says that the "peace should enable" them to do so; the peace in question being that "system of general security" which is referred to in Point VIII. Those who keep this peace will be protected by it; those who break the peace will be denied "freedom of the seas."

Of course, this project of a collectively protected freedom of the seas can only be realised if there is a powerful and widely representative international authority. And the freedom will not be real if it is limited merely to freedom from arbitrary interference by warships; the security must extend to aircraft; and it must cover not only blockade on the high seas but also boycott on land. As the L.N.U. points out in its new pamphlet on the Charter, Points IV, VI,

VII, and VIII are "all parts of a single policy, the object of which is to prevent the lawless use of national power."

Point VIII: "They believe that all the nations of the world, for realistic as well as spiritual reasons, must come to the abandonment of the use of force. Since no future peace can be maintained if land, sea or air armaments continue to be employed by nations which threaten, or may threaten, aggression outside of their frontiers, they believe, pending the establishment of a wider and permanent system of general security, that the disarmament of such nations is essential. They will likewise aid and encourage all other practical measures which will lighten for peace-loving peoples the crushing burden of armaments."

Point VIII (like the recent Anglo-Soviet Alliance) is based on the assumption that, after the initial Peace Treaty, there will have to be a period of transition and convalescence, during which the disarmament of the defeated aggressors will remain one-sided, and the preponderant power necessary for the "general security" against aggression and disorder will have to be retained by the victors. American spokesmen have lately emphasised that, in their view, the U.S.A. will have to shoulder, this time, its full share of this responsibility.

I hope it will soon be made clear by some official declaration that this holding of power will be a trust, exercised temporarily and on behalf of the organised Commonwealth of Nations. I am glad that Mr. Eden was quick to explain, after the Charter was published, that the purpose was to ensure that "no nation" (Germany or any other) "must ever be in a position to wage aggressive war against her neighbours."

Point VIII also indicates, in the most general terms, the need for a second stage, in which there will be "a wider

(Continued on page 10)

UP AND DOWN THE COUNTRY

Special attention is drawn to the Conference on "Our Part in To-morrow's Peace" which the LONDON REGIONAL FEDERATION is organising in the Swedenborg Hall, Bloomsbury Way, W.C.1, on Wednesday, July 8. Lord Cecil will speak at 6 p.m., after which there will be questions and general discussion. It is hoped that representatives of other countries will be present on this occasion.

The best meeting in the history of the ROMFORD BRANCH resulted when Dr. Vaclav Benes spoke, supported by Mr. John Parker, M.P., and the Mayor of Romford. The local newspaper commented on the "concrete ideas" for post-war settlement expressed by the speakers. Ten of the audience enrolled as members of the Union, and a number put their names down for a discussion group.

KESWICK Masonic Hall was filled to overflowing for the visit of Commander Stephen King-Hall, M.P., arranged by the local Branch. The President, Professor Darnley Naylor, took the chair. Describing the organisation of peace as "political problem No. 1," the speaker said that the military defeat of the Nazis was not necessarily the greatest or hardest of the tasks which must be achieved before the peace could be securely established. He favoured reconstituting the League of Nations as an organ of international economic co-operation and as an organ of propaganda for peace, and also use of the

ATLANTIC CHARTER

(Continued from page 9)

and permanent system of general security," with an all round renunciation of force as an instrument of national policy, a disarmament that is not one-sided but general, and a protecting force that is not only mighty but also impartial. Somehow, some day, we shall have to win the co-operation of a Germany that has truly repudiated Hitler; and that Germany will have to be accorded full equality of rights. Perhaps we shall fail. Perhaps that partnership

League machinery for restocking Europe with food and raw materials. After this had been done, the League must become a world economic general staff and Council, and gradually build up economic co-operation between sovereign States.

At EDGBASTON'S Annual General Meeting, Miss Freda White spoke on "British Colonies and the Future." After a masterly survey of the varied and complicated conditions in the British colonies, she came to the following conclusions:—(1) That tropical trade should be under international control; (2) that international research stations for hygiene and welfare should be established; (3) there should be similar stations for research in agriculture and nutrition. Miss White discussed the implications of these principles.

Although a great many of the BERKHAMSTED BRANCH'S 350 paying members are away for the duration, meetings with a speaker can be relied upon to attract an audience of about 50 people. Indeed, a combined meeting with the Rotary Club mustered an audience of 100 to hear Dr. Adamkiewicz speak on Polish-Russian relations. So successful was this venture, that a similar meeting was arranged, at which Dr. Lambridis outlined Greece's gallant struggle for freedom. The discussion group, which was temporarily defeated by winter weather and the black-

will be wrecked or refused. In that case, the desired "order under law" will remain unrealised, and "the children of the earth" will presently resume their mutual massacre. But it is not an irrational or unworthy faith that now tells us that man can "know bread and peace . . . an equal opportunity and an equal chance to do his best, not only in our lands but throughout the world." And the Atlantic Charter—this "rough and ready war-time statement"—was not ill-judged as a pointer in that direction.

out, is now going strong again. Talks are held on other countries as well as on current affairs.

For the BOURNVILLE WORKS BRANCH Committee, the past year has been "the busiest and most satisfactory so far." The visit of the Branch President, Mr. L. J. Cadbury, to Russia with the British Government Mission was a source of encouragement. There are nearly 300 paid-up members. Twenty new members have helped to offset the loss caused by members leaving for war service, and a drive is now being made to bring in arrears. "Much of our success," says the annual report, "is due to the encouragement and help given by the Firm, Works Councils and Boeke Trust."

Excellent educational work in connection with international affairs, done in conjunction with the Army Educational Council, is starred in the Executive Report of the NORTHAMPTONSHIRE FEDERAL COUNCIL. Ninety per cent. of the lectures given to troops in this area have dealt with some aspect of current affairs. The County Secretary, in the year under review, addressed 175 audiences varying in size from 4 to 400. Often, at first, quite a lot of suspicion is encountered; but after two or three lectures the men begin to appreciate the aim of Educational Council, and it is then difficult to deal with all the questions and points raised in the time available.

Outstanding for its vivid picture of war-time Sweden, the June Luncheon Talk (L.R.F.) given by Mrs. Corbett Ashby drew a large and appreciative audience. The next Luncheon Talk will be given on Wednesday, July 15, by Major Victor Cazalet, M.C., M.P., on the subject, "My Recent Visit to Russia." The Talk and the Luncheon (1s. 6d.) will take place in the Y.W.C.A. (Lounge), Great Russell Street, at 1 p.m.

Major Cazalet has recently addressed other meetings for the Union at BROMLEY and BEDFORD. Mrs. Corbett Ashby has spoken at five meetings in NORTHANTS. The Dean of Chichester paid a visit to KINGSTON.

NORTH WATFORD AND GARSTON BRANCH continues to hold regular monthly meetings for the discussion of post-war prob-

lems and subjects connected with our New Order. One recent gathering was addressed by Councillor S. W. Smith on "The L.N.U. and Roosevelt's Four Freedoms." Wider publicity has been secured by the appearance of brief reports in the local Press, and the collectors have used the *News Sheet* to keep in touch with members.

Unusual ground was covered at the annual meeting of the WIMBLEDON BRANCH when Dr. Joan McMichael, speaking from first-hand experience, gave a lantern lecture on "Health Services in Soviet Russia."

Miss K. D. Courtney dealt with some aspects of post-war settlement at the annual meeting of the HULL BRANCH.

A spirit of quiet confidence for the future of the L.N.U.'s work permeated the annual meeting of the CHISWICK BRANCH. The Hon. Treasurer said that, in view of the way in which the subscriptions were steadily coming in, she looked forward to being able to report a substantial increase of membership next year. A keen discussion followed Mr. Leslie Aldous's talk on "Hitler's New Order—or Ours?"

Mr. John T. Catterall's recent engagements have included a tour of NOTTS and DERBY, and meetings at BOURTON-ON-THE-WATER and STROUD (Glos.). He has also addressed a number of meetings in LONDON and the HOME COUNTIES. CROMER BRANCH thought that Mr. Catterall was "an inspiration and a life-giver." After his visit to GODALMING, a correspondent wrote:—"I'm sure the name 'League of Nations' would not keep people away from lectures and meetings if they would only come and find out what your speakers are like."

WOMEN'S INSTITUTES and similar audiences of women have been addressed by L.N.U. speakers at ORFORD, DUNSFOLD, WEST MERSEA, PREES, BURSTWICK, WELWYN, HADZOR and ODDINGLEY, PADDINGTON, GREENFORD, WEST NORWOOD, BLACKHEATH, ST. ALBANS and other places.

In one of their Wednesday afternoon "Activities" periods, about 100 pupils of the WALLINGTON COUNTY SCHOOL FOR GIRLS had a lantern lecture on "Clearing up the Debris," from Mr. Aldous.

WORLD AFFAIRS IN PARLIAMENT

By OWEN A. RATTENBURY

The debate in the House of Lords on Post-War Settlement, initiated by Lord Addison on June 2 and continued on June 4, was of such importance that the whole of my space this month will be given up to it—in spite of the tempting by-path offered by Mr. Lloyd George's dramatic declaration in the Commons that, if the Anglo-Russian Agreement had been reached a few years ago, this war *could not* have happened.

Quite soberly I believe that it was the greatest debate in either House for many years. The speaking was of very high quality. It absorbs 130 columns of Hansard, and every column is worthy of the closest attention. It should have far wider publicity than can be obtained through its circulation through the official report. A digest could well be printed as a pamphlet.

One welcome and noteworthy fact is that, in all these speeches, there was virtually nothing which criticised the idea of a League of Nations. Those who criticised the League in its working did so rather because of the limitations imposed upon it than because of the idea.

Lord Addison clearly stated the post-war problem. Thought, he claimed, must be taken on the main lines to be followed, before peace comes; failing that thought, there would be great confusion. There were three outstanding questions to be settled. First there was the immediate post-war emergency—millions of homeless people in Europe taken from their homes to strange lands, from Greece, Yugoslavia, Holland, Norway, France—not knowing where their friends are or whether their homes exist at all; forced labourers in enemy munition camps, prisoners, exiles; hungry, homeless, penniless multitudes: The task of dealing with that will have to be done by Britain and the United States. The second subject is security for future peace, the destruction of the German military system, the restoring to German youth something that the Nazis have destroyed; the control of the German financial system. The third subject is what kind of life people may look forward to after the war.

Lord Perth, in seconding, spoke of the measure of agreement already achieved between Poland and Russia, and Poland and Czechoslovakia, as hopeful. He asked for some further interpretation of the Atlantic Charter. Another speaker challenged the Government to "try the Atlantic Charter on anybody," to see if they remembered by this time exactly what was in it! There seems a real need for further publicity as well as further elucidation of the Charter. Lord Sankey called for a Declaration of Rights for the nations, to match the declarations of rights for people that history has given us. Viscount Cecil said something that was repeated by other speakers: "I am quite sure that the idea of a peace of revenge is futile and purposeless. . . . But I am equally satisfied that precautions against any further aggression are absolutely necessary."

Viscount Cranborne, for the Government, while saying there were overwhelming reasons against a unilateral declaration of policy at this stage, assured the House that the Government considered themselves absolutely pledged to the Atlantic Charter. Though there were arguments against a declaration of war aims, that did not mean it was a mistake to prepare war aims. Coming on to the League, he acknowledged defects but considered it was a great step forward in international machinery. It needed behind it, however, preponderating force, as well as more adequate provision for peaceful change.

This assurance Lord Cranborne gave the House: Plans are being hammered out, exchanges of views are taking place, various aspects of the post-war problem are being considered with the Dominions, the United States, Russia and the other United Nations. The Atlantic Charter outlines the objects which the United Nations have set before themselves. Fullest and frankest consultation between the United Nations is called for to put it into effect.

Although Lord Brabazon made what was in some respects a delightful and enlightened speech, there was one grave blot on it. Referring to Lord Cecil's illumi-

nating contribution to the debate, he added:—

"Although nobody has lost confidence or hope in the possibility that in the future another League of Nations will be formed, I hope that he (Lord Cecil) will feel some twinges of conscience in discriminating between the League of Nations and the League of Nations Union, because the League of Nations Union practically did nothing else but teach England, and nobody else, to disarm."

If that means anything, it means that the L.N.U. advocated unilateral disarmament, which our readers all know to be untrue. If the disarmament of this country *was* unilateral, nobody but the successive Governments are to blame; and Lord Brabazon was a distinguished supporter of the Party or combination of Parties in office for most of the time. Certainly the Peace Ballot, which has been so much criticised in general terms by some members of his Party, never suggested anything of the sort: It asked for opinions on collective security, and in its very substantial voting got an emphatic majority in favour of resisting aggression even by force of arms. It would be charitable to assume that Lord Brabazon has either not studied the pronouncements of the L.N.U. or else has been singularly unfortunate in his contacts with its advocates.*

A more notable part of Lord Brabazon's speech urged the Government to consider at the earliest possible moment an announcement to the world that the United States, Russia and ourselves intend to take charge of the air throughout the world. "Their international civil air force," he said, "would be able to go wherever it liked and could see that Air Forces were not to be built up anywhere for future mischief." He visualised a great air transport service—long overdue—contributing to the world's welfare, but ready at any time to stop any aggressor anywhere throughout the world.

* Writing on this debate in the "Zionist Review," Mrs. Dugdale commented: "Few men in our public life are so unsuccessful as Lord Brabazon at concealing their ignorance of some of the subjects upon which they rejoice to express opinions—on the other hand, when he talks about what he knows he commands attention."—Ed.

COUNCIL FOR EDUCATION IN
WORLD CITIZENSHIP.

SUMMER SCHOOLS FOR TEACHERS AND SIXTH FORM BOYS AND GIRLS

For Teachers and Educational
Administrators:—

KESWICK, July 24th to 31st, a Summer School on (a) the Atlantic Charter, the Declaration by the United Nations, the Mutual-Aid Agreements, the Anglo-Soviet Treaty and other statements of war and peace aims, (b) political, social, economic and educational problems of post-war reconstruction, (c) the teaching of world citizenship.

FEE: £2 10s. 0d., plus a **Registration Fee of 5s. 0d.** (2s. 6d. for Members of the Council and Correspondents).

LYNMOUTH, August 13th to 20th, an International Conference, to enable teachers from our own country to exchange with teachers from allied countries and with exiled teachers from enemy countries and Spain, experiences and information on the methods by which they have tried in the past or hope in the future to promote education for peace and democracy.

FEE: £2 15s. 0d., plus a **Registration Fee of 5s.** (2s. 6d. for Members of the Council and Correspondents).

For Sixth Form Boys and Girls:—

SHERBORNE, August 4th to 11th, a course of lectures and discussions on Our Allies; The Rights of Man; Education, Science and Politics in the Post-War World, and the possibilities of World Government.
Lecture Fee: 7s. 6d. (5s. for Members of School Societies associated with the Council).

Boarding Fee: £2 15s. 0d.

Full particulars from the Council's Office at 11, Maiden Lane, London, W.C.2.

"AFTER VICTORY"

By MR. SUMNER WELLES

Lord Cecil, in his Presidential Address to the L.N.U. General Council, urged all members to study the speech delivered by Mr. Sumner Welles in Washington on May 30, 1942. Readers will here find the salient parts of the speech.

And after we win the victory—and we will—what then? Will the people of the United States then make certain that those who have died that we may live as free men and women shall not have died in vain?

I believe that in such case the voice of those who are doing the fighting, and the voice of those who are producing the arms with which we fight, must be heard, and must be heeded.

And I believe that these voices of the men who will make our victory possible will demand that justice be done, inexorably and swiftly, to those individual groups or peoples, as the case may be, that can truly be held accountable for the stupendous catastrophe into which they have plunged the human race. But I believe they will likewise wish to make certain that no element in any nation shall be forced to atone vicariously for crimes for which it is not responsible and that no people shall be forced to look forward to endless years of want and of starvation.

I believe they will require that the victorious nations, joined with the United States, undertake forthwith, during the period of the armistice, the disarmament of all nations, as set forth in the Atlantic Charter, which "may threaten aggression outside of their frontiers."

I believe they will insist that the United Nations undertake the maintenance of an international police power in the years after the war to insure freedom from fear to peace-loving peoples until there is established that permanent system of general security promised by the Atlantic Charter.

Finally I believe they will demand that the United Nations become the nucleus of a world organisation of the future to determine the final terms of a just, an honest, and a durable peace to be entered into after the passing of the period of social and economic chaos which will come inevitably upon the termination of the

present war, and after the completion of the initial and gigantic task of relief, of reconstruction and of rehabilitation which will confront the United Nations at the time of the armistice.

This is in very truth a people's war. It is a war which cannot be regarded as won until the fundamental rights of the peoples of the earth are secured. In no other manner can a true peace be achieved.

In the pre-war world large numbers of people were unemployed; the living standard of millions of people were pitifully low; it was a world in which nations were classified as "Haves" and "Have Nots," with all that these words imply in terms of inequity and hatred.

The pre-war world was one in which small vociferous and privileged minorities in each country felt that they could not gain sufficient profits if they faced competition from abroad. Even the United States, with its rich natural resources, its vast economic strength, a population whose genius for efficient production enable us to export the finest products in the world at low cost and at the same time to maintain the highest wages; a country whose competitive strength was felt in the markets of the world—even such a nation was long dominated by its minority interests, who sought to destroy international trade in order to avoid facing foreign competition.

They not only sought to do so, but for long years following the first World War largely succeeded in doing so. The destruction of international trade by special minority interests in this and in other countries brought ruin to their fellow citizens by destroying an essential element upon which the national prosperity in each country in large measure depended. It helped to pave the way, through the impoverishment and distress of the people, for militarism and dictatorship. Can the democracies of the world again afford to permit national policies to be dictated by

self-seeking minorities of special privilege?

The problem which will confront us when the years of the post-war period are reached is not primarily one of production, for the world can readily produce what mankind requires. The problem is rather one of distribution and purchasing power; of providing the mechanism whereby that world production may be fairly distributed among the nations of the world, and of providing the means whereby the people of the world may obtain the world's goods and services. Your Government has already taken steps to obtain the support and active co-operation of others of the United Nations in this great task; a task which in every sense of the term is a new frontier—a frontier of limitless expanse—the frontier of human welfare.

When the war ends, with the resultant exhaustion which will then beset so many of the nations who are joined with us, only the United States will have the strength and the resources to lead the world out

of the slough in which it has struggled for so long; to lead the way toward a world order in which there can be freedom from want. In seeking this end we will, of course, respect the right of all peoples to determine for themselves the type of internal economic organisation which is best suited to their circumstances. But I believe that here in our own country we will continue to find the best expression for our own and the general good under a system which will give the greatest incentive and opportunity for individual enterprise. It is in such an environment that our citizens have made this country strong and great. Given sound national policies directed toward the benefit of the majority, and not of the minority, toward real security and equality of opportunity for all, reliance on the ingenuity, initiative and enterprise of all citizens rather than on any form of "bureaucratic management" will in the future best assure the liberties and promote the material welfare of our people.

FROM "HEADWAY'S" POST-BAG

Sir,—I would like to suggest to my fellow members whose subscriptions are not paid under Deed that it is as well to bear in mind that the payment under Deed is not only of financial benefit to the Union but an act of faith by all those who are responsible for the work of the Union from our President downwards; and further, after the enlightenment arising out of these war years, evidence of a conviction that the basic principles of the League of Nations must be the foundation upon which Peace must be built.

A. FRITH ALLBROOK.

(Note.—As things are to-day, when a subscriber of £1 or more pays under Deed, the amount the Union actually gets automatically becomes twice as much. A number of members living in Bucks, Cheshire, Cumberland, Cambridge, Devon, Gloucester, Hants, Kent, Lancashire, Leicester, Lincs, London, Northants, Northumberland, Oxford, Salop, Staffs, Sussex, West of Scotland, Warwick and Yorks have recently signed Deeds undertaking to subscribe £1 (or more) for seven years. Headquarters will be glad to supply full information on application.)

Sir,—I have no doubt that most of those present at the meeting of branch workers held during the Council Meeting found the talk interesting and some of them may have taken notes of some of the suggestions. I doubt, however, the meeting being of any real value to the Union.

When we started these meetings we had definite discussions, in many cases ending with recommendations to the Executive Committee, with a report in the minutes. That procedure was surely of far more value to the Union than simply a gathering of members having a talk.

There were on the agenda for the last meeting a number of items on which a discussion would have been useful in preparing for post-war organisation and in getting new and regaining old members. These matters were almost entirely ignored.

I suppose my ideas are hopelessly out of date and it is now thought more desirable to have an aimless talk than to arrive at definite decisions.

W. E. PRITCHARD.

Hampstead, N.W.3.

TIMELY TRUTH

Our alert contemporary, *TIME AND TIDE*, has been taking A.P.H. to task for his misinformed criticism of the Peace Ballot in *PUNCH* recently. Commenting on the way in which all the ex-Munichers and the Hoare-Lavalites so eagerly seized upon the Peace Ballot as a scapegoat, *TIME AND TIDE*'s Diarist, *Four Winds*, remarks that "Public memory is never too good and quite a number of people hearing the words Peace Ballot got them mixed up with Peace Pledges in their minds and supposed that the supporters of the Ballot had voted for peace at any price."

"The Peace Ballot," continues *Four Winds*, "was never, of course, a Peace Ballot at all; it was a Collective-Security-Anti-Aggression Ballot. It was for disarmament, certainly, but only on condition that it was "all-round" disarmament. What it was really concerned to demand was combined war against the aggressor nations. We all knew that at the time, and in fact I met quite a few people who refused to sign it because they, like the rest of us, recognised perfectly well that what in fact the Peace Ballot did was to commit us to war—to war against aggression. "Do you consider," ran the operative clause:

Do you consider that, if a nation insists on attacking another, the other nations should combine to compel it to stop by

(a) Economic and non-military measures;

(b) If necessary, military measures?

Do we consider it now?—and how!

"The people of this country—if we are

to judge by the Peace Ballot—'fell for' war against the aggressor nations in 1935. It took them four years to persuade the Chamberlain Government to fall for it too." And the very minute that Government had done so all the Munichers and the Hoare-Lavalites hurriedly started to fling mud at the Peace Ballot which had advocated in 1935 the very same principle in pursuance of which the British Government honoured its pact with Poland in 1939."

BOOKS IN BRIEF

THE SPOIL OF EUROPE. By *T. Reveille* (Allen and Unwin, 10s. 6d.) and **A GERMAN PROTECTORATE: THE CZECHS UNDER NAZI RULE.** By *S. Grant Duff*. (Macmillan, 12s. 6d. Describe the long-planned technique of undermining the whole foundations of Europe in favour of the German "master race," and the particular kind of obliteration applied to the unfortunate Czechs. Here is the German "New Order" in practice.

TOWARDS OUR TRUE INHERITANCE. RECONSTRUCTION WORK OF THE I.L.O. (Montreal, 1s. Obtainable from L.N.U. Headquarters.) A deeply inspiring account of the emergence of the *social objective* which distinguishes to-day from 1918, of the idea backed now by Governments, Trade Unions and the Churches, that economic policy must aim at improving conditions of life. The arguments for making the I.L.O. a key post for reconstruction are overwhelming.

MAIN CONTENTS

	PAGE
Anti-League of Nations Union Propaganda - - - - -	1
The L.N.U. General Council. <i>By Leslie R. Aldous</i> - - - - -	2
General Council Decisions - - - - -	7
Atlantic Charter: "A System of General Security" <i>By W. Arnold-Forster</i>	8
Up and Down the Country - - - - -	10
World Affairs in Parliament. <i>By Owen A. Rattenbury</i> - - - - -	12
"After Victory." <i>By Mr. Sumner Welles</i> - - - - -	14
From "Headway's" Post Bag - - - - -	15