

Library

SPECIAL RHINELAND ISSUE

SIR AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN
MEGAN LLOYD GEORGE

PROFESSOR J. L. BRIERLY
PHILIP NOEL BAKER

HEADWAY

APRIL 1936
BRITISH LIBRARY
POLITICAL / ECONOMIC SCIENCE
S1083

A MONTHLY REVIEW OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

Contributions to HEADWAY are invited from writers with special knowledge of world affairs. The opinions expressed in contributed articles are not necessarily endorsed by the paper.

Vol. XVIII. No. 4 [The Journal of the League of Nations Union]

APRIL, 1936

[Registered with the G.P.O. for transmission by the Canadian Magazine Post] Price 3d.

CONTENTS

	Page		Page
News and Comment	62	Banish War From Europe for Twenty-five Years.	
Hopes of a Brighter Day. (Editorial)	64	By Miss Megan Lloyd George, M.P.	70
Our Obligations Under Locarno. By Prof. J. L. Brierly	65	The Franco-Soviet Pact	71
In Queen Anne's Drawing Room, St. James's Palace. By an Eye-Witness	66	You Cannot Pick and Choose. By Sir Austen Chamberlain	72
What Has Hitler Actually Proposed? By P. Noel Baker	68	Book Notices	74
		Readers' Views	76
		Here and There	78

THE DEMAND FOR COLONIES



By courtesy of

"WHY CAN'T EVERYBODY BE PEACEFUL LIKE US?"

The Evening Standard.

NEWS AND COMMENT

War in Abyssinia

IN the flurry of Locarno, Abyssinia runs a grave risk of being forgotten. The supporters of the League must not allow such a tragedy.

Italy is making war; Abyssinians are dying in defence of their country. Germany has not made war; no life has been lost because of her action.

Italy has broken her solemn pledges in the Covenant; the League has sat in judgment on her and condemned her. Germany has broken a treaty, offering an excuse which the League has refused to accept, though the German people are passionately convinced that it is sufficient. But Locarno is not the Covenant. At most Locarno is a local buttress of the League system of which the Covenant is the foundation.

The League does its duty in blaming Germany. She has shaken world confidence. But it not only shirks its duty if it condones Italy's war; it destroys its own authority. The League must either do impartial justice or die.

Terrible Gases

FOR seven days without break the enemy have been bombing the armies and people of my country, including women and children, with terrible gases. . . . Against this cruel gas we have no protection, no gas masks—nothing. This suffering and torture is beyond description; hundreds of our countrymen are screaming and moaning with pain. Many, many of them are unrecognisable, since the skin has been burned off their faces."

In these words Princess Tschai of Abyssinia, speaking for her countrywomen, appeals to Viscountess Gladstone and the Women's Advisory Committee of the L.N.U.

Italy's Promise

ITALY is an unconditional signatory of both the Hague Convention, 1912, and the Geneva Convention, 1925. These forbid the use in war of poison gases or inflammatory substances.

Negotiations

MEANWHILE, the League Council says no word about oil.

On November 6, almost five months ago, an embargo on oil supplies to Italy was approved in principle. After many delays on various excuses, the Committee of Thirteen, which is the Council without Italy, on March 3 approved a further postponement while one more attempt was made to negotiate a peace. The last interval, the world was assured, would be brief. On March 5, the Emperor of Abyssinia agreed to peace talks "in the spirit of the Covenant and within the framework of the League." On March 7, Signor Mussolini agreed "in principle." Since then nothing has happened—only the bombing goes on.

On March 23, at St. James's Palace, the Com-

mittee of Thirteen thought about Abyssinia for an hour or so. But oil was not mentioned. The decision was still to try to find terms of peace. Señor de Madariaga is sounding Italy and Abyssinia on behalf of the Committee, whose chairman he is. It is reported that he contemplates a visit to Rome; there is no news of his going to Addis Ababa.

Two facts offer a crumb of comfort. The pressure put upon the League to withdraw the sanctions decreed against the aggressor has been resisted—so far. Powerful influences were at work. The object was to restore the Stresa front of Great Britain, France and Italy, and to re-enlist Italy in the opposition to Germany in Western Europe. The phrase used by the Emperor, "in the spirit of the Covenant and within the framework of the League," has been adopted by the Committee for its latest effort to make peace.

In its verbal forms the League's Abyssinian policy has been almost consistently irrefragable.

Heard at St. James's

SOME things heard at St. James's Palace are worth recording.

From an American journalist with a wide and intimate knowledge of Europe: "What exactly are the grievances and inequalities under which Germany has suffered during the past dozen years? Reparations? She has borrowed from her former enemies, and has failed to repay, money which is more than double her reparation payments. Disarmament? She is partly to blame for the failure of the Disarmament Conference; it was near doing her justice when she broke it up. Colonies? Perhaps. The one unforgivable wrong the Allies have done her was to defeat her in the war."

From a Rumanian Member of Parliament: "Why doesn't von Ribbentrop mention that France and Russia asked Germany to come into their pact on completely equal terms? Why does no one point out that by not taking her case to the Hague Court, Germany has done more than tear up Locarno? She has failed to obey the optional clause—which she signed again after Hitler had come to power."

From a distinguished Italian author: "They ask us to be prisoner on the Red Sea and policeman on the Rhine."

Pot and Kettle

A LESSON learnt at the Council may be added. In the ante-rooms and lobbies the argument between France and Britain waxed hot.

One side said: "Serve you right. Laval put a spoke in the League wheel in Abyssinia. He was ready to smash the Covenant to bribe Mussolini. France cannot fairly expect us to do more on the Rhine than she has done in North-East Africa."

The other side retorted: "You have proved Laval right. You asked him to throw away Italian friendship and to risk war with Italy. He didn't trust you. He didn't believe you would always keep your promises. He looked at your record—Manchuria, the Anglo-German Naval Treaty. He took Sir Samuel Hoare's Assembly speech with a very large pinch of salt. To-day you are refusing to honour your Locarno signature. The cause is quite obviously something much deeper than dislike of our Abyssinian policy."

Neither side was wholly wrong. But recrimination is disastrous. Its only result is resentment. It is a disloyalty to the League. What is needed desperately is a more genuine, more generous League temper and a firm resolve not to repeat the errors of the past. As League Members, both France and Britain have room for reform.

Proposals Summarised

ON March 7 German troops entered the demilitarised zone on the Rhine. At the same time Herr Hitler announced a seven-point offer: (1) A demilitarised zone on both sides of the Rhine frontier; (2) a twenty-five years' non-aggression pact between Germany, France and Belgium; (3) a British and Italian guarantee; (4) the inclusion of Holland in the pact; (5) an air pact to avert the danger of sudden attack from the air; (6) individual ten-year non-aggression pacts with the States bordering Germany on the East; (7) the return of Germany to the League, with a hope that "in the course of a reasonable space of time" colonial equality of rights and the separation of the Covenant from the Versailles Treaty "will be clarified in the course of friendly negotiations."

After the League Council's finding that Germany had broken the Versailles and Locarno Treaties, the Locarno Powers (France, Belgium, Great Britain, with the doubtful adhesion of Italy) proposed to Germany: a temporary international occupation by British and Italian troops of a zone 12½ miles deep on the German side of the Rhine frontier; a reference of the Franco-Soviet Pact to the Permanent Court of International Justice; negotiations on Germany's programme; a world conference on collective security, limitation of armaments, freer world trade, and other matters.

The German Government, in reply, said: "The Locarno proposals are based on a new discrimination intolerable for a great nation. To this Germany will not agree. . . . Economic conferences will be vain until there is unconditional and lasting security." They did not mention security. They added: "Though compelled to reject the draft proposals in all points which affect honour and equal rights, they feel they must comply with the British Government's suggestions by presenting new proposals."

The new proposals were promised for March 31.

Britain's Position

MR. ANTHONY EDEN, in his Council speech on March 18, stated Britain's position. He said:

The structure of security and confidence has been seriously shaken. How is it to be reconstructed? . . .

In approaching a task which is at once so delicate and fraught with consequences of such gravity for the future, we should also bear in mind that there are two elements in the present situation of which advantage may, we hope, be taken in the work of appeasement and reconstruction.

The first is that the breach, however plain, does not carry with it any imminent threat of hostilities, and has not involved that immediate action for which, in certain circumstances, the Treaty of Locarno provides. We happily have time in which to endow our action with the prudence, as well as the determination, which the situation requires.

Treaties will be required in the future as in the past, and that an effort must be made to construct and reconstruct international life on the basis of undertakings above the signatures of those assuming them.

This was the constructive sequel to his plain statement that "a patent and incontestable breach of the provisions of the Treaty of Versailles relating to the demilitarised zone has been committed. . . ."

On March 26, in the House of Commons, Mr. Eden reviewed the situation and again defined British policy: "to maintain peace, to strengthen the League, to uphold the sanctity of treaties."

Naval Treaty

IN London, on March 25, a new naval treaty was signed by Great Britain and other Members of the British Commonwealth, the United States and France. It is a poor and paltry substitute for the Washington and London Naval Treaties which limited the sea armaments of all the major maritime powers.

Warships are divided into seven classes, and various restrictions are placed on the tonnage and gun calibre of the ships in each class. Also the signatories promise to communicate to one another within the first four months of each year full details of the new ships they intend to lay down or acquire in their annual programmes. No ship will be laid down or acquired until four months after the notification has been made. But provided they give notice in due time and keep to the permitted kinds, the signatories may build as many ships as they choose.

Even the modest prohibitions of the treaty may be relaxed to counter the programme of some power who has not signed.

The one welcome circumstance is an exchange of cordial letters between Mr. Norman Davis, the President's Ambassador-at-Large, and Mr. Anthony Eden, in which they give assurances that there shall be no competitive naval building between the United States and Great Britain, and that the principle of parity as between the British and United States fleets shall continue unchanged.



EDITORIAL OFFICE:—15, Grosvenor Crescent, London, S.W.1
Telephone: Sloane 6161.

HOPES OF A BRIGHTER DAY

Is March, 1936, a turning point in world history? It may prove so. Already the signs are being read hopefully and even confidently by some experienced observers who are seldom the dupes of their desires. They say that the unhappy and most unhappily prolonged chapter of post-war resentments and suspicions is closed. In Europe, at last, not one of the major servitudes imposed by the Peace Treaties survives. Substantial equality is a fact. Therefore, all nations on a basis of recognised equal rights can take their place in the international community and do their full part in promoting the common good, unhampered on the one side by a perpetual anxiety for the defence of privileges, or on the other by a continual scheming to avoid penalties.

Perhaps the hopes of the moment are excessive. The livelier heads may have allowed themselves to be more strongly influenced than they will approve six months hence. But although the present is dark, darker than is commonly confessed in the natural reaction against the black fears of a fortnight ago, the gleams on the horizon of a dawning splendour are too clear to be denied. A brilliant day will break—if a few simple conditions be fulfilled.

First, the nations must mean peace. It is not prejudice which asks, above all, that Germany shall give conclusive proof of her goodwill. The March crisis was due to German action. In form that action was indefensible. But many doubts and dangers of the situation so created arose not from the entry of German troops into the demilitarised zone on the Rhine, nor from the tearing up of a major treaty at Germany's will, but from the obscurity of her purpose. Strokes of public policy do not explain themselves. If they are seen in isolation they are usually misunderstood. Their intention and their effect are not apparent until they are studied in their place as units in a linked series of developments. Public opinion is apt to form itself exclusively on the incident of the moment; and since acts of State are difficult to interpret, while the words of statesmen appear to convey an unambiguous message, it is apt also to attach too much importance to words and to give too little weight to deeds. It is impatient with grubbing in the past. That impatience is not ungenerous and not wholly unhelpful. It can, however, easily be carried to extremes and felt upon wrong occasions. The past must be remembered if the present is to be judged.

Germany has had many complaints to make against her victors in the war. Almost from the day when

peace was signed, they have been admitting the justice of her protests by modifying its terms bit by bit, one after the other. But Germany's own record has been far from blameless. During the past three years Germany has been ruled by the propagandists of a violent, sometimes ferocious, nationalism. Her people have been very willing to be militarised and they have been militarised very thoroughly. Responsible estimates of the nation's expenditure on arms since 1932 give a total of £1,500,000,000; and this stupendous effort was prepared for and is being accompanied by a systematic encouragement of a militant national temper.

No one says that Germany cannot become a good citizen living in amity with her neighbours in a peaceful Europe. Nor that she does not now wish to become such. Nor that the rest of Europe should refuse to accept her in the fullest and freest way as an equal or should band itself against her. But the fabric of European peace will not survive unless it is built carefully with tested and sound materials.

Secondly, the Covenant of the League must be recognised for what it is—the Constitution of the world commonwealth. Members must strive to fulfil honourably all their League obligations. The League system substitutes law for war and provides means for the settlement of disputes between nations by conciliation, arbitration, or judicial award. It binds Members to make use of those means. It imposes the common duty, and confers the common right of collective defence. Organised resistance by the peace-keeping nations to the peace-breaker is the heart of the League system. Members recognise that any nation which resorts to aggressive war strikes not only at one nation but at all. There can be no loyal League membership which does not confess that peace must be kept everywhere, in the East as well as in the West.

One of the points of Herr Hitler's new policy is the unconditional return of Germany to the League. Such an offer should not be received in any grudging spirit. Even if Germany shows herself not wholly aware of all that League membership entails, there is reason to hope that experience at Geneva and active and responsible participation in the business which the League transacts month by month will awaken in the new Ministers of Germany more comprehensive and generous League ideas. Nevertheless, whether a nation is a member or not is less important than how, being a member, the nation behaves. It would be fatal to the League's usefulness, and must soon put an end to the League's existence, if all attention were concentrated on the Rhine, and if the South-East and East of Europe were, even by implication, abandoned to the militarists as an area for permitted conquest. Or if a League Member were at liberty to restrict his peace-keeping even in the West to 25 years.

Thirdly, the sanctity of treaties is the bulwark of peace and the basis of the League. Who breaks faith who does not make himself judge himself in his own cause, who does not choose to use force, open or veiled, to gain his ends? There must be an assurance that those who give pledges shall keep them.

Fourthly, an international agreement for the reduction and limitation of arms must be negotiated. Who agrees to reduce and limits his arms and does reduce them shows that he honours his signature, is loyal to the League, and means peace

OUR OBLIGATIONS UNDER LOCARNO

by Professor J. L. BRIERLY

(Chichele Professor of International Law in the University of Oxford.)

THE legal obligation of Great Britain in the situation caused by the German occupation of the demilitarised zones depend primarily on the "Treaty of Mutual Guarantee between Germany, Belgium, France, Great Britain, and Italy," which is one of the Treaties annexed to the Final Protocol of Locarno.

In Article 1 of this Treaty, the parties "collectively and severally guarantee, in the manner provided in the following articles," the territorial status quo resulting from the frontiers between Germany and Belgium and between Germany and France, and the inviolability of the said frontiers. . . . Also the observance of the stipulations of Articles 42 and 43 of the Treaty of Versailles (*i.e.*, of the Articles which created the demilitarised zones). The words which I have italicised show that we must refer to what follows for a definition of the scope of the "guarantee" which we have here given.

Article 2 contains mutual undertakings by Germany and Belgium, and Germany and France, "that they will in no case attack or invade each other or resort to war against each other"; but this stipulation does not apply in three cases which the Article proceeds to specify, and to which I shall return. It should be noted, however, that since Germany has herself repudiated the Treaty, she cannot now appeal to this Article for protection; if Belgium or France were to "attack or invade or resort to war" against her, the legality of their action would have to be determined by the law as it stands apart from Locarno. But the article remains important because it has a bearing on our obligations; for our promise to assist Belgium or France would not oblige us to assist in action which the Treaty does not authorise them to take.

Article 4 deals with the event of the Treaty being broken. It provides that if one of the parties alleges a violation of Article 2 (*i.e.*, an "attack or invasion or resort to war"), or a breach of the demilitarisation Articles of the Treaty of Versailles, it shall bring the question at once before the Council of the League (as Belgium and France have done). (There is also a clause providing for the event of a "flagrant" violation, for which this procedure might be too dilatory, but in the circumstances of the present case this need not be considered.) As soon as the Council is satisfied that such violation or breach has been committed, its duty is simply to "notify its finding" to the signatory Powers, and thereupon these Powers have agreed that "they will each of them come immediately to the assistance of the Power against whom the Act complained of is directed."

These are the crucial words of our guarantee. What do they involve in the present circumstances?

The fact is that they do not seem to have contemplated the present circumstances. If an "attack, or invasion, or resort to war" had taken place, our obliga-

tion would be clear. But the occupation of the demilitarised zones, even if it is not merely "symbolical," as Germany has claimed, has not placed Belgium or France in a situation in which they require "immediate assistance." No doubt if they should propose to take military action to force Germany to respect the Treaty, they might need our assistance. But does the Article entitle them to demand it in that event?

In my opinion, it does not; and it is here that the importance of the exceptions in Article 2 to the undertaking not to "attack or invade or resort to war" comes in. The first of these is the case of "legitimate defence," and that phrase is defined. It covers (besides resistance to an attack or invasion or resort to war) resistance to a "flagrant" breach of the demilitarisation Articles, "if such breach constitutes an unprovoked act of aggression and by reason of the assembly of armed forces in the demilitarised zones immediate action is necessary." Now in the present crisis, Germany's action may be a "flagrant" breach, but it is doubtful whether it constitutes an "act of aggression," nor does the presence of her forces in the zones seem to make "immediate action" necessary. But it must be admitted that the language is unsatisfactory, for "necessary" invites the question "necessary for what?" Belgium or France might not unfairly argue that some action is "necessary" to remove a threat to their future security, though hardly that "immediate" action of a warlike kind is necessary for that purpose. The context seems to imply that the action must be "necessary" in the sense that the "assembly of armed forces" in the zones constitutes an immediate threat and calls for action of a defensive character. The objection to this view (though I do not think it is a decisive one) is that it involves the admission that when we said in Article 1 that we guaranteed "the observance of the stipulations" of the demilitarisation Articles, we did not do so fully, and that in the events which have happened we have committed ourselves to no positive action.

The second and third exception in Article 2 have no application to the present case. The second is "action in pursuance of Article 16 of the Covenant," but it is hardly necessary to point out that Article 16 operates only after a "resort to war." The third is "action as a result of a decision taken by the Assembly or the Council of the League," or "in pursuance of Article 15 (7) of the Covenant" (*i.e.*, failure of the Council to reach a unanimous report), but in the last event only if "the action is directed against a State which was the first to attack."

It is worth pointing out that although the Treaty makes no reference to sanctions of an economic kind, under general international law Germany's breach would justify such action if it were thought to be desirable.

IN QUEEN ANNE'S DRAWING

THE League of Nations is the hope of the world. This is the considered opinion of an eye-witness who watched at closest quarters the Council Meetings in the Queen Anne Drawing Room at St. James's Palace. One Saturday morning found him sympathetic, but doubtful. Another Saturday left him persuaded, though more acutely aware than ever before of the obstacles in the path. The way is long and difficult, but the League has set its face in the right direction, and it has strength enough to reach its goal.

No description of what has been happening in London could be accurate if it were confined to the speeches in public session. Private negotiations, rumours which flew through the ante-rooms, newspaper articles, public opinion, all these had their part in a situation which at times was much more dangerous than was generally understood.

In the first days of the crisis both the British people and their official spokesmen made mistakes. Their goodwill did not fail, but their perception was at fault. They responded readily and generously to the fair words with which Herr Hitler announced the entry of German troops into the demilitarised zone on the Rhine and the tearing up of the Locarno Treaty. British generosity was genuine. In France and Belgium, in Czechoslovakia and Russia, however, it was regarded suspiciously. Seen from the Continent, it seemed to be indulged at someone else's expense. Britain attended to what Herr Hitler said. The Continent fixed its gaze upon what he did. The different points of view led to the adoption of divergent attitudes, whose consequence might have been disaster. For two days the threat was real. France and Russia, supported by their closer European associates, were saying: "Another proof. Britain always picks and chooses, according to her own convenience, when the collective system shall be upheld and when it shall not." They might go on to say: "We must save ourselves. We have the strength to-day to coerce Germany. We must use it for our own protection; 1937 or 1940 may be too late."

Peace depended on British Ministers. They had to convince the Cabinets of the Continent that Great Britain was neither pro-German nor pro-French, but pro-League. Would she fulfil her obligations under the Covenant without fear or favour in all cases? Would she honour her undertakings? Was she sincerely concerned for the observance of Treaties and the lasting reconciliation of Europe on a basis of completely equal rights? These questions were being asked in all the capitals. They had to be answered.

Mr. Eden and Lord Halifax, in their hasty visit to Paris, achieved much. The summoning of the League Council to St. James's achieved more. For it was an emphatic assurance that Great Britain would use all her influence to obtain a settlement, just and acceptable to all parties.

The worst danger was over when the first public meeting of the Council was held on the morning of Saturday, March 14. But the tension was still severe.

BY AN EYE-WITNESS OF THE

The hundreds of experienced journalists from all parts of Europe, the United States, South America, Asia, and the British Dominions, who crowded the ante-rooms, did not conceal their fear that something might snap. Their apprehensions were known to be shared by some, at least, of the most astute delegates.

The proceedings in the Council improved matters. Both M. Flandin for France, and M. van Zeeland for Belgium, spoke with studied restraint. M. Flandin took his stand on good-faith between nations and their honourable fulfilment of their undertakings towards one another. He repeated, in effect, his earlier phrase: "In the Rhineland France is defending the existence of the League." They gave the impression of men very much in earnest who would insist upon the claims they had to urge. But they did not pitch those claims too high. They recited the German infraction of Locarno and of the demilitarised clauses of the Versailles Treaty, and they asked the Council to vote that such an infraction had been committed.

There followed an attempt to obtain the presence at later meetings of a German representative. Herr Hitler made the mistake of seeking to impose conditions. He seemed to wish to confuse the League's discussion of his breach of Locarno with an immediate conference on the seven points of his general peace programme. Immediately, automatically, the French and Belgian attitudes stiffened in retort. Then it was explained that Herr Hitler had not meant "forthwith" but only "in due course." The word "alstald," with its convenient two interpretations, took rank among the tragi-comedies of diplomatic history.

Mr. Eden found an opportunity to send messages of friendly advice to Berlin. They had the desired effect, and Herr Hitler announced the coming of his representative, without any other condition than that the making of peace should have its place in the Council's programme as well as the uttering of protest.

In the interval between Herr Hitler's acceptance and Herr von Ribbentrop's arrival, the Council listened to speeches by the delegates of the Powers not immediately involved.

M. Litvinoff delivered an embittered harangue against Germany. His address and its reception, not only in the Council but even amongst the less restrained journalists, afforded a remarkable example of League balance. You may say what you like at a League meeting, but if what you like is not dictated by good sense you pay the penalty. Nowhere is it more true that violence provokes reaction. Neither in the Council, nor in the Assembly, nor in the surrounding League audience is any undue respect paid to persons.

M. Litvinoff is something of a favourite. With the substance of his speech there was general agreement.

ROOM, ST. JAMES'S PALACE

LEAGUE COUNCIL MEETINGS

As one highly experienced, quite impartial American observer remarked, Herr Hitler's several peace pronouncements have retained a single likeness despite their many divergencies. They have all menaced and threatened Russia, and have flung declarations of hostility each little different from an ultimatum at the head of the Moscow Government. On March 7, and later, Herr Hitler said a great deal about his goodwill towards the West, and he exhibited not less volubly the exact opposite of goodwill towards the East.

Yet, despite the provocation, M. Litvinoff would have been wise to exercise more restraint. He spoke in the interval during which Germany was committed to an appearance in the Council Room, but was still unable to hear and answer. About an attack launched then hung an unpleasant suggestion of sharp practice. Russia would have held the general sympathy more surely if her delegate had ignored the hard words so continually flung at her. After all, M. Litvinoff's argument did not oblige him to retort. It would have struck deeper home in a colder logic. Here, he contended, was not merely a local disturbance to be adjusted by a local compromise, but a European crisis awaiting a comprehensive European settlement. War on the Eastern side of the Continent would be not less disastrous to the whole world than war on the Western side.

Mr. Eden, the next day, was brief and firm and completely loyal to the League. He frankly condemned Germany's infraction of Locarno. He was equally frank in saying that the breach of the Treaty was not a threat of resort to war, and he was emphatic in pointing out that the supreme purpose of the League is the maintenance of world peace. The League's business is to resolve international conflicts and to reconcile international rivalries. When the League had dispelled the legitimate alarm of France and Belgium over Germany's abrupt action it would have performed only the first part, and the lesser part, of its present task.

Herr von Ribbentrop took his seat on the Thursday morning. At once the Conference came much more vividly alive. At last all the parties to the dispute were round the table. The German delegate made many friends. His position was difficult. He had the tact to be outspoken without being aggressive. His speech fell into two parts, one insisting that the Locarno Treaty had been destroyed because the whole political basis on which it rested had been swept away by what he referred to throughout as "the Franco-Soviet military alliance," and the other dwelling upon the helpfulness and sincerity of Germany's peace programme. Its weaknesses were its omissions. He did not say that France and Russia had invited Germany to join their pact on fully equal terms, making it a

three-part agreement for the guarantee of peace in Eastern Europe.

The climax was deeply impressive. The quiet, the absence of ceremony, only threw the historic significance of the event into more striking relief. France and Belgium had laid their charge. Germany had made her reply. The other nations had given their counsel and their opinions. What remained was judgment.

Had the German Government "committed a breach of Article 43 of the Treaty of Versailles by causing, on March 7, 1936, military forces to enter and establish themselves in the demilitarised zone referred to in Article 42 and the following Articles of that Treaty and in the Treaty of Locarno"? Voice after voice replied in scarcely audible tones to the President's challenge. Chile abstained, asking for a judgment from the Hague Court on the disputed point, whether Germany had broken the Locarno Treaty or not. Equador was absent. All the others voted. With the one exception of Germany, they said "Yes." Germany being a party to the quarrel, her vote was not counted. France and Belgium were treated in the same way for the same reason. Of the others, it was noted with some amusement that Italy alone spoke emphatically, Signor Grandi's resonant response conveying more than a hint of the traditional Italian irony.

Germany asked leave for a final word. When Herr von Ribbentrop's request was announced there was a stir of uneasiness round the Council table and through the deathly still audience. Was he about to throw down a defiance? His tact survived the test, though his emotion nearly mastered him. At moments he was almost inarticulate. Germany, he repeated, believed that Locarno had already been destroyed by the Franco-Soviet military alliance. Both her people and her Government were profoundly convinced that the verdict now pronounced by the League Council would not be endorsed in history.

A few hours previously the German translator had achieved a triumph of his art. He had turned a long and elaborate German speech into English that was perfect in idiom, accent and intonation. Now he nearly broke down. He could do little more than whisper.

France replied admirably. There was no hint of triumph in M. Flandin's manner or his matter. It was a fundamental rule of all law, he reminded Germany, that no man could be a judge in his own cause. He himself, in the name of France, had already offered to refer the Franco-Soviet Pact to the Hague Court. He repeated his offer.

All was over. The last impression carried away from St. James's Palace is the genuineness of the League loyalty which has now become a permanent factor in world affairs. Throughout, and with increasing insistence as the days passed, the Council has emphasised the world danger and the world hopes of the Rhineland dispute. Not selfish advantage is the League's business, but the building of world peace.

Several spokesmen of the smaller Powers put the point with admirable force and directness.

WHAT HAS HITLER

AN EXAMINATION IN DETAIL OF

By PHILIP NOEL BAKER, *Parliamentary Private Secretary to the Secretary of State for 1929 and 1930, Private Secretary to the President of the Disarmament Conference,*

EVERY member of the Union desires that the present crisis should be transformed into an opportunity to "rebuild the foundations of Peace." Every member of the Union, and indeed almost every person in the British Isles, desires that from the crisis there may emerge a stronger League of Nations, able to bring about Disarmament and to prevent all War. Many people in the British Isles have accepted Herr Hitler's recent proposals as a basis upon which such a League of Nations can be built.

In submitting to the members of the Union the following analysis of his proposals, I beg them to understand that I fully appreciate the responsibility of France, Great Britain and other Powers for the present European situation. If Disarmament had been brought about, as in my belief it could have been years ago, if Great Britain and France had pursued a wise policy; if the Covenant had been resolutely applied in the Manchurian and Abyssinian cases, as again I believe Great Britain and France could have applied it, then the present crisis would never have come about. I beg them also to remember that I was among the first to preach that German inequality in respect of armaments must be ended and that no form of inequality could permanently endure. It would be fatal at the present moment to lose sight of the real grievances which the German people feel. But it would be no less fatal to allow the sense of those grievances to blind us to the real facts which face us to-day.

The following paper is an attempt to make an objective examination of what Herr Hitler has actually proposed:

1.—HERR HITLER'S METHOD OF NEGOTIATING A NEW PEACE ARRANGEMENT.

In putting forward his new seven-point programme, Herr Hitler's declared purpose was to create a new sense of confidence in Europe and to end the present dangerous atmosphere. In removing the inequalities in the Rhineland which, in his view, were a danger to peace, he offered alternative plans to take their place. In what circumstances and by what methods was his offer made?

The answer is as follows:—

(i) On February 28, 1936, Herr Hitler gave an interview to a French journalist, in which he asked for a rapprochement with France. The next morning, on instructions from Paris, the French Ambassador expressed the gratification of the French Government and their desire to collaborate for a rapprochement, and inquired if Herr Hitler had any definite proposals to make. Herr Hitler replied that he had and would present them shortly in writing.

(ii) No further communication came from Herr Hitler until he announced his seizure of the Rhineland. This he did without any suggestion that the removal of the existing inequality in the Rhineland might be obtained by diplomatic negotiations.

(iii) He publicly justified his action by the contention that the Franco-Russian Pact was incompatible with Locarno, and had therefore abrogated Germany's obligations thereunder. The question having been placed by Herr Hitler on this legal plane, France immediately offered to accept the decision of the Permanent Court—an

offer which, in view of the importance of the Demilitarised Zone to France, was perhaps without parallel in diplomatic history. Herr Hitler took no notice of the offer.

(iv) A little later more specific proposals were made that the matter should be decided by the Permanent Court under the Optional Clause or by a reference by the Council. Herr Hitler announced that he would refuse to be "dragged before tribunals," but he repeated his contention that the Franco-Russian Pact was "legally and politically incompatible with Locarno."—(*Times*, March 19, 1936).

In other words, desiring a change in the status quo in order to get rid of inequalities, Herr Hitler failed to ask for a settlement by peaceful negotiation, and refused a judicial decision when it was offered. Having done so, he proceeded to take what he wanted by force.

In the best of circumstances, this is an unsatisfactory way of conducting international relations. In the present case the following facts cannot be left out of account:

(i) Germany freely accepted the Demilitarised Zone in the Rhineland arrangement as part of the Locarno Settlement;

(ii) Herr Hitler himself has repeatedly declared in the last two years that he accepted the Locarno Settlement as one of the foundations of European peace, and he made no exception about the Demilitarised Zone;

(iii) Herr Hitler's Government renewed Germany's adhesion to the Optional Clause in March, 1933;

(iv) Herr Hitler must have known that the integrity of the Demilitarised Zone was perhaps the most dangerous international question in Europe;

(v) Before the Franco-Russian Pact was made, Germany was invited by France and Russia to join in an Eastern Locarno, which would have given her guarantees for her security on terms of complete equality; Herr Hitler refused that offer and has failed to mention it throughout the present crisis.

It is only natural that France, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Austria and other countries should feel that this is not a very satisfactory way to prepare a negotiation for a new peace system in Europe.

2.—THE SUBSTANCE OF THE COLLECTIVE SECURITY PROPOSALS PUT FORWARD BY HERR HITLER.

Herr Hitler's proposals, though divided by him into seven points may be more conveniently dealt with under four headings.

(1) *The Demilitarised Zone.*—The French and Belgians have always regarded the Demilitarised Zone on the Rhine as a most important element in the collective security of Europe. There are a variety of ways in which the inequality of the present system could be ended, without wholly depriving France and Belgium of the guarantees which it affords them—e.g., that recently suggested by the British Government (a bilateral zone with an International Police Force and League of Nations supervision).

Herr Hitler did not put forward any such proposal. He merely suggested that a zone of equal width should be established on the French and Belgian side of the frontier. The French and Belgians naturally interpreted this as a suggestion that they should blow up one hundred million pounds' worth of defensive works.

(2) *Non-Aggression Pacts on the Polish Model.*—Herr Hitler's proposals under this heading have been widely accepted in England as an offer to banish war from Europe for 25 years. The following points appear to be relevant:—

(a) The proposed pacts would, like the Polish model, be in, form reaffirmations of the Kellogg Pact. But if the Kellogg Pact is accepted by Germany as a binding obligation vis-a-vis the other signatories, why is it necessary to reaffirm that obliga-

ACTUALLY PROPOSED?

THE GERMAN PEACE PROGRAMME

Foreign Affairs, 1929-31, member of the British Delegation to the League Assembly, 1932-33, formerly Professor of International Relations in the University of London.

tion? Will not such reaffirmation merely have the effect of weakening the obligations which already exist?

(b) The actual contents of the Polish model leave something to be desired. Their main substance consists in two points:

(i) An agreement not to take disputes to arbitration or to the League of Nations, but to settle them by negotiations instead.

In so far as this meant that Germany and Poland stopped their endless quarrels in the Council of the League about Danzig, Minorities, and Upper Silesia, it was no doubt a good plan. But as a general principle it would obviously not be desirable. The present tendency is not to take disputes to the Council or to the Court too soon, but on the contrary, far too late.

(ii) The Polish model is limited to a period of ten years. The new pacts would be limited to twenty-five years. But the original obligation of the Kellogg Pact has no such limitation. The acceptance of a time limit would obviously undermine the authority of what was intended to be the basic and permanent rule of international relations.

(c) Herr Hitler offered to make pacts with various countries, omitting Austria, Czechoslovakia, Switzerland and Russia. A week later Austria and Czechoslovakia were added as an afterthought. Russia was still left out. True, Russia has no common frontier with Germany; but Germany could attack Russia either by sea (Russia has no Navy) or through the territory of weak neighbour states. If Europe is to have peace, the danger of Russo-German war must be got rid of. Herr Hitler makes no proposals to this end; on the contrary, he and his colleagues are still using language which must make us doubt whether they really do desire peace with Russia or not.

Thus Herr Hitler's Non-Aggression Pacts are:—

(A) *Unnecessary, if their existing obligations are taken seriously by the German Government;*

(B) *In themselves open to objection because they tend to weaken the binding forces of those existing obligations;*

(C) *Liability to interpretation by Germany's neighbours as an attempt to tie their hands while Germany remains free to attack Soviet Russia. (This contention was put to the Council of the League with great force by M. Litvinoff.)*

3.—HERR HITLER'S OFFER TO RETURN TO THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Incomparably the most important part of Herr Hitler's offer and that which has secured him most sympathy in Great Britain is his offer to return to the League of Nations without the prior fulfilment of political conditions. It is extremely important that nothing should be done by the Council of the League or by the British Government which should indicate a failure to appreciate this offer at its true importance, or which should make it more difficult for us to use it as an element in a true collective system.

But the offer to return to the League must nevertheless be viewed in the light of the following facts:—

(a) *Herr Hitler's departure from the League of Nations in October, 1933.* When Herr Hitler took the drastic step of leaving the League, Germany had just received the best offer of disarmament which had yet been made to her. If he had negotiated on that offer he was certain of widespread support in Great Britain and France for his claim to the removal of the remaining inequalities which it involved. He, nevertheless, preferred to break off negotiations and virtually to end the Disarmament Conference by severing all Germany's connections with the League. The failure of the British and

French Governments to take earlier opportunities to disarm on equal terms does not justify this action, as Mr. Arthur Henderson himself declared.

(b) Although he does not ask for the prior settlement of the Colonial question, Herr Hitler leaves no doubt that he will expect this question to be dealt with immediately after his return to the League, and that if he does not receive satisfaction he may regard himself as free to leave the League once more. The point was made more clearly by Herr Hitler's lieutenant, Dr. Goebbels, in a speech which he made two days after Herr Hitler's offer. Dr. Goebbels said:

The reasons why we left the League have been swept aside by what we have since done, but naturally we shall have to ask that, after our return to the League, the colonial question is solved, and the League divorced from the Versailles Treaty.

There is at least a suggestion in these speeches that unless the ex-German colonies are returned to Germany at an early date, Germany would once more leave the League. Membership on such terms would not create great confidence in Europe. It must also be remembered that Herr Hitler has not joined in the League's action to restrain Italian aggression, and that, as a permanent Member of the Council, he would be able to obstruct such action.

4.—THE AIR PACT

It is universally recognised that Disarmament is an indispensable element of any true system of collective security. In Herr Hitler's proposals he makes no reference to disarmament except for his offer to negotiate a Western Air Pact.

Since that proposal for a Western Air Pact was originally put forward by Great Britain and France, we cannot complain that Herr Hitler should have offered to renew negotiations about it, but that does not alter the fact that, in view of the armament expansion now going on, his offer is only a modest contribution towards disarmament. For:

(a) *It is difficult to see how any Western Air Pact can bring any measure of disarmament or even limitation of air armaments, so long as Russia remains outside.*

(b) *The proceedings of the Disarmament Conference have proved that disarmament, and particularly Air Disarmament, would be quite worthless without a stringent system of international supervision and control. Although professedly dealing with collective security for Europe, Herr Hitler failed to mention supervision and control.*

It must also be remembered that Herr Hitler's Government have introduced a system of conscription and the military training of boys which is far more complete than anything which the Kaiser's Government attempted before 1914, and that they have spent more than £1,000,000,000 on rearmament in the last three years.

5.—CONCLUSION

Herr Hitler's proposals must, of course, at the proper time, receive full and fair examination by all the Members of the League. But the above considerations indicate that these proposals do not enable us to hope that they will themselves provide a new and stronger system of collective security which will inspire confidence throughout Europe as a whole.

What is evidently required is a programme of more solid constructive proposals put forward by the League Powers, in which Germany should be invited to take her part on fully equal terms.

BANISH WAR FROM EUROPE

By MEGAN LLOYD GEORGE, M.P.

THINGS have been moving so rapidly since Herr Hitler presented Europe with his *fait accompli* in the Rhineland that it is difficult to find sufficient breathing-space in which to survey the situation as it presents itself to a breathless public to-day.

If a compromise agreement is reached on the immediate crisis, the next step will be the summoning of a conference with terms of reference wide enough to cover questions of political and economic adjustment in Europe, which will include within its scope the "objective examination" of Herr Hitler's proposals.

What is the value of these proposals? There is the view of General Smuts, shared by a substantial section of opinion in this country, that Herr Hitler should be taken at his word. "Herr Hitler," he says, "has offered 25 years of peace in Europe. No such offer has ever been made before." There are some, on the other hand, who are not inclined to value the proposals highly, or to take them seriously at all. There are even those who seek to dispose of them with the general criticism that they will be no more valid than the Treaty which Germany has so recently infringed.

The prospect of a pacific settlement in any quarter of the globe would be bleak indeed if we were to discount any proposals on the ground that previous undertakings had not been observed by the parties concerned. Our scope for negotiation would be extremely restricted. If it is for this reason that the proposals are regarded with suspicion and distrust, it is not these particular proposals which are unacceptable, but any and all proposals—from no matter what quarter they emanate—which have to depend on Germany for their fulfilment. This is a completely defeatist attitude, and if persisted in would certainly bring us to isolation, to a policy of every nation for itself and devil take the hindmost in armaments. I do not think there is any danger that British public opinion will reject consideration of these proposals upon that ground.

Immediately after the reoccupation of the Rhineland the Executive Committee of the League of Nations Union passed a resolution in which this sentence on the sanctity of treaties occurs: "*A scrupulous respect for all treaty obligations is one of the foundations of the Covenant of the League; it is the basis of all peaceful relations between States.*" That part of the resolution is a matter of common agreement among people holding widely divergent views upon recent events. No one, I think, would attempt to justify Germany's breach of Locarno, yet many feel that her action was the result of great provocation.

It is well to remember in this connection that the Demilitarisation of the Rhineland was imposed under the Treaty of Versailles as part of the measures for disarming Germany. The *quid pro quo* was the promise that the general disarmament of the victorious Powers would follow. Locarno, which reaffirmed the principle of the demilitarised zone, also reaffirmed the general aim of disarmament. For fourteen years Germany waited for the fulfilment of this undertaking. It has nowhere been maintained, however, that the nations generally have disarmed. On the contrary, in the

seven years following Locarno the armaments of the world, excluding Germany, increased by 50 per cent. France alone has spent close upon a hundred million pounds merely in fortifying her frontier on the demilitarised zone. It is difficult to reconcile such expenditure with the disarmament clauses of Versailles and Locarno, and in the circumstances I suggest that it is impossible to whip up public indignation in this country because a few detachments of German troops have invaded their own country.

Sir Samuel Hoare, then Foreign Secretary, expressed the views of a great many of his fellow-countrymen when he said, in replying to the suggestion that Germany and Great Britain, by coming to a naval agreement, had violated the Treaty of Versailles: "*I am quite aware that the logical and juridical mind often sees things from an angle different from that of the empirical and the practical.*" In spite of the fact that the League Council has come to the unanimous decision, upon the strict letter of the law, that Germany is guilty of a unilateral breach of Locarno, there is a very strong feeling in this country that the spirit of the Treaty has not been observed by the other Parties.

The essence of Locarno, and of all these Pacts, is that they are mutual and not directed against any outside Party. In this respect it cannot be denied that the Franco-Soviet Pact marked a definite departure from League principles. This Pact, between the two greatest military Powers in the world, was without a doubt directed solely against Germany. For all its adroit phraseology, in the political sense it is contrary to the European system of security laid down in Locarno. This view is borne out by the Protocol attached to the Pact, in which it is laid down that, if the League fails to reach a unanimous decision as to aggression, the obligation of mutual assistance between France and Russia shall take effect. Germany regards this as a short-circuiting of the Locarno Treaty and of the Covenant, in which the Parties agree to act in accordance with the recommendations of the Council, and who can honestly gainsay her on this point?

It is to be hoped that these considerations will ensure an unprejudiced examination of Herr Hitler's proposals, particularly in view of the fact that her chief accuser cannot claim to be without sin in face of the Covenant and is therefore not in a position to throw a stone at her neighbour across the Rhine.

Hitler's first proposal is for a mutual demilitarised zone. It has become obvious that in any scheme for the general pacification of Europe the first condition must be that all nations shall be equal before the law and that the discrimination between victor and vanquished cannot be maintained. Indeed, the refusal to grant equality to Germany in the days of Stresemann and Brüning has been responsible in a larger measure than anything else for the Nazi régime and the present situation. This proposal would clear away the remaining obstacle which prevented Germany from entering as a full Sovereign State into free undertakings with her neighbours.

The proposal to banish war from Europe for 25

FOR TWENTY-FIVE YEARS

years is the most important of all. It is suggested that if Germany takes her existing obligations seriously, no further commitment is necessary. But that is equally true of any bilateral pacts entered into by signatories of the Kellogg Pact. It is certainly true of the Franco-Soviet Pact, which has precipitated this crisis; for if France and Russia are bound by the Covenant of the League, which lays upon them a definite obligation to come to the assistance of any Member of the League whose territory has been the subject of aggression, then no further undertaking is necessary.

It has been suggested again that this proposal is open to objection because it tends to weaken the binding forces of existing obligations. It is not easy to understand how the Kellogg Pact, which was to outlaw war for ever, and has not succeeded in outlawing it for a decade, could be weakened by a proposal for 25 years' peace; or why an undertaking to disarm, which has resulted in greater armaments than the world has ever seen before, should suffer greatly from a new pact to limit air power.

Then there is Herr Hitler's offer to return to the League of Nations. It has been suggested that, even

though Germany is prepared to come into the League unconditionally, she will remain inside only if she receives satisfaction with regard to her Colonies. If this were so, Germany is not the only country that has threatened to leave the League unless decisions were given in its favour. Japan left the League in these circumstances, and Italy has threatened to do so. We have seen also in recent months and weeks that the degree of a nation's attachment to Treaty obligations, to the League and to the Covenant, does not always depend so much upon the offence as upon the offender.

Finally, there is the suggested Air Pact. At a time when the armaments of most countries have increased, and are increasing to an alarming extent, Herr Hitler's proposal should be universally welcomed. That Herr Hitler is quite prepared to discuss an arms agreement where a solution appears possible is shown by his readiness to conclude a naval limitation pact with Great Britain. There is no reason, therefore, why his offer should not be treated as a sincere one. On the contrary, at a time when all the Powers are increasing their armaments there is every reason why France should welcome this opportunity of decreasing hers and why we should encourage her in this attitude.

THE FRANCO-RUSSIAN PACT

THE Franco-Russian Pact of Mutual Assistance was signed in Paris on May 3 by M. Laval and M. Potemkin. The preamble says the French and Soviet Governments are "impelled by the desire to consolidate peace in Europe and ensure its blessings to their respective countries by enforcing more completely the strict application of the provision of the Covenant of the League of Nations intended to maintain the national security, territorial integrity, and political independence of States, and determined to devote their efforts to the preparation and conclusion of a European agreement for that purpose, and in the meantime to promote to the extent of their ability the efficient working of the provisions of the League Covenant."

The text of the treaty is as follows:—

I.—In the event of France or the U.S.S.R. being threatened with, or in danger of, aggression on the part of any European State, the U.S.S.R., and, reciprocally, France, undertake mutually to proceed to an immediate consultation as regards the measures to be taken for the enforcement of the provisions of Article 10 of the League Covenant.

II.—In the event of France or the U.S.S.R., under the circumstances specified in Article 15, section 7, of the League Covenant, being subjected, in spite of the genuinely peaceful intentions of both countries, to an unprovoked aggression on the part of any European State, the U.S.S.R., and, reciprocally, France, shall immediately come to each other's aid and assistance.

III.—In consideration of the fact that under Article 16 of the League Covenant any member of the League having recourse to war contrary to the pledges

given under Article 12, 13, or 15 of the Covenant, is *ipso facto*, considered as having committed an act of war against all the other members of the League, France and, reciprocally, the U.S.S.R., agree, in the event of one of them being subjected under these conditions, and in spite of the genuinely peaceful intentions of both countries, to an unprovoked aggression on the part of any European State, immediately to lend each other aid and assistance in application of Article 16 of the Covenant. The same obligation is assumed in the event of France or the U.S.S.R. being subjected to an aggression on the part of any European State in the circumstances specified in Article 17, sections 1 and 3, of the Covenant.

IV.—The undertakings stipulated above being consonant with the obligations of the high contracting parties as members of the League of Nations, nothing in this treaty shall be interpreted as restricting the duty of the latter to take the proper measures efficiently to safeguard the peace of the world or as restricting the obligations laid upon the high contracting parties of the League of Nations.

V.—This treaty, both the French and Russian versions whereof are equally valid, shall be ratified and the instruments of ratification exchanged at Moscow as soon as possible. It will be registered at the Secretariat of the League of Nations. It will come into force as soon as the ratifications have been exchanged, and will remain operative for five years. If it is not denounced by either of the high contracting parties giving notice thereof at least one year before the expiry of that period, it will remain in force indefinitely, each of the high contracting parties being at liberty to terminate it at a year's notice by a declaration to that effect.

YOU CANNOT PICK AND CHOOSE

By SIR AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, K.G., M.P.
(Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs 1924-1929).

GERMANY claims that the Treaty of Versailles was a dictated peace, and, therefore, less binding than the Treaty of Locarno. Do you think there would have been a less rigorous peace to the beaten party if Germany had won the war? Have you looked at the terms imposed on Rumania when Germany was victorious? Have you asked what would have been our fate to-day, what British colonies would be in our hands, what life we should have been living or what ransom we should have had to pay to live that life?

It was a "dictated peace." I know of no peace except the peace of exhaustion which has not been dictated. I think a great deal too much has been said about the so-called "dictated peace." But whatever may be said on that subject Locarno was not "a dictated peace." It was a treaty the proposals for which came from Germany. The particular provisions for the guarantee of the *status quo* in the West, for the observance of the conditions in the demilitarised zone, were in the original German offer.

That is the treaty. Those are the clauses of the Treaty of Versailles—dictated if you will—and of the Treaty of Locarno—suggested by Germany, offered by Germany, accepted by us, after free negotiation as equals one with another—that she has renounced and violated.

What is the excuse? That a treaty arranged, signed, but not yet—not even at this hour—ratified between France and Soviet Russia is a breach with Locarno. The German Government know well—they made inquiries—that it is not only France who does not share their view. The other parties—our own Government, the Belgian Government, the Italian Government—have all communicated their views that there was no contradiction between the Franco-Soviet Treaty and the Treaty of Locarno.

A dispute had arisen between the contracting parties, particularly between Germany and France, about their respective rights. Such a possibility was foreseen in Article 3 of the Treaty of Locarno, which simply embodies the undertaking contained in the direct Treaty for Arbitration and Conciliation, initialled at Locarno, and signed, as the Treaty of Locarno itself was signed, in Geneva in the month of December, 1925. Article 3 reads, I quote the words essential:

In view of the undertaking entered into in Article 2 of the present treaty, Germany and Belgium and Germany and France undertaking to settle by peaceful means, and in the manner laid down herein, all questions of every kind which may arise between them and which it may not be possible to settle by normal methods of diplomacy, any question in which the parties are in conflict as to their respective rights shall be submitted to judicial decision and the parties undertake to abide by such decision.

Granted that the other parties are wrong. Granted that Germany is justified in her assertion that the Franco-Soviet Pact is incompatible with Locarno, why did she not ask for judicial decision as to the rights of the respective parties, a course to which she set her seal and made solemn promise? It was not Germany who proposed the International Court at

The Hague. It was France who offered to submit this to The Hague and to abide by the decision.

Now I come to the exact bearing of the military occupation of the demilitarised zone in terms of the Treaty of Locarno. Again I quote only the words essential for the purpose. Article 1:

The high contracting parties collectively and severally guarantee the maintenance of the territorial status quo resulting from the frontiers between Germany and Belgium and Germany and France and the inviolability of the said frontiers. And also the observance of the stipulations of Articles 42 and 43 of the Treaty regarding the demilitarised zone.

Article 4 proceeds:

If one of the high contracting parties alleges that a violation of Article 2 of the present Treaty or a breach of Articles 42 and 43 of the Treaty of Versailles has been or is being committed it shall bring the question at once before the Council of the League of Nations.

It was in pursuance of that Article France made her appeal to the League. Still more pertinent to the present situation the third section of the Article goes on:

Any case of flagrant violation of Article 2 of the present Treaty or of flagrant breach of Articles 42 and 43 of the Treaty of Versailles (the Articles forbidding fortification and forbidding assembly or maintenance of troops in the demilitarised zone), each of the other contracting parties undertakes to immediately come to the assistance of the party against whom the act is directed as soon as the said Power has been able to satisfy itself that the violation constitutes an unprovoked act of aggression and that by reason either of the crossing of the frontier or the outbreak of hostilities or by the assembly of armed forces in the demilitarised zone immediate action is necessary.

If Germany had desired to challenge all Europe, if she had desired to raise once and for all the issue whether there is any international morality or any international law, she could not have raised that question more completely, more challengingly than within the compass of her action within the demilitarised zone. This is not a dictated treaty. The observance of the conditions of the demilitarised zone were part of the original offer from Germany.

Herr Hitler himself has more than once drawn a distinction between a dictated peace which he felt free to break and a negotiated, voluntary treaty which he pledged himself to observe. Speaking in the Reichstag in January, 1934, about the occupation and the return of the Saar, he said:

After it (the Saar) has been settled, the German Government is ready to accept not only the letter but also the spirit of the Locarno Pact, as there will then be no territorial question at stake.

As late as May of last year he said:

They will scrupulously maintain any treaty voluntarily signed, even if it was signed before their accession to power. In particular they will observe and secure the Locarno Treaty, providing that other parties are ready to stand by that Pact. . . . Regarding the demilitarised zone, the German Government considers that a contribution to the appeasement of Europe.

Do You Draw Two Salaries?

Never has the new writer had a more varied field of opportunity than lies open to him to-day. Hundreds of journals require outside contributions for every issue they produce; altogether thousands of publications use free-lance work.

Editors welcome fresh talent. If you have literary aptitude you can learn to make a second income in your spare time. You can most readily acquire the technique of successful writing by taking one of the Regent Institute's world-famous postal courses. Regent students have contributed to over 1,000 publications, including every daily newspaper of importance and leading magazines and reviews.

Hundreds of students have earned money by the pen during tuition; many of them have recouped the fee several times over. Read these extracts:

"To date I have had 121 articles and paragraphs accepted" (all written and sold during the Course).

"I enclose final lesson. . . . My earnings amount to over £20."

"One story more than paid for my whole Course! Your Course is one of the most stimulating things a man with any spare time could invest in."

Many students have been enabled to earn a substantial income in their leisure hours. One pupil, for instance, sold 3,094 articles and stories in spare time; another reported that his literary earnings almost equalled his salary.

WRITE

Articles and Stories In Spare Time

Send to-day for a free copy of the Institute's prospectus, "How to Succeed as a Writer," which describes the profitable openings for outside contributions—articles, paragraphs and short stories.

Cut out this coupon and post it in an unsealed envelope (½d. stamp), or write a simple request for the booklet addressed to The Regent Institute (Dept. 219N), Regent House, Palace Gate, London, W.8.

That contribution has been withdrawn without consultation, without negotiation, by an act of brutal force, tearing up a treaty once again. We wonder and do ask ourselves, "Is any treaty made with Germany more than a scrap of paper?" I have said and I will repeat it at this point in case I should have been thought to have overlooked it. There is a qualification—he will respect the Treaty of Locarno so long as other Powers are ready to stand by the pact.

That is as passionless as I can make it, with my mind quivering at this moment with the memory of the events that led up to the Great War, impressed as I am with the similarity of the policy of Germany to-day with the policy that rendered that war inevitable. That is as objective a statement as I can make on the history of this question.

How can you justify our action in the Italo-Abysinian dispute unless it is a fixed policy? If you are talking of collective security, if you are talking of the sanctity of law, if it is your purpose to substitute the rule of law for the rule of force, you cannot pick and choose, you must act consistently. Whenever the occasion arises you must take the same attitude and follow the same course. If you choose otherwise you must give up the idea of the League of Nations gradually substituting the rule of law for the rule of force, a great international tribunal where in the face of all the world peace can be discussed, conciliation can be employed by neutral parties, and the aggressor—if there be an aggressor—may be deterred by the risk he will run in affronting the world, knowing the sanctions that will follow.

Sir John Simon, as Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, in November, 1933, said:—

The Treaty of Locarno cannot be denounced by any signatory by way of unilateral action. Locarno was entered into as a contribution towards stabilising the forces of Europe, and I would submit to the House Locarno has not exhausted its influence in that respect.

More important and more recent, the Prime Minister, speaking on the second of October last:—

I apologise for even alluding to this. There is fear in the world that our country has lost regard for the sanctity of treaty agreements entered into since the war that may contribute to the peace of Europe. I say this, and I take the Treaty of Locarno as the most difficult, what Britain has signed she will adhere to. She adhered to her signature with regard to Belgium. Her signature to this agreement is sacred.

All the world, most of all the little States, are looking to Great Britain to-day.

WORLD REVIEW OF REVIEWS

Edited by

VERNON BARTLETT

A unique periodical that concerns YOU

WORLD REVIEW OF REVIEWS (an amalgamation of World and the Review of Reviews) is the only British review of the Imperial and Foreign Press. It gives you that knowledge of world opinion without which you cannot be a useful supporter of the League.

Vernon Bartlett continues in its columns the calm analysis of events he formerly gave you through the microphone.

Special reduced subscription rate to members of the League of Nations Union, 12/- per annum, post free.

On Sale at all booksellers: 1/- monthly.

40-42 CHANDOS STREET, LONDON, W.C.2

The REGENT INSTITUTE

(Dept. 219N)

Regent House, Palace Gate, London, W.8

Without obligation on my part, please send me a free copy of "How to Succeed as a Writer."

Name

(Block letters)

Address

BOOK NOTICES

Anarchy or World Order? Problems of Peace: Tenth Series. (Allen & Unwin. 7s. 6d.)

The latest volume of lectures from the Geneva Institute of International Relations does more than maintain the high standard of its predecessors. All the addresses delivered last August and now published have an admirable actuality and liveliness. Some of them are contributions of permanent value to the theory and practice of world peace.

During the past few difficult years, when the friends of peace and believers in the League have suffered many disappointments, one deep and persistent trend has shown itself in international events and international thinking from which they may derive new hope. The old estimates were not heroic enough. There is much more to do and much more need to do it. The effort and the need are a summons to struggle, a warning against impatience, a promise of success. The task attempted by the League has come to appear vaster, more complicated, and more laborious than used to be imagined. Fifteen years ago nearly everyone supposed that all peoples desired peace and that the general desire could prevail quite easily. To-day the truth is seen that, on the one side, a thorough process of education, enlightening and strengthening the public mind, is required, and on the other the construction of a social, economic, juridical and political system, planned in detail for the purposes of peace. This realisation is stamped on every contribution to "Anarchy or World Order?"

Mr. Moritz J. Bonn, the eminent German economist, who is now at the London School of Economics, deals with the economic strains of the League world. He shows how mistaken is the commonplace view that all economic agreements between nations are advances in co-operation. Sometimes they are merely selfish devices to benefit sectional interests at the expense of the common good. What is needed as the economic basis of a genuine League world is not a sharing out of natural resources or the concerted holding up of prices. Still less a deliberate creation of scarcity. It is a planned plenty made systematically available to all peoples. The League must secure, the earlier the better, a reversal of the plunge since 1929 into exclusive economic nationalism.

Mr. Clarence Streit says a timely word in most telling fashion for democracy. He points out that the democratic peoples are the strong and successful element in the modern world. The triumph of dictatorship is a myth. With abundant facts and figures he illustrates how completely the chief democratic nations, the Free Fifteen, as he calls them, surpass the Absolutist Three. The world is theirs to fashion as they choose if they embark together on the high adventure. He elaborates his argument with a gusto which drives it home.

A final word is due to Professor Lauterpacht, whose high authority on all matters of international law awakes in the reader high hopes of his address, which are not disappointed. The law-keeping of the world at large during the past few years is tragically below the

brave promises of 1919. But the world moves on. Progress is a fact. The practice of to-day is encouragingly above the pre-war standard. Professor Lauterpacht tells a convincingly lucid story. His address is an effective shock to the lazy assumption of the plain man that the vigorous growth of international law doesn't much matter to anyone except international lawyers.

Altogether a truly readable and useful volume.

The Twilight of Treaties. By Y. M. Goblet. (Messrs. Bell. 7s. 6d.)

The new geography is much more readable than the old. There are times when it is little less exciting than the detective thrillers of the Crime Club. It explains things so cogently and sweeps on to such confident conclusions that the novice finds himself carried away. But when at last he is released from the spell he is apt to wonder whether the evidence has not been too skilfully selected and too carefully arranged. The familiar story comes to mind of the young lady at the London School of Economics, who confessed that she did not know where Tokio was, but added brightly that if anyone would tell her she would explain why it was there. M. Goblet is an eminent French geographer of the human or political school. In his fascinating volume he is, perhaps, over-ready to accept assumed relationships which he forthwith hurries on to explain. But he has much that is true to say, and much that is important. He deals with the Saar, Schleswig, Danzig, Austria, Manchuria, Abyssinia, and the Chaco, and with a dozen other parts of the world towards which public attention has been directed during the past few years.

Everywhere, he insists, a correct understanding of geographical conditions and relations is necessary for the settlement of political disputes. Statesmen are apt to see in the contacts and conflicts between nations abstract legal issues, whereas the problems which challenge them cannot be solved unless facts are admitted and the needs of living communities satisfied. The nature of a territory, its location, the natural resources it contains, the way of life and the methods of gaining a livelihood adopted by its people, and its people themselves, are bound intimately together. They form a complex, intimately interconnected whole. That whole persists obstinately. Political attempts to break it up and to distribute its parts amongst other systems are costly, dangerous, and often futile.

In Manchuria, for example, M. Goblet sees an outlying, detached territory of the Chinese Empire, which was never an integral part of the Chinese system and whose development is naturally separating it from China. The alternatives were a Chinese Manchuria on the one hand, and on the other a new political arrangement linking Korea with Manchuria and Inner Mongolia. Geographical influences worked against China. They would not have been effective without Japanese political intervention. But had they been absent Japan could have had no chance of lasting success.

WHAT THE LEAGUE HAS DONE

1920 to 1936

New Edition just published

PRICE 1/-

From the Union's Book Shop

A Private Income Not a Salary

£400
A YEAR
FOR LIFE
for YOU!

THINK of it! Not a salary necessitating daily work at the Office, Factory or Shop, but a private income to be paid to you every year as long as you live.

And while you are qualifying for it—to begin, say, when you reach age 60—you have the satisfaction of knowing that if you do not live to that age the Capital Sum arranged for, plus profits, will provide a monthly income to meet your family's everyday requirements and to educate your children. Should your death be caused by an accident, your family would receive an additional £5,000.

If, in consequence of illness or accident, you become totally incapacitated, no further saving deposits need be made. Yet your pension or the monthly income for your family would be paid just as if you had continued making the deposits.

Every year you save for your comfort in later years you will secure a reduction in your income tax—a big consideration in itself.

It is a wonderful plan which can be obtained for any amount, large or small, by regular annual savings.

It will bring independence and comfort to you and yours.

Whether you are able to save £10 or £100 or more per year, you cannot fail to be interested in this guaranteed income plan. The enquiry coupon makes it easy for you to obtain complete information entirely without incurring any obligation.

To H. O. LEACH (General Manager),

SUN LIFE ASSURANCE COMPANY OF CANADA

(Incorporated in Canada in 1865 as a Limited Company),

99, Sun of Canada House, Cocksbur St., London, S.W.1

Please tell me more about your Pension-Protection Plan. These are the details you require:—

NAME

(Mr., Mrs. or Miss)

ADDRESS

EXACT DATE OF BIRTH

OCCUPATION

Headway, April.

M. Goblet might have argued not less persuasively in the opposite sense if events had taken the contrary course. He knows what has happened, and he says what has happened is what geography required. Nonetheless, though some of his conclusions may be challenged, his thought is highly stimulating. It outlines a new and helpful approach to many hitherto intractable difficulties. The world has lost the old formal respect for treaties. M. Goblet makes out a case for the new attitude. He leaves his readers with an alert sense of the urgency of the challenge: Are treaties straight jackets in which the peoples of the world must be rigorously confined, no matter how cruelly their growth may be misshapen as a consequence? Or are they the formal registration of certain aspects of international life, valid until vital changes produce a rearrangement, and then without force because without relation to the new order?

Ethiopian Realities. By Major Polson Newman. (Allen & Unwin. 3s. 6d.)

Major Polson Newman is a competent journalist; he has made a readable book of the Italian case in the Italo-Abyssinian dispute. It is as impartial as any argument can be which is content to state only one side. In other words, the author adopts a scrupulously moderate tone, but notices only the facts which tell in Italy's favour and ignores the facts which tell against her. He seems to have persuaded himself that Italy is waging a defensive war. He does not notice how odd a figure his client makes in the role of the victim of aggression. Again and again Italian diplomacy attempted to secure recognition of special and predominant Italian interests in Abyssinia. Italy pushed forward her military outposts far into what she had herself once recognised as not her territory. Italian agents promoted rebellion and armed rebels against the Emperor. To this last activity Major Polson Newman closes his eyes. Even his strongly-coloured Italian spectacles could not give it a respectable look. But the others cause him no discomfort. If Abyssinia has doubts that only shows the suspicious, unfriendly, evasive nature of the beast. In Major Polson Newman's story Abyssinia is as provocative as was the lamb in the fable of Æsop and La Fontaine, and Italy is as generously firm as was the wolf.

The author is astonished to find the British public curiously misinformed about the most important aspects of the Italo-Ethiopian question. But perhaps it is the British public which understands what is afoot and Major Polson Newman who is mistaken.

The supremely important issue is not the fate of Abyssinia or of Italy, but the success or failure of the effort pursued by three-quarters of mankind during the past sixteen years to substitute law for war and to organise a new international order of assured peace and friendly co-operation.

These are the essentials. The British public knows them. Apparently, Major Polson Newman does not. They would not fit into the Italian brief to which, no doubt unconsciously, he is pleading.

Official League Publications

Dispute Between Ethiopia and Italy.—Co-ordination of Measures under Article 16 of the Covenant. I.—Committee of Eighteen.—Minutes of the Third Session (December 12 to 19, 1935).

II.—Committee of Experts (appointed under the Terms of the Resolution adopted by the Committee of Eighteen on November 6, 1935).—Minutes of the First Session (November 27 to December 12, 1935). (Special Supplement No. 147 to the "Official Journal." 62 pages. 2s. 6d.)

Acts Relating to the Constitution of the Permanent Court of International Justice. (French and English Texts.) (Ser. L.o.N.P., 1936.V.1). 42 pages. 1s. 9d.

Settlement of the Assyrians of Iraq: Statutes of the Trustee Board: (Ser. L.o.N.P., 1936.VII.1). 6 pages. 6d.

READERS' VIEWS

(Letters for publication are only invited subject to curtailment if rendered necessary by exigencies of space.)

CHRISTIANITY AND THE USE OF FORCE

SIR,—The questions raised by "Christian Pacifist" deserve, I think, a rather more detailed answer than is given in the replies—excellent as they are—printed in your current number.

The suggestion that the obligation of "love to all" should forbid measures of restraint of Italy's war of aggression has been sufficiently answered, though I don't myself think it is necessary in principle, or would be always practical in policy, to make Miss Royden's distinction between economic and some kind of military action. We should always act from good will; but, while the use of force is regrettable, there may be occasions when it is, I think, our duty to use all the force of compulsion we possess to prevent wrong being done. That may be the most practical way of showing good will.

The question of the example of Christ, raised by your correspondent, needs more careful consideration than has yet, in general, been given to it. It is true He refused to use any means but reasonable persuasion to gain adherents, and accepted for Himself the consequences of that refusal. The moral is that Christians should follow the same rule in spreading His religion. But He did use compulsion in driving the traffickers out of the Temple. His personal claim not being then in question. He saw much good in a Roman centurion, and did not, apparently, in any way suggest that his occupation was a wrong one.

And, on any intelligent view of Christianity, the Gospels are not (that impossibility) an encyclopædia of ethics for all times and circumstances, but a means to enable us to gain an inspiration which will enable us to judge for ourselves. The general Christian judgment has held that, as individuals or communities, we may have to use force to prevent wrong being done. One might cite St. Paul in his "Romans" (chap. 13), the book on "The Catholic Tradition," reviewed by Professor Gilbert Murray in your February number, and Bishop Gore's "Religion of the Church" (pp. 104 and 105)—to give only these instances. From this general judgment I, for one, am unable to dissent.

May I add that, as regards the particular case in point, the question at issue is not only whether a small country is to be delivered (all too slowly) from an unjustifiable armed invasion, but whether by this means the collective system of the League is to be shown to be a reliable reality, and the Western world saved from slipping back (as it is doing) into the old international anarchy, the inevitable results of which are only too well known. That is the major fact which Christians, in common with all others concerned for world peace and justice, must face.

ARTHUR FLOYD.

46, Downs Court Road,
Purley, Surrey.

THE WHITE PAPER

SIR,—I am surprised at the complaisant way you watch rearmament. You say to the Government: "If while you are buying these arms you are building up the League and binding yourself to use them within the League, and are obtaining similar pledges from other nations to use similar arms in the same way, then an expenditure of even £300,000,000 will be a wise economy."

But how many people (including Government supporters) really believe that we are rearming for that purpose? It was obvious even from the wording of the

White Paper that national interests are the only ones that have been considered and the only ones that are going to be considered. And if English people realise this, what hypocrisy it must seem to foreigners.

The result is certain. Within a few months Hitler or Mussolini will be saying: "In view of the enormous increase in Britain's Navy and Air Force, we propose to lay down . . ." And so it will go on until the swelling armaments burst, as they did in 1914, unless there is a drastic change of policy—which means a change of mind. The Government of this country professes to believe in an international system, because ten millions voted against nationalism in last year's ballot, but how many members of the Government genuinely believe in it?

CLIVE SANSOM.

Palmers Green, N.13.

WHAT CONSTITUTES A PACIFIST?

SIR,—I am dismayed to read Mr. Walker's bitter letter in the March issue of HEADWAY, in which he proposes that "machinery should be devised for purging our ranks" of the so-called Christian pacifists. "How these Peacemakers love one another!"

I am not a "Christian Pacifist," and agree with Mr. Walker that the name is ill-chosen, but I am sure that the vast majority of members of the Union will agree with me that we greatly appreciate the support of this school of thought, and that its adherents may fairly be said to be "in general agreement with the objects of the L.N.U." and, as such, eligible for membership.

I have yet to find in the Covenant any repudiation of the doctrine accepted in this country that a man should not be forced to fight if he can show genuine conscientious objection.

There are, in fact, few of us who would consider Article XVI as it stands as our ideal as a means of stopping aggression. Why should the modifications proposed by the "Christian Pacifist" be any more heretical than mine, or, for that matter, Mr. Walker's? Harpenden.

G. W. SCOTT BLAIR.

THE USE OF FEAR

SIR,—I was interested in the letters from Eric Walker and Langford Jones in the current issue of HEADWAY.

With Langford Jones I am opposed to methods—personal, national and international—which "use fear in order to reach after power."

I call myself a Christian Pacifist because my attitude is based on what I believe to be Christ's teaching and because that term seems most effectively to convey to others my general type of attitude to affairs.

I learn with deep regret that the use of this term causes Eric Walker concern and that he considers it ludicrous that membership of the L.N.U. is open to such as I, to say nothing of George Lansbury.

This point has troubled me. Is it consistent for me, a Christian Pacifist, to be a member of the L.N.U.? Can I conscientiously support an organisation which advocates the use of an international force?

In January of this year I wrote to the Union, at Grosvenor Crescent, explaining my views and suggesting that I ceased membership. In reply it was hoped that I would remain a member. Is the Union so sadly blemished by counting among its members people who believe God meant what He said, when He declared "Thou shalt not kill," and that Christ really meant "Love your enemies," that it requires purging of them?

ALBERT F. TAVENER.

Kingsthorpe, Northampton.

CONCESSION COLONIES: AN ANSWER

SIR,—My attempt at compression has led Mr. Pearce to suppose that I would encourage Nazis to take up and control colonies! But, as I wrote in my July letter, last year, this is "unthinkable!"

My point is this: the Abyssinian imbroglio is just one token or symptom out of many that civilisation is heading towards catastrophe unless our idealists for commonwealth can advance proposals which are not mere provocations to further and worse "fascisms." And "political colonies" being *unthinkable*, I look round and see others of different types.

There are Italian social colonies in the Argentine; German and Japanese in Brazil; formerly, there was a huge German colony, with thirty German papers of its own, in and around Milwaukee; there is a big Irish colony which keeps up the old septs, centred in Brooklyn. These are *not quite* my ideal: *yet they might have been*. Nearer approaches are those of the French in Quebec and the Dutch in South Africa. The nearest of all is that of the Jews in Palestine. For this really is a Concession Colony under the League surveillance, with Britain, only, as mandatory Power.

Why, then, not devise first a safe juristic model for promoting various *corporate* social colonisation for all the peoples on earth who need them? If I had my say in the matter, native populations would be safeguarded ten times more securely than the wretched Assyrians were when we gave up our mandate over Iraq. But my view is that, in the very act of our inviting Germans and Italians to attend a World Conference on Concession Colonies, we would be affording them lessons in civilised methods. And it was the fact that, after the Peace, the "Haves" had no such lessons to offer to the "Have Nots," which, originally, stirred up the Fascist and Nazi spirit. They would now see the value of taking part in a genuine World Policy.

I see the *Times* has devoted much space of late to the Colony Problem. Subjects such as raw materials have been assiduously discussed. Yet little has been said, for instance, about Germany's desperate attempts to effect barter arrangements with Brazil and Australia. Surely there are plenty of raw materials on the earth. The crux lies in the currency problem. For which reason, in my Concession Colonies, I would allow the colonising nation to make use of their own currency within their respective colony concessions.

Horton, Wimborne.

RICHARD DE BARY.

THE CATHOLIC TRADITION

SIR,—May I respectfully join issue with Professor Gilbert Murray over one passage in his interesting article, "The Catholic Tradition," in the February issue of HEADWAY? He refers to "... the old habitual champions of justice and freedom, the parties of the Left . . . doing their best in various separate countries."

Now, socialist parties are generally regarded as of the Left; yet what do we see? In Germany, National Socialism, in Russia Communism, in the United States an American form of Socialism, and the British Socialist Party—all with this, at least, in common; the suppression of freedom, the desire for the supremacy over the individual of some form of bureaucracy or dictatorship, and the suborning of the Courts to the ends of the prevailing government. This last would be particularly dangerous in this country, where there is no "separation des pouvoirs."

In fact, the "champions of justice and freedom" are the older Constitutional parties—almost invariably promptly suppressed by régimes of the Left.

JOHN RUTHERFORD.

Weir Lodge, Near Aylesbury.

THE MONEY MYSTERY

EXPLAINED FOR BEGINNERS BY

A BOOK

"The Money Mystery"—3/6

A GAME

"The Money Game"—5/-

both by

SIR NORMAN ANGELL

and published by

J. M. DENT AND SONS, LTD.

Aldine House, Bedford Street, W.C.2

Explanatory leaflet post free

Anarchy or World Order

By R. B. MOWAT, W. ARNOLD-FORSTER, A. E. ZIMMERN, M. J. BONN and others.

Lectures, by a committee of experts, on such subjects as: International Anarchy—The Elements of World Order—American Neutrality—The Social Basis of World Order—The Future of the Collective System. 7s. 6d.

Problems of Peace—Tenth Series.

The Refugees from Germany

1933—1935

By NORMAN BENTWICH.

An account of the work which has been done for the refugees, Jewish and non-Jewish, from Germany, by philanthropic organisations and by the High Commission which was set up by the Assembly of The League of Nations in 1933.

"It is an account of everything done towards helping, housing, feeding, training and employing refugees since the persecution began. The interest is practical, and Professor Bentwich fully brings it out."—Spectator. 6s.

George Allen & Unwin Ltd.

HERE AND THERE

Special Mention in this month's "News Sheet" is accorded to the Welwyn Garden City Branch for the excellent result of their share of the National Canvass.

The visits to Geneva, this year, will comprise one in June, during the session of the International Labour Conference; a Youth Group Expedition in July, with a holiday extension in the mountains; the Junior Summer School for boys and girls during the first ten days of August; the Geneva Institute of International Relations and a short course for Teachers on Training for World Citizenship, from August 16 to 22; the World Youth Congress on "The World We Mean to Make," from August 31 to September 7; and arrangements are also being made for a visit during the League Assembly, in September.

The proposed visit to Soviet Russia, which is already attracting many supporters, and which will take in Leningrad, Moscow, and many other interesting localities, will sail from London on June 27.

There will also be shorter visits to Bruges at Whitsuntide, Stratford-on-Avon, in May (as a sort of reunion for former members of Geneva parties), and a party is being organised in preparation for a visit to the United States and Canada in the spring of 1937.

Fullest particulars will gladly be sent on receipt of a postcard inquiry which should be addressed to the Secretary of the L.N.U. at 15, Grosvenor Crescent.

A large audience attended a meeting at **Bournemouth**, convened to inaugurate the house-to-house canvass, and a stirring speech from Mr. Vyvyan Adams, M.P., resulted in a valuable influx of enthusiastic helpers.

The branch at **Cranleigh**, which had been permitted to lapse, has now been revived as the result of a well-attended meeting.

A meeting at **Oxshott**, with Lord Ebbisham in the chair and Mr. Frederick Whelan as the speaker, resulted in a Branch being formed with a membership of 40.

We are asked by the hon. secretary of the **PORTISHEAD** Branch to explain that the outlying district of the Weston-super-Mare Branch, to which we alluded last month as having made a fine start in the National Canvass, referred to Portishead. He tells us that the 120 new members obtained in the first fortnight has now increased to 139, and that results are still being obtained.

Lady Power, the wife of Sir John Power, M.P., held a largely-attended reception on behalf of the League of Nations Union, to meet Viscount Cecil of Chelwood, at 38, Belgrave Square. Full details of the important personages who were present appeared in the principal London dailies.

BROADCASTING NOTES

Two talks on World Affairs will be given on April 13 and 20, at 10 p.m. These will be topical in character and the speaker will only be arranged at short notice.

On April 7 the "Conquest of the Air" series closes with a special programme in which there will not only be a vision of what future developments in the air may achieve, but various international experts will give their views.

From an ancient land, once called Persia, but now Iran—ruled over long ago by Ahasuerus, who "reigned from India even unto Ethiopia over an hundred and seven and twenty provinces"—there is coming on a visit to England the Rev. Ali Khan Nakhosteen, who is sub-agent for the work of the British and Foreign Bible Society in Iran, and one of the leading members of the Christian community in that country. On April 5 he will describe the changes and the progress which are taking place in the land of his birth.

EASTER IN THE WEST COUNTRY.

THERE is still time to register for the Easter School for the Study of Contemporary International Affairs, to be held from April 9 to 14 at Wills Hall, University of Bristol.

The syllabus includes a survey of Britain's place in world affairs during the reign of the late King and lectures on the foremost events of the last year.

There will be an opportunity to visit places of interest in and around Bristol, including the Cheddar Gorge, Wells, and Glastonbury.

The fee for the lecture course, with five days' accommodation at Wills Hall, is 3½ guineas, and registrations should be sent immediately to the Secretary, League of Nations Union, 15 Grosvenor Crescent, London, S.W.1.

OVERSEAS NOTES

A League of Nations Union Group in **Egypt** has been formed at Port Said—the hon. secretary is Mr. J. R. Kingsford. Since its formation in the autumn of 1935 the Group has grown rapidly and hopes to have 100 members enrolled by the end of March. A library of books on international affairs is being formed, a well-attended lecture has been held, as well as a debate on military sanctions. As a result of the lecture, the membership of the Group was increased by 20 and good publicity was obtained in the press.

On February 1, 1936, the "Popolo D'Italia" published an appeal from Signor Mussolini to the students of Europe, in which he attempted to justify the Italian Fascist invasion of Ethiopia and renewed the threat that economic sanctions mean war in Europe, for which the youth would bear the cost.

This appeal has had the effect of arousing a wave of protest from the students of every country.

The French Universities League of Nations Society passed the following resolution:—

The Bureau of the French Universities League of Nations Society, representing an association composed of thousands of professors and students outside party politics, supporting the former declarations made by the group with regard to the Italo-Ethiopian war;

Repudiates the appeal to students of Europe made by Signor Mussolini on February 1, 1936;

Declares its conviction that it is the loyal and immediate application of the Covenant which can limit the dispute and put an end to it;

Recalls that Italy has been recognised as the aggressor by 51 nations, and that, under these conditions, the measures taken against her are police measures and not war measures;

Recalls that this aggression has been committed after two refusals on the part of the Italian Government for a peaceful settlement of the dispute (in the month of August during the tripartite negotiations and in September, following the proposals of the Committee of Five, accepted by Ethiopia);

Considers that the Italian Government cannot mobilise all the youth of its country within the framework of the Fascist regime and at the same time preach revolt against order and the authority of the State in other countries; that it is not justified in proclaiming its horror of war while at the same time threatening the youth of Europe with a new slaughter;

States with emotion that war thus undertaken is further conducted by methods which constitute a violation of the old Hague conventions; Affirms once again its firm desire to uphold and to defend the League of Nations, the only organisation capable of maintaining and safeguarding the essential principle of collective security.

Geneva International Chalet.—A rustic but comfortable dwelling, called the Chalet International, is about to be opened in Geneva, just off the Place des Nations beside the new seat of the League of Nations and five minutes' walk from the seat of the International Labour Organisation. It will receive groups of young people who may spend some time visiting Geneva in order to study the great international institutions there established. The chalet, situated in a pleasant park, can accommodate some thirty young men and one dozen young women. Groups of at least 20 who reserve accommodation in advance can have board and lodging for 5 Swiss francs a day; larger groups at 4.75 or even 4.50, according to circumstances. The Chalet is still free for the month of July and from September 8 onwards. Groups desiring to occupy it in these periods should communicate immediately with the International Federation of League of Nations Societies, 46 route de Ferney, Geneva, which will gladly give any further information required. (Telegraphic address: Wilscnia, Geneve).

International Essay Competition for Youth.—The International Christian Youth Commission is organising for the second time, with the generous help of an American lady, Mrs. F. G. Van Loan, an International Essay Competition for Youth on the general subject: "Christ and World Friendship." The competition is open to young people of both sexes. Further information may be obtained from the World Alliance for International Friendship through the Churches, Youth Commission, 2, rue de Montchoisy, Geneva, Switzerland.

The 1936 **Journalists' Course** will take place in Geneva from July 6 to 15. The aim of the course is to give young journalists or those who intend to be journalists, an idea of the press of different countries and the responsibilities of the journalist, since to-day the newspapers play so great a part in forming public opinion. The idea originated at a conference held in Geneva by many youth organisations, at the time of the Disarmament Conference, to discuss the question of Moral Disarmament. The course is being

Start Reading AND SPEAKING a Foreign Language to-morrow!

The **PELMAN METHOD** means no drudgery
— grammar taken in your stride!

If that seems an extravagant claim for the Pelman Method of Learning Languages—you can test it by writing for a **free first lesson** here and now.

By the Pelman Method you cut out all drudgery because you learn **French, Spanish, German or Italian just as you once learnt your own language—only far more quickly.** In fact, you don't so much learn the new language as "pick it up." From the very first you actually use it. You absorb the grammar without realising, as you go along. No laborious translation—for you **think** in the new language. No memorising of vocabularies—for you automatically remember the words you keep reading and speaking. **And there are no classes to attend.** You pick up your foreign language by correspondence, in your spare time, in half the usual period.

Write to-day for the free Pelman book, "The Gift of Tongues," telling us which of the four editions you want—French, Spanish, German or Italian. The address is:

PELMAN INSTITUTE

114, Languages House, Bloomsbury Street,
London, W.C.1

PELMAN (OVERSEAS) INSTITUTES:

PARIS: 80 Boulevard Haussmann. NEW YORK: 271 North Avenue, New Rochelle. MELBOURNE: 396 Flinders Lane. JOHANNESBURG: P.O. Box 4928. DURBAN: Natal Bank Chambers (P.O. Box 1489). DELHI: 10 Alipore Road. CALCUTTA: 102 Clive Street. AMSTERDAM: Damrak 68.

sponsored by Mr. Vernon Bartlett, of the "News-Chronicle"; Mr. Malcolm Davis, Assistant Director of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace; M. Louis Joxe, Director of the Agence Havas; Professor Pitman B. Potter, of the Graduate Institute of International Studies at Geneva; Professor Ruysen, Secretary-General of the International Federation of League of Nations Societies; Clarence K. Streit, Geneva Correspondent of the "New York Times"; and M. St. Valot, Secretary-General of the International Federation of Journalists. Most of these will also speak. Requests for enrolment should be sent to 12, rue Calvin, Geneva, or to the Secretaries of National committees of the International Student Service. Some reports of last year's course are still available (price 2 Swiss francs or the equivalent), and may be had on application to Geneva.

The role of private organisations, both national and international, in creating and mobilising world opinion in relation to the Italo-Ethiopian Dispute is described in a study just published by the Geneva Research Centre, entitled: "**Public Opinion and the Italo-Ethiopian Dispute.**" As early as December, 1934, the report shows, such organisations began to demand League intervention in the developing conflict. During the early months of 1935, these groups were insistent in their demands that the League must act to preserve peace, and national organisations followed this initiative with demands for action by their own governments. All the decisions that the League has taken in an effort to settle the conflict seem to have been advocated earlier by private organisations. The study treats in detail the work of more than a hundred peace, women's, labour and religious organisations and that of groups interested in the welfare of coloured and colonial peoples. In addition, the reaction of public opinion in more than 30 national communities is summarised. Private organisations, the study shows, have not only supported the League in the present crisis. In their effort to establish a basis for permanent peace they have concerned themselves with the fundamental problems involved, such as the redistribution of colonial possessions and raw materials. The study is a comprehensive survey of the work of private organisations in an international political crisis, as well as a critical analysis of the role of unofficial action in the possible future of world government. Single copies may be obtained from the Geneva Research Centre, Geneva, Switzerland, for 1 Swiss franc. A special 25 per cent. reduction is offered to organisations placing block orders for ten or more studies.

WELSH NOTES

We record with deep regret the death of Councillor Walter Williams, of Whitchurch, Cardiff, and of Alderman E. R. Horsfall Turner, of Llanidloes—two of the most faithful and ardent workers for the Union in Wales. Both Mr. Walter Williams and Mr. Horsfall Turner were members of the Welsh Council's Executive Committee, and through their passing the Welsh Council has suffered irreparable loss.

The **Barry** Urban District Council has generously granted the free use of the Barry Memorial Hall for the meetings of the Welsh Council's Annual Conference, to be held at Barry on Friday and Saturday, June 12 and 13.

COUNCIL'S VOTE

The following Branches have completed their Council's vote payments for 1935:—

Aldeburgh, Brize-Norton, Burton Latimer, Broadstairs, Chichester, Chelmsford, Coggeshall, Duffield, Dunmow, Falmouth, Fernhurst, Hanley, Heathfield, Launceston, Lazonby and Kirkoswald, Nulford-on-Sea, Newcastle (Staffs.), Ongar, Pottersbury, Portslade, Roundhay, Rochford, Scotland (East, West and North), Stony Stratford, Teignmouth, Titchmarsh, Workington, Wickford, Wokingham.

For 1936:—Brislington, Glastonbury, Williton.

UNION MEMBERSHIP

Foundation Members: £1 a year (minimum). (To include HEADWAY, the journal of the Union, monthly, by post, and specimen copies of the pamphlets and similar literature issued by the Union.)

Registered Members: 5s. or more a year. (To include HEADWAY, or, if preferred, one of the subsidiary journals of the Union, by post, and occasional important notices.)

* 3s. 6d. or more a year. (To include HEADWAY, or, if preferred, one of the subsidiary journals of the Union, by post.)

Ordinary Members: 1s. a year minimum.

Life Members: £25.

* In Wales and Monmouthshire the minimum subscription for Registered Members is 5s. Particulars of the work can be had from *The Secretary, Welsh National Council, League of Nations Union, 10, Museum Place, Cardiff.*

A "TALKING" GOSPEL

Quite recently steps were taken to have "talking" books prepared for the blind, and quite a number of such books on a variety of subjects have already been produced.

The Bible Society has defrayed the cost of having St. John's Gospel prepared as a "talking" book, and the result is a record of the Gospel, which, spoken by a trained and sympathetic voice, makes a deep impression upon the hearer.

The Bible Society has decided to have St. Luke's Gospel similarly recorded.

By means of Braille the Society has long had a share in making the Scriptures available for the blind, and through the invention of "talking" books it hopes to help still further in bringing God's Word to those who have lost their sight.

A "talking" Gospel may lead to a "talking" New Testament.

BRITISH & FOREIGN BIBLE SOCIETY,
146, Queen Victoria Street, London, E.C.4.

CHILDREN OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS



Printed in brilliant colours, with a brief description of the country concerned on the reverse of each card.



Two sets of 6 cards, price 1/- per set or 1/6 for the complete issue.



Obtainable from the Union's Book Shop.