

LEAGUE OF NATIONS UNION

THE ANNOUNCEMENT and form on page 19 of the September HEADWAY are not intended for Union members.

Members and Corporate Members of the Union are asked to continue to pay their subscriptions, augmented, if possible, by an additional contribution towards the cost of HEADWAY, to their Branch Secretaries or to the Secretary of the Union at the Head Office, 15, Grosvenor Crescent, London, S.W.1.

LYTTON,

Chairman, Executive Committee.

BRITISH LIBRARY
12 SEP 1939
OF POLITICAL AND
ECONOMIC SCIENCE

51083

HEADWAY

TOWARDS FREEDOM AND PEACE

VOL. 1. No. 12

SEPTEMBER 1939

PRICE 3d.

TO EVERY HEADWAY READER

Some day peace will return. Even to-day no service to humanity can be more valuable than honest thought given to the building of an ordered world.

Somewhere must be saved a meeting place of minds. Some means must be kept for communication between the leaders of collective sanity and their many but scattered supporters. The results of hard thinking and close eager discussion must be published in order that the nation may come to know of them. Good sense must continue its struggle even amidst the smoke and flames of disaster. There is no other hope.

After reading the present number of Headway carefully, will every subscriber please turn to page 19 and complete the form printed there.

HEADWAY

TOWARDS FREEDOM AND PEACE

Editorial Offices 17, Devereux Court, Strand, London.

VOL. 1

SEPTEMBER 1939

No. 12

CONTENTS

	Page		Page
WHY THE FREE NATIONS MUST MAKE A STAND	2	THE SOVIET-GERMAN PACT. By Louis Segal	8
BRITAIN UNITED IN DEFENCE OF FREEDOM, JUSTICE AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY	3	BEHIND THE NEWS	10
YESTERDAY AND TO-MORROW. By Wickham Steed	4	HEADWAY'S CORRESPONDENTS DESCRIBE LAST HOURS OF PEACE: EN ROUTE FROM BERLIN; PARIS; WASHINGTON	13
PARLIAMENT AND PEOPLE. By Ronald Cartland, M.P.	6	THE KING TO HIS PEOPLES	15
ACROSS GERMANY UNDER THE SHADOW. By an English Girl	7	FORGOTTEN CZECHOSLOVAKIA. By Eleanor Rathbone, M.P.	16
		THE VERSAILLES TREATY. By Maurice Fanshawe	17

"It is a Naked Claim that Might Belongs to Germany, and that Might is Right"

WHY THE FREE NATIONS MUST MAKE A STAND

A STATEMENT BY THE OFFICERS OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS UNION.

AS we write these lines the future is still uncertain. But, whatever the issue of the present crisis, one thing is clear. The nations of Europe cannot go on existing as separate units, owning no duties one to another; they must have some sort of international control. It was hoped after the World War that such control would be provided by the League of Nations; but during the last seven or eight years the nations outside the League and actively opposed to the League have increased in strength and audacity, the League has been increasingly ignored, and nationalism of the most extreme type has flourished without check. The failure of the Disarmament Conference has been followed by a vast competitive increase in national armaments, and that in its turn has led to a further growth of suspicion, fear and unrest, until we now find ourselves living in a state of continual crisis.

It is impossible that this state of things should continue. It may culminate in war, but that will be no solution. When the war is over the problem will remain. For the moment there is nothing to be done except to express our full readiness to submit all differences to third party judgment, to maintain our treaty obligations and to strengthen our forces, so that aggression may be defeated.

If the German Government has any confidence in the justice of its claims, let it put them before some Court or Conference. We hear a great deal about Danzig being

in reality a German town. It is a predominantly German town situated in territory that is predominantly Polish. But that is not the point. If it were far more German than it is, that is no excuse for the German policy of violence. No pretence is made that Hitler's followers in Danzig are being ill-treated. On the contrary, they have complete control of the Danzig government. Furthermore, the rights of both the German and the Polish inhabitants are secured to them by definite agreements administered by an independent Commission appointed by the League of Nations—the only arrangement which, if it were allowed to work, could assure good control of the Danzig government. The complaints, and they are many, come from the Polish minority and the Germans who are not Nazis. Furthermore, even if there were any national German grievances, there is ample provision for their peaceful redress, since the rights of both Poles and Germans are secured to them by definite agreements administered by an independent Commission appointed by the League of Nations.

But redress of grievances is not what the Nazis want. They represent the old German policy of conquest, made doubly intense by the natural psychology of a beaten nation, longing to redeem its defeat and recover all, and more than all, that it has lost. They want to show the world that they are above negotiation, that they can take

SEPTEMBER 1939

HEADWAY

3

Danzig or any other place by force, and that no one either can or dare stop them. It is a naked claim that Might belongs to Germany, and that Might is Right.

If that claim be conceded, the whole basis of international security is gone. Therefore we and the French and others have determined to resist it.

But that is not enough. It is intolerable that the lives and happiness of millions of human beings should depend on the arbitrary will of a single man or even of a single government. It was to prevent precisely this evil that the League of Nations was established. For ten years with growing authority it preserved the peace of Europe and fostered international co-operation. Then came its much-advertised "failure." A steady increase of armed strength and national ambition in the anti-League Powers, accompanied by weakness, lack of cohesion and indecision on the part of the principal members of the League culminated in a complete failure to enforce the peace provisions of the Covenant. Whatever occurs in the present crisis, we of the League of Nations Union must work as we have never worked before to re-establish the League, in the words of our Royal Charter, "as the guardian of international right, the organ of international co-operation, the final arbiter in international differences and the supreme instrument for removing injustices which may threaten the peace of the world." At present the League is, as it were, in cold storage. Its machinery is intact, and as soon as its members decide to operate it, is ready to resume its functions.

Let us be clear. We in this country have no territorial or other national ambitions. We do not desire to elevate

our own country or to crush Germany. All we wish is to see established some international system under which all nations may prosper and live in safety. We want to put an end to this insane squandering of wealth by all nations on their rival armaments. We recognise that this can only be achieved if nations are freed from their present fears and can rely on the effective protection of strong law-abiding Powers against attack by marauders. That and that only will make it possible to have a general reduction and limitation of armaments by international agreement.

Beyond that we freely admit that from time to time it may be right to have modifications of boundaries and other political changes; but they must be carried out peacefully under the supervision of an international authority, with due regard to all rights affected. So, too, with regard to colonies; we are ready to consider re-adjustments, perhaps on the lines recently suggested by Lord Halifax. Nor do we underrate the immense importance of economic reforms which will do away with those barriers to international trade which have done so much harm in the past. All these things and more can and should be considered; but only on the fulfilment of the preliminary condition that violence between nations is abjured and the supremacy of law and justice acknowledged both in word and in deed.

GILBERT MURRAY,
KATHLEEN D. COURTNEY,
HERBERT S. SYRETT,
LYTTON,
CECIL.

BRITAIN UNITED IN DEFENCE OF FREEDOM, JUSTICE AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

(THE PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Neville Chamberlain):

We shall enter this struggle, which we earnestly endeavoured to avoid, with a clear conscience, with the support of the Dominions and the British Empire, and the moral approval of the greater part of the world. We have no quarrel with the German people except that they allow themselves to be governed by a Nazi Government. So long as that Government exists and pursues the methods it has so persistently followed during the last two years there will be no peace in Europe.

We shall merely pass from one crisis to another and see one country after another attacked by methods which have now become familiar to us in their sickening technique. We are resolved that these methods must come to an end. If out of the struggle we can re-establish in the world the rules of good faith and the renunciation of force, why then even the sacrifices that will be entailed upon us will find their fullest justification.

THE DEPUTY LEADER OF THE LABOUR PARTY (Mr. Arthur Greenwood) speaking for his party in the absence through illness of the Leader (Mr. C. R. Attlee):

I now reaffirm and say, for the third time in this House during the present crisis, that British Labour stands by its pledged word. We shall, at whatever cost, in the interests of the liberty of the world in the future, use all our resources to defend ourselves and others against aggression.

THE LEADER OF THE LIBERAL PARTY (Sir Archibald Sinclair):

It was not Britain, it was not France, it was not Poland that refused to come to the table to negotiate. It was Herr Hitler. It is now abundantly clear that the war started, not this morning in Poland, but three years ago with the occupation of the Rhineland, the war to establish the domination of Nazi Germany in Europe and in the world, a war in which successive and temporarily successful moves have been played in

Spain, Austria, Czecho-Slovakia, and last of all in Russia.

Every move has strengthened the forces of aggression and weakened those of law and reason, negotiation and peace.

Let us, in this solemn moment, set the goal of our endeavour clearly before us, not the aggrandisement of our country and Empire, not merely the defeat of Nazi tyranny. Tyranny has been defeated before, aggression has been defeated before, dictatorship has been defeated before, and it has sprung up again. Let us keep before us the necessity for constructive effort for the reconstruction of that new order in Europe which before the emergence of National-Socialism in Germany we were beginning slowly and faithfully, with many setbacks, but on the whole not unsuccessfully to build, an order based not on the sanction of power politics, but on the sanctity of moral law in which freedom, justice, and equality of economic opportunity will be guaranteed to nations great and small alike.

YESTERDAY AND TO-MORROW

By WICKHAM STEED

The famous authority on Central Europe, formerly Editor of "The Times," author of "Vital Peace."

LONDON, August 31.

THOSE who take thought for to-morrow need also to think of to-day and yesterday. From the standpoint of to-morrow our yesterday is a record of error and folly, not to say betrayal. The names "Manchuria," "Abyssinia," "Spain," "Munich," and "Prague" are writ large upon them. We may try to forget them. The world remembers. And since our to-morrow, if it is to be peace, may depend upon what the world thinks of us, we need to ponder our recent past.

To-day we are engaged in a "white war," a "war of nerves." Some think we have won it. I cannot yet share their confidence. They seem to imagine that the contest of wills and brains which has gone on since the spring, and became acute after the Russo-German "Pact of Non-Aggression," must issue before long either in deadly war or in a "settlement by negotiation." Some think and say that even war, with all its terrors and horrors, would be preferable to an indefinite period of uncertainty and strain.

The War of Nerves

To think thus might be the very way to lose the "war of nerves." In it we have a redoubtable adversary. Since I first read "Mein Kampf" (in the original) more than ten years ago I have loathed the doctrines, as I have since come to loathe the deeds, of Herr Hitler. I have failed to understand how so many of our politicians could visit and converse with him as though he were like unto themselves. But I have always rated Hitler's powers very high—his swift intuitive understanding of the weak points in the characters of his opponents, the shrewdness of his cunning, the ruthless brutality of his action, and the calculated deceitfulness which have made of him one of the most formidable factors in the international situation since January, 1933.

We are inclined to think that our nerves are strong because we were not "rattled" by the Russo-German Pact and because we are resolved, and bound by treaty, to stand by Poland should she resist in arms any attack upon her vital interests and independence. Are we not a calm and united nation, ready to keep our word, come what may? Doubtless. But have we measured the strain to which our resolution and our resources may be subjected? What if the "war of nerves" were only now beginning? What if Hitler intends to keep us and our allies on tenterhooks for weeks and months, trusting that the financial and economic cost of preparedness for instant war will end by leading us or Poland to prefer an "agreed settlement" to ordeal by battle?

We Must Know Why We Failed

How, in these circumstances, can we turn our thoughts to to-morrow? "Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof." In my view this is precisely where "yesterday" and "to-morrow" come in. We need to think why we failed "yesterday" to uphold the only great and good thing that had seemed to come out of the war of 1914-1918—the ideal which the League Covenant was meant to serve and the League of Nations progressively to realise. In my own mind the answer to this question has long been clear; and it is twofold. The nations whose Governments entered the League were not prepared to surrender enough of their national sovereignties to make a reality of collective security

against aggression. Many of them clung to the conception of neutrality—as an attribute of national sovereignty—without understanding that neutrality between the method of violence and the method of inquiry and third-party judgment in international affairs is the same thing as the neutrality between wrong and right, which the members of every civilised community have found to be incompatible with social peace. Until nations are prepared to abandon their sovereign right to be neutral between aggressors and the victims of aggression there can be no organised peace in the world.

Strength of War's Appeal

This is the first part of my answer. The second part is more general and, perhaps, more hopeful. It is that the earnest men who framed the League Covenant after the Great War were hardly aware of the immensity and the difficulty of the task they were undertaking. Most of them did not fully realise the strength of war as a human institution or the potency of its appeal to the minds of men. For countless generations war had been the supreme expression of political activity. It had determined the scale of social honour. Often the right to hold property had been contingent upon the performance of military service. It was looked upon as a full-blooded, adventurous enterprise, to which the best brains and the most resolute characters should be devoted. Merely because war had become more destructive, was it likely that the peoples of the earth would henceforth turn their minds to peace, conceived as non-war, and be satisfied with riskless lives in growing ease and plenty? In a word, the supporters of collective security as a pledge of peace failed to keep their hold upon men's imaginations because they conceived peace negatively, as non-war, instead of conceiving it boldly as a far higher, nobler, and more risky adventure than war itself could ever be.

If my twofold answer to the question why the supporters of non-war and the League have suffered a serious setback, not to say defeat, is in any way adequate, it seems to follow that what we need to-day, and must work for to-morrow, is precisely a truer and fuller conception of the nature of peace itself. Without such a conception, without an enlightened and passionate faith in the possibility of building a better future for mankind, we may not even be able to win the present "war of nerves." We need an ideal and a policy that shall sustain our minds and direct our activities, whether armed conflict now come upon us or not. And both the ideal and the policy must be strong, not weak.

What should they be? We have no cause to be ashamed of, or to renounce the aspirations cherished by, the makers of the League Covenant, true though it be that mere harping upon the League Covenant will warm few hearts and rekindle few old enthusiasms to-day. The ideal must be to transform any grouping of nations against aggression into a federation or, still better, a union of peoples set for constructive, positive peace, and counting their own sovereignties as dust in the balance when weighed against this higher need of mankind. It must be an ideal of deliberate sacrifice, on the part of those who hold it, for a cause loftier than their own material interests. They must be pioneers and pathfinders, bound together in a vigilant and determined brotherhood. On no account should they make universality their first aim. Just as the

strength of a chain equals the weakness of its weakest link, so the strength of a peace ideal and a peace policy will be determined by the solidity of the bonds between their supporters. Few and firm are better than many and half-hearted.

Liberal Civilisation

The reason for this is plain. Peace can only be built upon what we understand by "liberal civilisation." It cannot be founded upon dictatorships or military alliances concluded for limited and specific national purposes. Still less can it be made by "settlements" with totalitarian gangsterdom. Respect for the human personality and for human rights must be its first principle; and its second, responsible freedom within the framework of laws freely made by representative democratic institutions. Toleration, without which there can be no true freedom, must be among its watchwords, with the sole exception that intolerance—racial, religious, or social—cannot be tolerated. And all members of a peace union among the nations of liberal faith must be ready to stand, in arms if need be, against tyrannical dictatorships and totalitarian systems of every sort.

This ideal and this policy may seem to-day fantastic impracticabilities. I am convinced that they are far nearer to being practical possibilities than many imagine. Even in countries like Germany and Italy millions would respond to the call and rise at the touch of freedom in peace did they know that this ideal is resolutely sustained even by a minority among the free peoples of the earth to-day.

For Sake of Mankind

None of us can know what the immediate morrow may bring. It may bring war, bloodshed, destruction, suffering, and death. Should war come it must be won for the sake of mankind. To win it we need faith in victory, a faith more passionate than any totalitarian ideology or system can inspire. Such a faith might move mountains and work miracles. Sometimes, in the dark hours through which we have been and are passing, the closing lines of Kipling's poem "The Dawn Wind" ring through my memory and make me wonder whether the hour he foretold may not be much nearer at hand than the most hopeful among us supposes. They run:—

"So when the world is asleep, and there seems no hope of her waking

Out of some long, bad dream that makes her mutter and moan,

Suddenly, all men arise to the noise of fetters breaking,
And everyone smiles at his neighbour and tells him
his soul is his own."

In this spirit let us take thought for to-morrow.

MENTAL HOSPITAL & INSTITUTIONAL WORKERS' UNION.

London Office: Swinton House, 324, Gray's Inn Road, LONDON, W.C.1.
Head Office: 1, Rushford Avenue, Levenshulme, MANCHESTER, 19.
Gen. Sec.: GEORGE GIBSON.

Mental Nurses await the introduction of the "Nurses' Charter."



SHOE makers, electricians, moulders, tinsmiths, millers, tailors, jam boilers, tobacco workers, weavers, wood workers . . . nearly sixty thousand of these employees will again draw their usual full trade-union wages at the end of this week—thanks to you.

They'll greet the coming week with a happiness which springs from an enviable sense of security, based on the knowledge that their working conditions are second to none and that their jobs are as secure as can be. All this is thanks to you. Your support of C.W.S. products, which you buy regularly at your local Co-operative Society, ensures these things. Because the C.W.S. exists "to Serve, and not to extract profit from, the people."



WITH AN INTERNATIONAL REPUTATION

PARLIAMENT AND PEOPLE

By RONALD CARTLAND, M.P.

At the last moment before joining his regiment he has set down for "Headway" his impressions of the critical meeting of Parliament on August 24. He writes without awareness of what will be in the minds of his readers, that he at least has little to reproach himself with in his Parliamentary action. He has not been blind to the approach of disaster nor has the policy which he has advocated lacked courage

FOR some time past our experience has been that, more often than not, a sudden change of circumstance has made the speech prepared in the morning out of date by the time for its delivery in the evening. But never have events moved with such rapidity and caused such a perplexity as those which shocked and amazed us in the week of August 21. On the Monday of that week I wrote my article for this page and sent it to the Editor. Within twenty-four hours the situation made it necessary that I should re-write nearly every word.

After Three Weeks

When Parliament adjourned on August 4 a number of us felt certain that before the end of the month we should have to be recalled, and the signs and portents from abroad seemed to us to presage the imminence of war. The Labour Opposition demanded the recall of the House for August 21, the Liberals for the following day. Mr. Chamberlain promised, without acceding to any specific date, that the House would be recalled on the request of the Government (Mr. Speaker alone has the right to accept or reject the Government's advice) if a change in the international situation warranted it. On August 24 both Houses met.

Members and Cabinet Ministers had scattered, but none, I think, can seriously have contemplated a recess until October 3, the date originally laid down by the Government for the limit of our holiday. Indeed, Mr. Chamberlain himself said as much in the opening of his speech on the 24th.

But few, too, can have contemplated that on our meeting we should be faced with a German-Soviet agreement, our own negotiations still unfinished, and our own and the French Military Missions still in Moscow.

In Sombre Mood

Members met in sombre mood. This was not quite the eleventh hour. There was still, though none knew how or where, the chance of peace. But the possibility of war—it seemed evident to all—had been enormously increased by Russia's treachery to the Peace Front. As treachery nearly every member regarded it. Mr. Logan, from the Labour benches, was more outspoken than anyone; he received general cheers as he declared:—

"It is no use telling me that the cooing doves of Moscow or the wonderful emancipators of Berlin are any good to the human race. I detest them both."

The Prime Minister said he himself would not judge until he had more information. Most members were prepared to follow his line, though, in Sir Archibald Sinclair's words, "it seemed incomprehensible." Of course, there were some who gloried that they, who had never trusted the Russians, had now been proved right. But these were few.

Indeed, the unity of the Commons was remarkable and impressive. If any had wanted, all the arguments were there ready to hand for a bitter onslaught against the Government. But criticism was put aside. Partiality and prejudice, which, in the prayer used daily in the Commons, we ask we may lay aside, were on that Thursday readily abandoned. The feeling of the nation was paramount, and could any one of us, wherever we sat, whatever our label, doubt what the feeling of the nation was?

No Signs of Fear

And so we gathered, 500 of us; more silent than usual, more serious, but without sign of fear. The Chamber to me was almost unbearably stuffy. Others remarked on it, too. Later, the windows were opened; most of us had been for a week or so at least in the open air.

Mr. Attlee's return after his illness was seized on as an obvious opportunity to demonstrate our unity. Cheers for him and, of course, for the Prime Minister. But otherwise the day was singularly free from cheers. Members sat impressively silent throughout the speeches of Mr. Chamberlain, Mr. Greenwood, and Sir Archibald Sinclair. Later, as the debate was rather unnecessarily protracted, the House took on its more usual appearance of ceaseless movement and restlessness. Mr. Eden held it for a few minutes—his intervention was very brief. From no one was absent for long the thought that minutes wasted now might, in the very near future, be paid for in hours or days, the loss of which in turn might be reckoned in human sacrifice.

Somehow, when one thought of the future, the scene was unreal. The words one listened to did not register,

as one's thoughts did, the horrors of war. The speeches seemed out of focus to the picture one's imagination so easily, so terribly conjured up.

Memories of Munich

The heightened emotions of last September were absent. The dramatics—the Berchtesgaden flight, the Godesberg ultimatum, the dénouement of the Munich invitation—were missing. Mr. Chamberlain looked grey, his voice very quiet. "God knows I have tried my best!" It was a cry from the heart, the cry of a man who sees he can do no more. Was the burden intolerable? Neither of the Opposition leaders was at his best. Both were a little too long.

Yet there was little to be said. The nation's mind was clear. Germany's intentions were plain. The German-Soviet embrace may have put us in the cold. It also left us cold. Later, perhaps, would come explanation and recrimination. Now was the time for resolution.

Many questions, of course, arose for discussion in the lobby and in the smoking-room. The formation of a War Cabinet came in for particular attention. Mr. Amery made mention of it in his speech, and it was fairly generally felt that a War Cabinet should be instituted on the immediate declaration of war. Some people would have liked immediate mobilisation. When maybe hours alone separated us from the first bombardment there was much to be said for no delay in putting war plans into operation.

Calm and Clear

But calm was the order of the day. Never, surely, can Parliament have appeared more calm and more clear in its mind as to where its duty lay on that Thursday afternoon of August 24.

Late that evening I travelled home. In my train were some reservists off to join their stations. If they were aware of the dangers that threatened, not one of them apparently gave a thought to them. I have yet to find a man or a woman who would have us shirk the issue or who is not quietly confident that right, whatever our tribulations, will triumph; that England, however violent the course ahead, will through the strength of her people conquer the tyranny of those who have set out to destroy the supreme values of life.

ACROSS GERMANY UNDER THE SHADOW

By AN ENGLISH GIRL

IN a crowded theatre in Budapest peasants wearing the costumes of their villages were dancing to traditional airs. I spent a delightful evening watching them. Except for the enthusiastic applause which greeted the words of a song during a "conscriptio dance" and the fact that dancers from a district recently regained by Hungary after the break-up of Czechoslovakia were loudly cheered, international troubles seemed very far away.

Next morning I received a wire from home advising my immediate return. I called at the British Consul's office and was told that though there was "nothing definite" except the signing of the non-aggression pact between Germany and Russia, I ought to get home by the quickest possible route. As that lay through Germany by Vienna, Munich, and Cologne I left on the four o'clock afternoon train for Vienna.

Five Nationalities in One Carriage

The compartment was a veritable League of Nations. There were Belgians, Dutch, Hungarians, Germans, and English; and as everyone could make themselves understood in at least one of the other languages, conversation became general and most amusing. Everyone agreed that they "Didn't want a war," but we did not talk much about politics. This time there was no difficulty at the frontier, and the train arrived in Vienna almost to time. The people were not allowed on to the platforms there because a large company of soldiers was waiting to entrain. As I was already inside the platform barriers I had no difficulty in finding my way to the train for Munich; I was both cheered and saddened to find that the soldiers who were crowding into a train alongside mine were little more than boys, instead of the grimly efficient warriors they had seemed when drawn up in full equipment on the platform. Those steel trench helmets have the same formidable effect as our policeman's headgear.

The compartment this time contained three sleepy civilians, and a private soldier from Sudetenland with a small suitcase filled with apples. He told us where his apples came from as he affably handed them round. There was also one of Hitler's black uniformed guards, of a very different type from the soldier. Not knowing whether war had broken out yet or not, I just nodded and smiled in response to remarks. As we rattled on our way I studied the face of the "black guard" opposite to me, and decided that he would make a good friend or a bad enemy. The hard lines about his mouth made it possible to believe the stories of the ill-treatment they give to Jews and political prisoners, yet the kindness in his face when he smiled made me wish that he could be used for something better than the maintenance of Nazi rule in Germany. In the meantime I tried to appear as German as possible myself!

At 7.30 a.m. we arrived in Munich to find the station crammed with people, loud speakers roaring instructions beginning "Achtung! Achtung!" (a sound I'll hear all my life) and warning people that after ten o'clock that night trains would not be available. All Germany seemed to be travelling home from holiday with baggage and babies.

Crowds at Cologne

The train for Cologne was full. People were standing two deep along the corridors, luggage was piled everywhere, being sat on and tripped over, and every doorway was filled with people who couldn't move to let another person inside. Luckily for me a small group of people hurrying up and down the platform found an unopened door at the

end of the restaurant car. The handle turned and we piled into the space between the dining-car and the kitchen. Then we saw that there were some seats round the set tables, and so we sat down, and in about an hour, after the train had started, breakfast was served. I made mine spin out as long as possible, firstly because I had only a few marks and saw no prospect of changing any more Reichsmarks, and secondly, because while I was eating I had a seat!

At last we were asked to move as they were going to serve the first lunch, and so we adjourned to our space between the dining-car and the kitchen, and all Sunday I stood there or shared a small wooden tip-up seat, while the waiters served non-stop lunch to relays of passengers who pushed, climbed, and wriggled along the crowded corridors, and I grew hungrier and hungrier as the steaming dishes passed within inches of my nose! About six o'clock the lunches were over and I was able to get a glass of tea and a cake—which I could afford. There had certainly been no shortage of food on that train, for those that could pay for it.

Outside there was no sign of Sunday traffic on the roads, only a few bicycles, groups of strolling people, and bathers by the rivers. Petrol was evidently being rationed already. Along the railway, in sidings, were engines standing in groups of five or six with steam up ready for use, and every bridge was guarded by a sentry.

The passengers near by soon found I was English, and

Craven 'A'
For your throat's sake

- Your throat is safe with Craven 'A'. Their coolness and smoothness make smoking a real pleasure.
- Craven 'A' never vary. Wherever you buy them, you'll find these cork-tipped cigarettes have the real touch of quality.
- Freshness makes your smoking satisfying—that's why Craven 'A' are sealed fresh inside in moisture-proof Cellophane.

10 for 6s 4d
20 for 11s 6d
MADE SPECIALLY TO PREVENT SORE THROATS
C.A. 733

Carreras Ltd.—150 years' Reputation for Quality

those who could speak my language were very kind. We all hoped there would be no war, but now some of the people looked worried and were curious to know why I was returning home. Had I been told to go by our Government? I said I had received a wire from my home and didn't mention the Consul's advice. There seemed no need to worry such kindly people more than I could help, and the thought that soon they might be in danger from our war machine was just as bad as the thought of the danger we might find in England from theirs.

Friendly Workers

As the train was four hours late at Cologne I had missed the Ostend connection, and the people round me were not hopeful as to my chance of catching another train to Ostend after ten o'clock. One lady spoke to me quietly, saying that if I didn't get a train to Ostend I should try to get on to one of the Dutch boats going to Rotterdam down the Rhine. She said they took passengers, and gave me minute instructions where to find their pier. When we arrived in Cologne everyone shook hands and hoped I'd soon be at home.

So far, so good. Every official I spoke to said there was no train to Ostend that night and shrugged when I asked if there would be one in the morning. I knew that the German Customs station on the Belgian border was at Aachen, and asked about a train. Yes, there was one at 10.20! If only I could get near to the frontier, I thought, even the police would let me go over, and I hoped that if war did start, Belgium would be allowed to remain neutral.

There were great crowds waiting for the Aachen train, and when it arrived it stopped far down the platform and we all rushed for it. I was struggling along with my heavy case when I felt it taken out of my hand by a workman, and he and his friends and I all piled into a dark mail van at the front of the train and sat round the walls! It was very dark and very crowded. Next to me was the man who had carried my case; he had been a prisoner of war in the Isle of Man for over three years, and spoke good English. He said he had made many friends here—that he liked the English people very much, but that he could not understand our politics. Why did we interfere with them? Danzig was German—our support of the Poles, an uncivilised people, had made them cocksure, and they were now behaving disgracefully, etc., etc.

I was not brave enough to start an argument, so I held

my tongue and merely shook my head, and we talked about the Isle of Man. As had happened earlier in the day, a man spoke to me just before he left the train, saying, "If there is no train to Ostend, and I don't think there will be, just go to the — Hotel, say I sent you, and you will be all right for to-night!" I thanked him gratefully, and when the train arrived in Aachen about midnight everyone round about shook hands and hoped I'd soon be home.

Welcome Fellow Countryman

I found myself in the swiftly emptying Aachen main station, not in Aachen Sud, where the Customs and Passport officials had examined our luggage and stamped our passports on the incoming journey—so I tried to find out if I could get a train for that station, being determined to get within sight of the border, even if it meant sitting on my case under a hedge all night! There was a young Englishman at the booking-office and we joined forces automatically. I was never so glad to see one of my countrymen in my life! We were given tickets for Aachen Sud, but no one seemed to know if and when there would be a train. Someone thought there might be a train about 2.30 a.m., so we waited hopefully between Platforms 2 and 3, which had received the most votes, and, although there were sentries outside the station, the lights were still blazing away, so we decided that nothing had happened yet. At last a train drew in, and immediately about ten uniformed officials, led by a black guard, assembled on the platform, locking the gate behind them. There was only one more passenger and ourselves, so it all seemed rather dramatic. As we had agreed that I should do all the talking, as people would be more inclined to help an English girl than an English man at such a time, I asked one of the officials if the train went to Aachen Sud. He shook his head, but the black guard must have heard me, for he came along and said, "Ostend." I could have embraced him!

We climbed on board. Our passports and money were checked and passed, and in another half-hour we were over the frontier and through the Belgian customs. By eleven o'clock on Monday morning we were steaming across the Channel; the sea was calm and blue, and on the horizon was a white-sailed ship. The feeling of gladness at being among my own people once more was giving way to sadness over the possibility of war in a world that now seemed so beautiful against a nation that held so many kindly folk.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE SOVIET-GERMAN PACT

By LOUIS SEGAL, M.A., Ph.D., Dr.Phil.

IF by the time these lines appear in print we are in a state of war, or appreciably nearer to one, it will be due, in a very large measure, to the existence of the Soviet-German Pact. Whoever may bear the responsibility for its conclusion, there is no reasonable ground for denial that it has increased considerably the tension in Europe.

When enthusiasts in this country claim it as "a victory for peace" surely they speak with their tongues in

their checks. They cannot seriously believe that Hitler has all of a sudden become such an adept of peace that he has taken all this trouble to secure a pact for its strengthening. The reverse is, of course, true. The prospect of Russia's neutrality in a struggle between two such evenly balanced coalitions as those that are facing one another at the present time in Europe, might induce a man of Hitler's mentality to risk the gamble of a war.

For years now the Germans have successfully fooled the people in Great Britain and in many other countries. By feigning a desire to fight Russia they have gained the support of powerful financial and political groups who regard Bolshevism as their chief enemy. For years those who have been trying to explain that Germany was not preparing for a war against Russia, from which she can gain nothing, but against France and Great Britain, in the hope

of repartitioning the world, have been ignored by the "experts." The result was that while Germany was helped to rearm and to strengthen her financial position, no opportunity was missed to snub Russia and treat her as non-existent. Her efforts to strengthen the League of Nations were thwarted, and while Russia wanted to see the Spanish Government victorious, the Governments of the two democracies acted in such a manner as to leave no doubt which cause they were championing. The shameful and painful surrender of Czechoslovakia has also left very bitter memories.

New and Tangible

The pact should not be regarded too lightly, although its scope may be limited to mutual non-aggression. Germany and Russia already had what amounts to a non-aggression pact which was concluded in 1926 and confirmed by Hitler in 1933. The first pact was never denounced and was still valid when the second was negotiated. It is unlikely that Germany would have sent Ribbentrop to conclude a pact that was already existing. The elation of the German Press must be regarded as other evidence that what was obtained was new and of tangible value.

It is true that Hitler concludes pacts with the greatest of ease and the maximum of cynicism, whenever it suits his purpose and denounces them as soon as they have achieved their aim and have become a hindrance to the realisation of his schemes. But the present pact is an exception. Germany has no territorial claims on Russia, and Hitler knows something of Russia's strength. He is aware that a struggle with the Soviets could only end in the ultimate defeat of Germany. That is why when he decided to burn his ships by exposing his own anti-Comintern fraud and by becoming friends with those whom he constantly denounced, he must have realised that he was starting on a new path from which a return would be either difficult or impossible.

Threat to South-East

Russia would, no doubt, denounce the pact should Hitler attempt to attack the Baltic States and threaten to become too near a neighbour. But Hitler has enough work to do in other directions, and can afford to leave the Baltic States alone. It must, therefore, be assumed that after the settlement of the Danzig problem, if he succeeds, his next attempt will be to secure his hegemony in South-Eastern Europe.

Russia has secured by the new pact a free hand in the Far East, and she need no longer worry over Japanese threats. Japan will, no doubt, have to modify

her policy towards Outer Mongolia and the Soviet Union in general. She may even be forced to seek an understanding with Great Britain and abandon her present policy towards the other states interested in the Far East.

The gain in the Far East alone, however, would not have justified for Russia the conclusion of the pact. It is evident that there must have been other factors of a serious nature which induced the Soviet Government to accept the repeated offers made by Germany and start negotiations. And for this a considerable proportion of the blame must be apportioned to both Great Britain and France, who definitely played into the hands of Germany. Russia was all the time suspicious that while negotiating with her for an agreement a deal would be concluded with the Axis Powers which would result in throwing Russia to the wolves. So serious was this fear that Stalin thought it necessary to warn the democracies that two can play at that game, and that Russia too could conclude an agreement with Germany, a warning that was entirely ignored.

When Litvinov Went

The dismissal of Litvinov should have been an eye-opener to those responsible for this policy, and should have induced a change of tactics. Nothing happened, and the old game was continued causing considerable irritation.

So great was the suspicion that neither Great Britain nor France were seriously desiring to conclude an agreement that the Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Supreme Soviet, Zhdanov, was constrained to write a letter to the Russian Press in which he expressed "his own private opinion" while protesting against the delays in the negotiations and reminding his readers that: "Of the seventy-five days, the Soviet Government required sixteen days to prepare answers to various British drafts and proposals, whereas the

rest of the fifty-nine days passed in delays and procrastinations on the part of the British and French."

The answer to all these warnings was an outbreak of appeasement speeches by three leading members of the British Government in one week-end, and an attack by an ex-Ambassador of the proposed agreement with Russia, after the Prime Minister had spent a week-end with him. It was inevitable that all this should be regarded in Russia as an attempt to join the Axis Powers. The subsequent talk of a £1,000,000,000 loan to Germany only strengthened that suspicion.

Russia Has Blundered

In spite of all this trafficking the Soviet Government should have stood by Great Britain and France, and used her endeavours to prevent war. On the evidence at present available the pact is as serious a blunder as any government has ever committed, and Russia's loss from the transaction will be great. She has on her own volition condemned herself to an isolation more nearly complete than any possible combination of enemies could have imposed upon her. Before very long Stalin will discover that lasting friendship with a regime as egoistically aggressive as that in Germany is an utter impossibility.

Here's a rather important correction...



I should have said

HōVIS TRADE MARK



and not just Brown

BEST BAKERS BAKE IT

BEHIND THE NEWS

LEAGUE COULD HAVE SUCCEEDED

WAR has begun. To save mankind from horror the League of Nations was created. After twenty years it has failed.

In the moment of disaster the plain truth must be put on record in the plainest words. The League could have succeeded; war could have been prevented.

War has come because the League had not been worked, because statesmen have had little foresight, principle, courage, because the peoples have submitted to leadership in which those essential qualities have been lacking.

Great events are not brought about by momentary causes. They are long in the making. The seeds from which has sprung the poison crop of 1939 were planted before 1919. If there had been fuller and freer discussion during the last war the settlement would have been wiser. If in the years after 1919 fuller and freer discussion had continued uninterrupted and consistent action had been taken on its conclusions, the foundations of peace would have been so strengthened and its fabric so extended that they could not have been destroyed. Had the L.N.U. been ten times as active with ten times its resources and ten times its public support men might be living to-day in a peaceful world.

We may be proud of what we have done. We need feel no shame except that we have not done more.

THESE THINGS ARE NEEDFUL

THE essentials of the League system are the elimination of war from the dealings of nations with one another and the substitution for it of law.

In detail the requirements of a successful League system are (1) the common restraint by every effectual means of any law-breaking nation which resorts to violence; (2) peaceful change for the remedy of proved wrongs; (3) the settlement by legal process of all disputes between nations; (4) all-round disarmament by international agreement; (5) social justice between man and man and class and class as the basis of a civilised life.

To the League system the nations must come. They must adopt it and work it as the only alternative to the plunge of them all into the utter blackness of a new barbarism.

SURRENDER!

HERE is a fact that must be hammered into every honest mind in the world.

On Friday morning, September 1, Germany excused her invasion of Poland on the pretext that the Poles must be assumed to have rejected without negotiations the settlement proposed by Germany. In Berlin, seemingly, it was considered an insignificant detail that the Poles heard the terms for the first time in the wireless message which registered their supposed refusal and the beginning of war. More important was the story of events even in its German version, completely destructive of Hitler's pretences.

OLD METHODS AGAIN

HITLER'S passion for working again a method which had previously succeeded led him to try once more the procedure previously fatal to Austria and Czechoslovakia. It is an abuse of words to say he proposed negotiations; he ordered the Poles to come and surrender blindfold. They must submit first and be told afterwards; and they were allowed only two days to decide.

Incidentally, the British Government are reproached because, having been informed of Hitler's ultimatum on August 29, they delayed until almost midnight on August 30 before they conveyed "an assurance" to Germany that "they were ready for their part to promote negotiations." Napoleon never spoke in more imperious terms. The master of nations does not openly threaten Britain with his displeasure. He lets it be seen, however, that he is most seriously displeased. British dilatoriness had wasted more than a whole day in two air journeys between Berlin and London and the consideration of his demands and the formulation of an answer. A memory springs into the mind of Bismarck's provocative trickery with the Ems dispatch; the man of blood and iron gave it an offensive twist to prevent the saving of peace. Seventy years later his successor seems to be possessed by the same ambition.

THIRD TIME

HITLER'S intentions towards the Poles are open to no doubt whatever. In the spring of 1938 Dr. Schuschnigg was sent for and browbeaten into giving away Austria. In the spring of 1939 Dr. Hacha and M. Chwalkowsky were sent for and browbeaten into giving away what remained of Czechoslovakia. In the late summer of 1939 the plan was

to send for the Poles and browbeat them. The intended result was the same.

The word negotiations may be stretched to mean many things, but there is a point beyond which elasticity makes it meaningless.

HUMILIATION TO ORDER

IT is another recurring element in the Hitlerian method to cover each forward move with profuse promises for the future. When Hitler has decided to launch an attack the "injustice" which is his excuse for the moment becomes suddenly an intolerable humiliation for the German people. Old promises go by the board; but it is still a case of "Let me devour just this one sheep and all the rest of the flock shall be safe forever?"

In his thirteen points speech in the Reichstag in May, 1935, justifying the illegal rearmament of Germany, Hitler said:

Germany neither intends nor wishes to interfere in the domestic affairs of Austria or to annex Austria or to attach that country to her.

When Germany invaded and annexed Austria Marshal Goering gave a formal assurance to Czechoslovakia that Germany had no hostile intentions towards her.

At Godesberg six months later, demanding the dismemberment of Czechoslovakia, Hitler pledged himself to Mr. Chamberlain that he had no further territorial claims in Europe.

A few months later, however, Poland's turn had come and the effective independence of Poland was forthwith a deadly offence to German honour. The artificial nature of Hitler's rage is shown by the existence of a German-Polish Pact negotiated by him in 1934, and guaranteeing each party against attack by the other. Danzig and the Corridor were in Polish hands in 1934, as in 1939; Polish conduct was as conciliatory in 1939 as it had been in 1934. And even in 1939, before the hour for aggression had arrived, Nazi Germany was still praising the treaty.

On January 25, at a banquet in Warsaw, Ribbentrop declared that the pact of 1934 was the work of "our two great leaders, Josef Pilsudski and Adolf Hitler." He said:—

It has stood the test and strains of the last five years, and will remain the surest foundation of relations between Germany and Poland, for a firm understanding with Poland is an essential element of the Führer's policy. Therefore both Poland and Germany can look into the future with complete confidence.

Nazi Germany has a singular politic

susceptibility to outrage, never at an inconvenient moment, but always when Hitler's plans call for it.

RUSSIAN MYSTERY

RUSSIA'S Pact with Germany has still to be explained. The passage of the days has only raised new mysteries.

The speech of M. Molotov, the Soviet Prime Minister, to his Parliament was able enough in its way. He said Russia was looking after her own interests and everything else was guff. But that way of thinking is in fundamental conflict with the principles Communists inside and outside Russia have loudly and persistently proclaimed during the past five years. The Communists have cried: "Resist the Fascist and Nazi aggressors by every means"; and they have derided their quieter neighbours who were less eager to send round the fiery cross. Now to decide suddenly that after all the Nazi is a charming fellow with whom Russia and Communism has no quarrel is a confession of rashness or insincerity.

A failure to find a basis of alliance with the French and British democracies does not leave the sole alternative of a rush into Nazi friendship. Of course, Russia may change her course again. Her tearing up without a word of her mutual military guarantee with France, exchanged in 1935, shows that she is not inflexible. It also recalls what is often ignored that a year ago she was bound to help Czechoslovakia by a two party military guarantee as well as by the Covenant of the League.

SELF-DETERMINATION

ANOTHER example of the pliability of the Nazi sense of "injustice" is the recent bargain struck at the expense of the German inhabitants of what has been since 1919 the Italian Tyrol. The interests of the unhappy victims have gone for nothing. They and their ancestors have been rooted in their lovely and beloved country centuries out of mind. Their labour has made it fruitful. They are a vigorous, hard-working, honest, independent, law-abiding folk. Since Italy carried her frontier to the Brenner on a strategic excuse they have suffered systematic oppression far worse than anything that has befallen any other German minority. Their grievances were immeasurably worse than those of which the Sudeten Germans in Czechoslovakia complained. In 1926 the much maligned German Republic came to their defence and secured the release of political persons and a partial restoration of free speech and a free

Press. But Nazi Germany has betrayed them step by step until at last its treason is consummated in consent to their being ejected from their homes and driven into exile.

This is no small matter. A quarter of a million men, women and children have inflicted on them much bitter distress, although they are completely innocent of any offence except that of being Germans and of living where their fathers have lived for many generations. Not less important than the sacrifice of human decency is the sacrifice of political principle. So far from asserting their right of self-determination and succession, Herr Hitler denies to the South Tyrolean Germans even the right to remain in their ancient homes.

GRATITUDE FOR WAR

A STATE maintains itself, said Machiavelli long ago, by the same means by which it was created. Five hundred years have not proved that shrewd political observer wrong. The truth he expressed is the fundamental reason why millions of liberals in many countries despair of a peaceful settlement with Nazi Germany. They will go on striving for the discovery of some way whereby their peoples may live at peace with her, but they can have no confident hope of the outcome.

The words and the deeds of Nazi Germany, and of her creator Adolf Hitler, are on record for every candid mind to read and understand. They are not the words and deeds of a willing partner in a peaceful world order.

In August, 1914, Hitler, on hearing the news, went down on his knees and wept with gratitude that the blessing of a great war had come to the German folk. He recalled his emotion proudly five years later after war had cost mankind, directly and indirectly, 30,000,000 lives and an infinitude of suffering. The Hitler of "Mein Kampf" was the Hitler of 1914, and is the Hitler of to-day.

ACQUIRE FOREIGN LANDS

IN THE unexpurgated English translation of "Mein Kampf" appears the following passage:

When the territory of the Reich contains all Germans . . . the moral right will be born for the German people to acquire foreign lands. The ploughshare will then be replaced by the sword, and the tears of war will prepare the harvests of the future world.

EXISTS FOR WAR

KARL RAABS' Seventh Year Class Book proclaims in a quotation from Rudolf Sohm:

The State exists for war. War is not a force of destruction, but, on the contrary, a constructive force which builds up society. Without war the social edifice would not exist as we know it, neither authorities nor law. From the Christian point of view there must be authority, therefore, must be war, for without war there could be no government.

A POLICY TO WORK FOR

THE League of Nations Society in Canada, in the last week in August, issued to all its branches the following circular letter:—

War being, apparently, almost a certainty, will you advise the National Office at the earliest possible moment of the views of your Branch Executive on the course which should now be followed. Please telegraph or use the air mail. Please consult the members of your Executive individually or arrange for an emergency meeting.

The following rough draft of a public statement that might, if adopted, be given to the Press, is submitted as a suggested basis for your discussion and report:—

Face to face with the catastrophe of another general war, the failure of the efforts put forth since 1914-18 to create effective international organisation stands out as stark tragedy.

Many statesmen and others share the responsibility, and what our attitude towards these should now be is a matter for consideration, but what matters most is our future course.

It is difficult to see how the people of Canada can possibly give continued and sustained support to another war unless:

(a) There is a definite recognition of the inadequacy of our past national efforts to provide a substitute for the anarchy from which the war has arisen;

(b) A new national policy in this regard is formulated without delay and announced as an integral part of our national programme and war aims;

(c) The Government undertakes to make every effort to secure the pledged word of other nations in support of this policy, making acceptance a condition of continued Canadian participation in the war if this is necessary.

The League of Nations Society, in the interest alike of national unity and of its principles and objectives, urges the Prime Minister to declare that forthwith the Government will make a thorough-going re-examination of its external affairs and League of Nations policy as proposed.

The Society offers its full co-operation in making the examination suggested.

Your immediate assistance will be much appreciated.

REMEMBER CHINA

AT a special meeting on August 31 the Executive Committee of the League of Nations Union passed a resolution which reiterated its support for the policy of the British Government in resisting aggression in the present European crisis. The resolution continued: "This policy requires also the condemnation of aggression wherever

it occurs, and the Executive Committee urges H.M. Government to make it plain to the Governments of Japan and China that there will be no change in the policy of support for China."

JAPANESE PROPRIETY

JAPAN is not commonly regarded as a model of constitutional propriety. One of the last things any British democrat can have expected in recent years is that he should find himself regarding any of her affairs with a tinge of envious respect. Yet he looks in vain nearer home for the nice scruples shown by Japanese Ministers in the August crisis. After the German-Soviet Pact they recognise the need for a new policy, and assume that it must be carried out by new men not involved in and compromised by the old failure.

Baron Hiranuma, the Premier, has resigned, declaring that he feels bound to accept responsibility for the failure of the protracted negotiations with Berlin and Rome for a military alliance.

"I am so filled with trepidation that I cannot stay in office any longer," he explains. "Reorganisation of the domestic front and reorientation of foreign policy for pulling through the emergency call for a change of the political situation and a renewal of popular sentiment."

UNCOMFORTABLE COINCIDENCE

FANTASTICALLY enough, there appeared in Berlin simultaneously with the Russo-German statements of mutual affection, a book declaring that Hitler's chief intention is the conquering of Russian territories.

This book, which has been awaited with considerable curiosity, is Germany's answer to Dr. Lajos' book "Germany's War Chances," published in Hungary almost two months ago. (An English translation is now on sale.) Dr. Lajos, it will be remembered, revealed, with quotations from German sources, the weaknesses of the German Army, and proved that the Third Reich intended to push the *Drang nach Osten* through Hungarian territory.

The reply, called "Reply to the Grey Book," was published by one of the Hungarian Nazi organisations, the "Hungarian National Front," in Berlin. The author does not deny the truth of the quotations proving the weaknesses of the German Army, but asserts that the *Drang nach Osten* is not to lead through Hungarian, but through Russian territories. Hitler's historical mission, he states, is to suppress the "Jewish" Bolshevik system and replace it with his own.

"SILENCE!" IN HUNGARY

THE CHAMBER of Journalists set up by the Hungarian Government in April comes into full force in September. It is designed to eliminate all non-Aryan and anti-Fascist elements from intellectual life. Its measures strike severely at writers of national and international reputation, denying to them in effect every opportunity of practising their profession in their own country.

Amongst those of the older generation to whom the Chamber does not allow admission are Hugo Ignotus, poet, publicist and leader of the great Hungarian literary renaissance before the war; Dezső Szomory, dramatist and novelist; the poets Ernő Szép and Jenő Heltai. Of the intellectual leaders of the new generation similarly persecuted are Béla Zsolt, the novelist and publicist, known as "the Hungarian Vernon Bartlett," whose works, in part, are translated into English; the essayist and radical publicist Paul Ignotus; the young Catholic poet and publicist, Béla Horváth, the sociographic writers Géza Féja and Zsigmond Remenyik, and the poet Josef Fodor.

IS THE AXIS BENT?

ANY EFFECTIVE protest on the part of the Hungarian public against further German domination has been and, of course, still is quite impossible. It is, however, interesting to note the unprinted comments of the audience of Magyar peasant deputies and gentlemen farmers at the annual Conference of the Agrarian Party in Budapest.

Tibor Eckhardt's references to Poland provoked cries of "We must not abandon Poland!" "We won't be German slaves!" "Only a cad could take a gun against a Pole!" When he spoke about foreign policy the audience shouted bitter and ironic comments on Count Csáky's political peregrinations, which had been described in the censored Press as holiday jaunts. "Why does the Count walk between Salzburg and Rome? Is the Axis bent?"

Unhappily such determined Magyar opposition lacks the opportunity to express and organise itself.

SPAIN A RUINED COUNTRY

THERE will be no question about Spanish neutrality. Spain to-day is a ruined country. Food is scarce. Unemployment is rampant. Business is almost at a standstill. The economic life of the nation is in a disastrous plight. Little

or no reconstruction has been attempted. Once one of the smartest and most lovely capitals of Europe, Madrid appears to be inhabited by a population of beggars.

General Franco is having to pay for German and Italian help given during the civil war. Imports have been reduced to a bare minimum; Spanish exports are being sent to Italy and Germany in payment of outstanding debts. Currency control is extremely severe at the frontier. Not a peseta may be brought into or out of Spain, and travellers leaving Spain must prove that all foreign currency exchanged during their stay in Spain was sold to official banks. The true position is best judged by the fact that the official rate for the peseta in Spain is 53 to the pound, while abroad as much as 150 may be obtained.

Communications are in an appalling condition. Rolling stock is unbelievably antiquated; trains are far between; the few so-called expresses with a speed of about twenty miles per hour that do run are filthy, and so packed that it is scarcely possible to find room in them. Most of the bridges were destroyed during the civil war, and the trains rumble at walking speed over crazy temporary contraptions that have replaced them. Fares are high.

POPULAR APATHY

THE PEOPLE are completely apathetic. There is no enthusiasm left for Franco. Nobody is in the slightest interested in politics. Wholesale arrests and denunciations of former Republicans are the order of the day. Most families have lost one or more members. Many soldiers can be seen, as well as numerous Fascists and Carlists. Relations between the Fascists and Carlists are by no means harmonious. Only recently an open fight took place between the members of these two bodies in a big Catalan town, and hundreds of the civilian population were delighted eye-witnesses of this novel combat.

All parties are agreed that in the event of war Spain will have perforce to remain neutral. General Franco is simply not in a position to do anything else. His interior difficulties and his economic plight permit of no other course. It is, however, an illusion to imagine that there would be a rising against him if by any chance he did resort to war—the population are far too weary for that, and are likely to remain so for a long time to come.

The main danger comes from the possibility, even probability, of the use of Spain as a base for the operations of warplanes and submarines.

HEADWAY'S CORRESPONDENTS DESCRIBE LAST HOURS OF PEACE

The famous journalist who has watched German life at the closest range for nearly twenty years, and in recent months has written Headway's Berlin commentary, tells of the nation's doubts.

En route, August 30.

As can be seen from the date line, this month's letter is not being written from Berlin, but in the Nord express as it speeds towards the Belgian frontier. The reason is clear. The Nazi régime has forced a major crisis upon Europe, and all British subjects have been ordered to leave. Only those covered by diplomatic passports and a few German-born Britons remain behind.

Business Man

My compartment is being shared with a German business man travelling as far as Hanover. Though he appears very tired, he will insist upon talking about the situation. What a pity it is that England should not see eye to eye with Germany! Why do not England and France allow Germany to have a free hand in East Europe? Then there would be peace for a generation at least! He admits that he does not like the *volte face* shown in the German-Russian Non-Aggression Pact, but excuses it on the ground that this is the only way to save the Reich from the danger of encirclement in case of war. Unfortunately, one does not talk long with him before realising that he has no place for any arguments based upon broader conceptions than German interests, and has such a contempt for the Poles that it is clear his main desire is to see Germany left alone to clean up the "Balkan conditions" to the East. Nevertheless, he still hopes that a general war can be avoided—that would be too big a price to pay for Danzig and the Polish Corridor. Confident in the hope that Hitler will find a peaceful solution, he bids me a cheerful "Auf Wiedersehen!"

Porter

At Cologne I talked on the platform for a moment to a porter who was standing idly aside. His great concern was whether there was going to be a war to satisfy the "Bonzos"—the Nazi clique now ruling Germany. "I and hundreds of thousands like me," he declared bitterly, "will have to pay for this, not those who have been filling their pockets and living in fine houses for years at our expense!" He had

been in the last war; and he had a son who had been called up weeks ago, and was in Bohemia or Slovakia, he did not know where, with his regiment. He had heard only the night before what the new rationing actually meant. His wife had told him of how long she had had to wait at the stores and how little she had got. This had embittered him still more, since until then he had considered that this diplomatic crisis did not very much concern him personally and that it would blow over again "in some sort of conference."

When Alarm Began

One might recall many such conversations in Berlin in the week before leaving. The realisation of a possible European conflict did not come with the mobilising of the troops or the commandeering of private vehicles, etc., because that was simply a repetition of the tactics of last September and had been going on gradually for some time. But the announcement that the great celebrations for the twenty-fifth anniversary of the battle of Tannenberg had been abandoned and that the Nuremberg Party Congress, due to open on September 2, was postponed, brought the average German down to reality; and he has since been kept there by the presence of ration cards and military activity everywhere. It is for these reasons that tension exists among the Germans to-day, and that the "war of nerves," which the Goebbels Press talked about so much, has already been won by the democracies. What the Nazi leaders to-day are trying to do is to win the war of tactics and, if possible, to save their faces before their own people, without having to wage a war.

Understand Nazi Tactics

By all means let us avoid bloodshed if it is possible. But if the basis of a lasting European peace is to be laid, then not only must there be resolution on the part of the democracies, but also a clear understanding of Nazi tactics.

Hitler and Goering, Himmler and Goebbels, Ribbentrop and Rosenberg believe as little to-day in any other method than that of force as they did a few days ago when they thought that the signing of the Soviet-Reich Pact would bring the democracies to their knees. (Almost a parallel with what the Reich expected after Brest-Litovsk during the World War, and what a similar result!) Their goal in Eastern Europe, the disappearance of Poland as a strong Power, remains as clear as ever, and

guarantees from a régime which considers treaties to be valid only so long as they serve German ambitions will have to be more than paper guarantees. There must be the creation of a new atmosphere by partial demobilisation, the cessation of the artificially created incidents in the Polish Corridor, and so on before a real start to peace can be made.

Whether the Third Reich is prepared to come to such a point should be known before these lines are in print. Maybe it will have decided that it still can win through by force, because of the strategical advantages of its present military positions. This means war, and the end of the Nazi régime, unless it is going to make a triumphal progress in a few weeks.

The chaos which has resulted from the abandonment of the party ideology by making the pact with Bolshevism may have unexpected results in the near future, because it has resulted in the disillusionment, not of the leaders—they have been placemen with few aims except self-advancement for a long time—but of the rank and file, who really believed all the anti-Bolshevik propaganda.

Towards New Europe

However things may turn out in Germany, it should be obvious that the time has now come for a settlement of European problems on a comprehensive scale. The Nazis have always complained against the Treaty of Versailles, and the opportunity should be utilised to refashion what is left of it in accordance, not with German demands, but with human ideas of justice which have not been warped by four years of war, as in 1919. This task is not easy. It must be done, and nobody will pray for success more than seventy-nine of the eighty million inhabitants of the Third Reich, who are sick to death of the surrender to Nazi gangsterism which they made six and a-half years ago. Hitler has shown clearly what little value he sets on "Self-determination" (in Czechoslovakia), "Blood and Soil" (in South Tyrol), and "Anti-Communism" (German-Russian Pact), and the reaction which all this is producing among his own people, together with increased economic hardships, is preparing the ground for the change.

Nothing could be more tragic to-day than a surrender by the democracies of their determination to resist hegemony by aggression. It is only to be hoped in

Germany's interest, as well as that of the whole world, that it will settle its problem itself.

For an international conference the machinery and the place are already to hand. To say that Hitler hates the

League and Geneva is no argument why they should not be used. The greatness of the shock in Germany to-day is particularly due to the fact that it took the democracies so long to apply collective security. Why not continue?

FRANCE IN THE CRISIS

By JOHN ELLIOTT

PARIS, August 26.

FRANCE, united as she usually is in time of peril, is ready for war, if Hitler insists on submitting the issue of Danzig to the arbitrament of arms. There will be no second Munich. This country knows from bitter experience of last September what a Nazi peace means.

So France is holding her own unflinchingly in the "war of the nerves." Even the shock of the Russo-German non-aggression pact, stunning surprise that it was, has not weakened her determination to fulfil her obligations to the Poles, if the occasion arises. President Albert Lebrun broke off his holiday in his Lorraine retreat of Mercy-le-Haut to return to Paris and preside over the Cabinet sitting at which this fateful decision was reached. At the same time the Ministry approved the military measures which Premier Edouard Daladier had been taking in his capacity of Minister of National Defence to put France in a state of readiness to come to the aid of Poland in the event of a German aggression.

To the Maginot Line

Quietly and without fuss the French reservists have been going up to the Maginot Line all the week. The now familiar white placards summoning the various groups to the Colours have been posted on the walls of Paris, and the Gare de l'Est has been crowded with men in civilian clothes, suitcase in hand, departing in the direction of the Rhine.

In the other railway stations of Paris there has been an exodus mostly of women and children. For the French Government has advised all civilians who can do so to leave the capital. At the same time British and American tourists have been going home. The sidewalk cafés have become strangely deserted, and the night clubs of Montmartre may soon have to close for want of customers. In the Louvre workmen are busy taking the priceless paintings down from the walls and carefully packing them away in boxes. Historic palaces like Ver-

sailles and Fontainebleau have been closed to the public. The big boulevards such as the Champs Elysées and public squares like the Place de la Concorde are still brilliantly illuminated, but in the side streets the lights have been extinguished or dimmed.

Change in a Year

The atmosphere in France is totally different from what it was last September. One of the chief reasons for Munich was the division of public opinion as to whether France should fight for the Czechs. Fully 50 per cent. of the French people, drawn equally from the ranks of the Left and the Right, did not see why Frenchmen should die for Czechoslovakia. Many felt that on the basis of Woodrow Wilson's principle of self-determination, the Sudeten Germans should be allowed to join the Reich. There was an uneasy qualm of conscience that the Germans had not had a fair deal at the Peace Conference and a willingness to take Hitler at his word when he said that after his aspirations in the Sudetenland had been satisfied he had no further territorial claims to present in Europe. The General Staff and the French Foreign Office (that is the permanent officials as distinguished from their chief, Foreign Minister Georges Bonnet) argued that French security required the maintenance of the Czech bastion, but they could not rally a united French nation behind them.

Munich Discredited

But to-day the situation is radically different. The events of the 15th of March have convinced even the most ardent "Munichois" from Flandin down that what Hitler is after is not justice, but hegemony. They realise now that if the Führer is permitted to strangle the independence of Poland by seizing Danzig and the Corridor, it will be the turn of France next. After France has permitted Germany to overrun Europe with impunity, the day will soon come when France will have to fight to hold Alsace-Lorraine without the support of any allies in the East.

This was the point stressed by Premier Daladier in his stirring radio talk this week. The French Prime Minister told his countrymen that with the question of Danzig was linked up the life of Poland, and with the liberty of that country was bound up the destiny of other European countries, notably that of France.

If the crisis should end in war, Daladier is credited with the intention of repeating the unsuccessful experiment that Leon Blum tried after the Austrian Anschluss in March, 1938, and reviving the famous "union sacrée" of 1914 by forming a coalition of all the parties from the Socialists on the Left to the Marin group on the Right.

All parties would be represented in this Government with the exception of the Communists. That party is in a very unhappy position after the collapse of negotiations for a Tripartite Pact. They foolishly tried to justify the Russo-German treaty by saying that it had caused confusion in the Fascist camp, and that it was still possible to conclude an Anglo-Franco-Russian treaty.

Communists Isolated

As a consequence the Communists have been thoroughly discredited and have put themselves outside the national community. They are isolated by the Socialists, one of whose members demanded their exclusion from the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Chamber. Their newspapers, *Humanité* and *Ce Soir*, have been banned indefinitely. When the Communist deputies sent a delegation to protest to the Prime Minister he declined to see them. It is probable that the party will soon be proscribed by the Government.

AMERICAN SENTIMENT OVERWHELMINGLY ANTI-NAZI

By BARNET NOVER

WASHINGTON, August 26.

FOR historic and other reasons the people of the United States regard their nation as a neutral, and a large majority of them would like to have it remain one. They want the United States to avoid "entangling alliances" or any other commitments that might directly or indirectly lead the country into another war.

Yet, paradoxically, the American people have never in their hearts been neutral, nor are they constitutionally capable of any such attitude. They are given to taking sides on matters about which they feel deeply. And

rarely have they felt so deeply regarding the course of events taking place abroad as during the last twelve months. And not even in 1917, on the eve of their entry into the World War, did they take sides so passionately as now. For to an increasing degree they have come to the belief that it will be difficult and perhaps impossible for the United States to stay out of any general war in Europe.

Munich Blamed

That is why the country reacted so bitterly against the Munich Settlement, which, a very considerable proportion of the American people was convinced, made war ultimately more rather than less likely. That is why the *volte-face* of the Chamberlain Government last spring was approved and applauded here and gave an undoubted impetus to revision of the Neutrality Act, thwarted as that action ultimately was by mismanagement and sabotage. For the same reason the slowness of the effort to bring Soviet Russia into the peace front helped to keep alive suspicions of Great Britain and France.

Sentiment has for some time been overwhelmingly anti-Nazi. But while the total number of actual Communists and Communist sympathisers has never been large, the attitude toward Russia in this country has, on the whole, been favourable. The successive purges aroused a great wave of disgust, for few took any stock in the official Soviet explanations of what was behind these bloody events. Yet the fact that Russia was deemed a peaceful nation in contrast to the Fascist aggressors, that she supported efforts aimed at achieving collective security and similar indications that her external policies were similar to those pursued by the democracies made it possible to place her in a different category from Germany and Italy.

Russia Bewilders

The announcement of Russia's decision to sign a non-aggression pact with Germany produced bewilderment and chagrin. The first tendency of the Press and public was to explain it as Moscow's over-bitter reaction to the snub administered to the Soviet Union by Great Britain and France at Munich last year, and to the failure of those nations to meet Russia's terms in the matter of proposed alliance. The alarm over the dangerous possibilities envisaged in Russia's *rapprochement* with the Third Reich was accompanied by bitter comment regarding the mistakes of the London and Paris Governments.

This initial reaction to the German-Russian bombshell was followed by another of quite different tenor. The revelation that Russia had been secretly negotiating behind the backs of Great Britain and France ended the criticisms of Messrs. Chamberlain and Daladier. On the other hand this revelation and the publication of the actual terms of the Ribbentrop-Molotov pact engendered a tremendous wave of bitterness against Russia. The earlier belief that Russia was playing an obscure and Machiavellian game of prestige, that before it was too late the Soviet Union would somehow turn up in the peace front, vanished altogether. In its place was a profound disgust with what was deemed Moscow's deep-dyed treachery. Russia, said the Press and the public almost unanimously, had sold out the peace, and to the nation which she had previously proclaimed as her worst enemy. And it was also agreed, with very few dissenting voices, that Russia's action encouraged Hitler to the point where unless there was another capitulation there would be a war.

THE KING TO HIS PEOPLES

The King broadcast a message to his peoples from his study at Buckingham Palace on Sunday evening, September 3:—

In this grave hour, perhaps the most fateful in our history, I send to every household of my peoples, both at home and overseas, this message, spoken with the same depth of feeling for each one of you as if I were able to cross your threshold and speak to you myself.

For the second time in the lives of most of us we are at war. Over and over again we have tried to find a peaceful way out of the differences between ourselves and those who are now our enemies. But it has been in vain. We have been forced into a conflict. For we are called, with our allies, to meet the challenge of a principle which, if it were to prevail, would be fatal to any civilised order in the world.

It is the principle which permits a State, in the selfish pursuit of power, to disregard its treaties and its solemn pledges; which sanctions the use of force, or threat of force, against the Sovereignty and independence of other States. Such a principle, stripped of all disguise, is surely the mere primitive doctrine that might is

Upsurge for Democracy

The third reaction to the German-Russian deal was equally emotional, but more constructive. By sharpening the division between the democratic nations and dictatorial Powers, the Moscow bombshell helped clear the air. It made Americans realise that more sympathy for those elements in Europe still trying desperately to save the peace was needed. These last days have seen a great upsurge of sentiment in favour of wiping out the embargo provisions of the neutrality. That emotion of solidarity is not to be discounted in the perilous months that lie ahead. It would be absurd to interpret this feeling, however, as reflecting any desire to get the United States into a war against Germany or any other Power. The feeling that this country must, if it possibly can, stay out of a European conflict remains overwhelming. But at the same time it must be noted that only a diminishing minority believes that if war comes the United States will manage to stay out.

right; and if this principle were established throughout the world, the freedom of our own country and of the whole British Commonwealth of Nations would be in danger. But far more than this—the peoples of the world would be kept in the bondage of fear, and all hopes of settled peace and of the security of justice and liberty among nations would be ended.

This is the ultimate issue which confronts us. For the sake of all that we ourselves hold dear, and of the world's order and peace, it is unthinkable that we should refuse to meet the challenge.

It is to this high purpose that I now call my people at home and my peoples across the Seas, who will make our cause their own. I ask them to stand calm, firm, and united in this time of trial. The task will be hard. There may be dark days ahead, and war can no longer be confined to the battlefield. But we can only do the right as we see the right, and reverently commit our cause to God. If one and all we keep resolutely faithful to it, ready for whatever service or sacrifice it may demand, then, with God's help, we shall prevail.

May He bless and keep us all.

FORGOTTEN CZECHOSLOVAKIA

By ELEANOR RATHBONE, M.P.,

who has worked tirelessly to help the victims of German aggression

HUMAN beings have short memories, especially for those they have injured. The temptation is to thrust the unpleasant facts well down into the unconscious mind. Czechoslovakia is a victim of this tendency. Whatever view one takes of the Munich Pact, indisputably it involved our Government and the French in special responsibilities towards the people from whom they have demanded so great a sacrifice. That was admitted at the time.

£10,000,000 Promised

The Prime Minister himself said that H.M. Government was "profoundly conscious of the immense sacrifice to which the Czechoslovak Government had agreed and the great public spirit they had shown." A guaranteed loan of £10,000,000 was immediately promised to the Czech Government to meet their urgent needs, especially those arising from the flood of refugees who fled from the areas ceded to Germany. A larger loan was obviously intended. President Benes had asked for £30,000,000. But when it became clear that the mutilated State was completely helpless to resist Berlin, it was thought necessary to safeguard British money from those greedy hands, and, after much negotiation, the Government agreed with the Czech Government to turn £4,000,000 of the promised ten into a gift on condition that it should all be spent on the emigration of refugees from Czechoslovakia, while the other £6,000,000, with £2,000,000 to follow—the whole £8,000,000 loan to be shared with the French—was to be secured for the settlement of refugees within the state.

Then, on March 15, came the German march into Prague. Luckily for the British Treasury, but unluckily for the refugees, the British authorities and the refugee committee concerned had been so leisurely and cautious in arranging for their emigration that the greater part of the promised money was still within the control of the Treasury, which without losing a day took steps to safeguard not only that amount but also other Czech assets in London, so that it is now able to recoup itself not only for the expended but for the unexpended portion of the loan. The £4,000,000 gift earmarked for emigration was to remain available for that purpose.

Flight From Terror

Unfortunately, £4,000,000 has proved insufficient for the needs of the greatly increased and still increasing number of those for whom the former Czechoslovakia has now become a place of terror and persecution. There are known to be several thousands at least as much endangered as most of those already emigrated, but they cannot be covered by the Treasury grant, and for them, therefore, neither our Home Office nor any other friendly state will grant admission.

Some are the remnant of the original Sudeten-German refugees, and of those refugees from the Reich and from Austria who had taken refuge in Czechoslovakia while it was still one of the most hospitable countries in Europe towards the persecuted; others are Czechs menaced because of their known, however now concealed, antipathy towards the Nazi party; others are Jews exposed to increasingly rigorous anti-Semitic legislation. In fact, the whole Jewish population of the state is now nominally under sentence of expulsion.

Some of all these groups have already escaped into Poland, but are threatened with being sent back if they cannot move elsewhere.

What is to become of all these? Are they—if they do not manage or their consciences do not allow them to commit suicide, as hundreds have done already—to be sent to rot in concentration camps till they succumb under repeated beatings, while the Treasury pockets its recovered loan, probably reflecting that, after all, the destruction of Czechoslovakia was an ill wind which brought some good? Technically the British Government are absolved from their promise to Czechoslovakia because that state no longer exists, nor are its former territories a possible place of settlement for refugees. But are the Government—are we—morally absolved from responsibility for those whom the loan was intended to benefit? Both their numbers and their danger are not diminished, but greatly increased, by our failure to protect from Germany the frontiers of the shrunken state which we had guaranteed. The gift of £4,000,000, which might have been adequate before, is adequate no longer. As to the loan, it was at best a risky loan. One may safely say that the Treasury would at the time have gladly substituted for it a further gift of, say, £2,000,000.

More Permits Suggested

All these considerations were brought before the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Home Secretary just before Parliament adjourned by a deputation asked for by Mr. Arthur Greenwood, led by Mr. Amery, and including members drawn from every political party. The request put forward was that, in lieu of the promised loan, the Government should add to their gift whatever might be necessary, say, up to £2,000,000, to make provision for those in serious danger and still able to escape. It was suggested that considerably less than the sum mentioned would probably suffice, and that, pending Parliamentary sanction in the autumn, the Home Office should be encouraged to grant the necessary permits for entry to this country. It was also pointed out that many of the refugees concerned were men of such fine quality and technical qualifications—experts in the various industries that made Czechoslovakia prosperous—that they might be profitably absorbed for the present in armament work, agriculture, etc., and would be acceptable to the Colonies later.

But the deputation was given no reason to hope that their plea would be granted. The Government are evidently anxious to write off their debt to Czechoslovakia and bury the whole unpleasant subject. But will the British public allow them to forget it? Or will they not, by using all the familiar methods of political pressure and Press agitation, induce the Government to change their mind? Have the Churches nothing to say about it, nor those electors who are always ready to champion the cause of any single individual whose wrongs and sufferings come directly within their sight? Can we rest in our beds knowing that thousands of men and women and some children are hunted fugitives, or going about their daily work in constant fear of the concentration camp and its horrors, whose plight is directly or indirectly the result of British policy? Can we really, because we shall never see or know the names or numbers of these victims, wash our hands, and say: "We are innocent of their blood"? Is Czechoslovakia, and the sacrifice we demanded of her as the price of our peace, indeed so completely forgotten?

THE VERSAILLES TREATY

By MAURICE FANSHAWE, Head of the Intelligence Section, League of Nations Union

In Germany and in Italy the Treaty of Versailles has long been made the excuse for all the world's troubles. In Great Britain many well-intentioned people have been persuaded to accept that view, but the document itself is not much studied. Many of the critics indeed betray very little knowledge of the contents.

MOST of the ills of the post-war world, including the Nazi movement (curiously enough not its unacknowledged parent Fascism) seem at one time or another to have been dumped on the doorstep of the Treaty of Versailles. All treaties after wars have to face violent criticism. The Versailles Treaty, the biggest treaty after the biggest war, was booked for a record. It got it. In fact it became a sort of universal scapegoat. But criticism on this massed scale is too untrue to be good; clearly there has been too much protesting and far too much propaganda. It is worth while, therefore, to marshal some of the salient facts about the whole business—the motives of the prosecution, as well as actual sins of the accused. They may induce at least a sense of proportion before a judgment is ventured on Versailles.

Defeat Resented

We are often asked, what has been the real reason for Germany's venom against Versailles? The answer is national psychology. German hatred of the Treaty came and comes primarily from the humiliation, the national inferiority complex begotten of the unpleasant fact that Germany lost the war. Even if it had been penned by the Archangel of Peace himself the Versailles Treaty would have been intolerable to most of the war generation of Germans, for, in their eyes, it stood for the defeat of their invincible army in the field. It made it impossible for Germans to get back to that *Machtfreudigkeit*—the joy in the pomp and strength of Bismarck's Empire, which sang in their blood before the war. So reactionaries, militarists and a host of others joined in the slogan "the Treaty must go." Their propaganda was simple but effective. The Treaty was one vast dictated lie. Once this premise was accepted two enormous advantages followed. They were able to create the myth (which post-war Germany has swallowed neat) that their army was never defeated, and to add to it a second myth that this victorious army was stabbed in the back from the home front by the Jews and the Socialists. As there were many of these in Germany's post-war Governments, and as these Governments were already handicapped by having to carry out the Treaty, here ready to hand was a

glamorous weapon for a determined Opposition against the real object of their hatred—the whole Weimar system. It was used to the full. In this sense it is true that the Versailles Treaty, not necessarily because of its faults, helped the Nazis to power.

Best British Ideal

Another relevant question: Was there, at the same time, a genuine sense of justice inspiring German grievances against Versailles? First-hand evidence is provided by *Mein Kampf*. Here Herr Hitler explains his propaganda against the Treaty, thus: "I prepared the ground by an account of the Treaty of Brest Litovsk. I placed the two treaties side by side, compared them point by point, showed the positively boundless humanity of the one in contrast with the inhuman cruelty of the other." Now the bald facts about the Brest Litovsk Treaty of March, 1918, are these. As a result of this German Diktat—only three days were allowed for the discussion—Russia had to pay vast reparations in goods, bonds and gold. She lost 34 per cent. of her population, 32 per cent. of her agricultural and 85 per cent. of her beet sugar land, 54 per cent. of her industrial undertakings, and 89 per cent. of her coal mines. European Russia was dismembered, cut off from the Black Sea and pretty well from the Baltic. If this is what Germans mean by "boundless humanity," how far can we credit their charge of "inhuman cruelty" against Versailles, or trust their definition of or belief in justice?

Turning from matters of motive and sincerity to the actual provisions of the Treaty, a word must first be said about the background, though the Treaty could not be blamed for this. It was frankly appalling. As a result of four years' agony "people were in an impossible frame of mind at the time." "One of the gravest evils of war," says Mr. Harold Nicolson, "is that it produces a state of mind which makes it impossible to consider things impartially." This evil was responsible for the tragic post-war blockade of Germany, and for the disastrous decision that the Treaty should not be a negotiated one. Moreover, Paris, still under the shock of bombardment, was the worst place for a Peace Conference. That should have been held at Geneva or The Hague.

Three Empires Fall

Quite as "impossible" was much of the existing political situation which the Conference had to face. Three empires, Russia, Germany and Austria, had gone. New governments of States with enlarged boundaries or claiming such boundaries, with mixed populations, had already been set up by Poles, Czechs, Rumanians and Serbians. Governments were in occupation of many of the new areas. Reversal of these *faits accomplis*, through some new process of territorial readjustment in the direction of autonomy of component nations in a federal constitution, or other "good European" settlement, could have been made in two ways only—by force, or by expert examination over a long period. In the one case the only army in a position to use effective force was the American, and Americans, from President Wilson down, were against force. In the other, nearly all Governments and peoples were clamouring for a quick, clean-cut treaty, and it may be noted that it was from the British Parliament that there came a telegram to Mr. Lloyd George, who was trying to get M. Clemenceau to soften the Treaty, that he was "spoiling the Germans."

The Covenant

Broadly, the Treaty fell into five divisions. Chapter one was the Covenant, the first treaty of wide range to provide for peaceful and timely change of the *status quo*. The potentialities of this part of the Treaty for bringing decency into the conduct of foreign affairs, and for a policy of the "good neighbour," were immense. President Wilson and others of its founders always meant the Covenant, with its vein of constructive idealism, to be used to mitigate the harshness of any other parts of the Treaty. But the Governments themselves would have none of it. A miserable minority of seven American Senators crippled the League at the start. Later, the Great Power Members who were Member States—Germany was as bad as any—lacked the vision or vitality to use the dynamic machinery which was in their hands. Criticism of the original Treaty because its signatories did not use it properly is grotesque. And when such comes from Powers who cut away from the

League because they demanded more than justice and preferred to get it by aggression in breach of treaties, it ranks as hypocrisy.

Better Frontiers

Next, the territorial distribution. Races in Central and Eastern Europe are so intermixed that no division could ever satisfy all nationals. But it is a fact that the map drawn by Versailles and the other Treaties was more in accordance with the views of the peoples than ever before. Millions more than in 1914 were content. Only 3 per cent. of the total population of the Continent was now under alien rule. The re-creation of Poland and the return of Alsace-Lorraine were just. The Saar was a temporary settlement, and is now part of Germany. Germany's bitter attacks on the Polish Corridor and Danzig have a psychological and strategic basis, but it has to be noted that both these settlements are identical with No. 13 of President Wilson's 14 Points, which Germany herself accepted as a basis of Peace. There was more genuine injustice in the territorial settlement of the other Peace Treaties, though, of course, this did not directly concern Germany. Austria, for obvious if short-sighted reasons, was forbidden to join Germany, yet.

Far too many Hungarians were not excluded from the new Rumania, Jugoslavia and Czechoslovakia, which last had also too many Austrians, though this was done by the Big Four and all their experts, American and Italian, because they knew that the new State without its historic and strategic frontiers would die at birth. Italy, one of the arch-baiters of Versailles, got the Austrian Tyrol, quite the worst decision of the whole Conference. But in all this distribution the Versailles and other Peace Treaties—and this is far too often forgotten—at the same time created antidotes for unjust division, not only the Covenant, but the new Minority Treaties, which were to guard against harsh treatment by Governments and pave the way to reconciliation and peace. Once again it was the Governments, and Germany among them, who refused to work these parts of the Treaties properly, and finally killed them.

Colonial Clauses

The Colonial clauses of the Treaty remain intact. The moral stigma laid here on Germany of unfitnes to possess colonies, was, with an eye to Belgian and Portuguese records, at the time quite indefensible. And the acquisition on such grounds of African and Asiatic areas by the Allies was a legitimate German grievance. In defence it was

said that Australia, Japan, the South African Union, giving as their reason the menace to peace of German colonial policy, bluntly refused to surrender the areas, and, more justifiably, that the Treaty, thanks to the genius of General Smuts, created a new type of colonial government, the Mandate, based on the principle of holding the land in trust for the natives. The force of this argument would certainly have been increased if Germany had been invited as an equal to come and work this new experiment, for example, in Tanganyika.

But, since 1933, the Nazi policy of race domination, extreme exploitation of subject races, and of contempt for international co-operation has undermined the whole validity of the German claim to the restoration of colonies. In any case "Colonies" have now become an international problem.

Germany's disarmament was harsh, yet not so harsh, for a nation which had been beaten. The method of enforcing it, at the beginning, was unnecessarily humiliating. Yet the occupation of the Rhine area was withdrawn well before its time. Demilitarisation was wise, and would have been more just if carried

IN THE VERSAILLES TREATY THE MEANS WERE PROVIDED FOR THE CONTINUOUS, SYSTEMATIC REMEDY OF PROVED WRONGS.

The High Contracting parties—

In order to promote international co-operation and to achieve international peace and security

by the acceptance of obligations not to resort to war

by the prescription of open, just and honourable relations between nations

by the firm establishment of the understandings of international law as the actual rule of conduct among Governments

and by the maintenance of justice and a scrupulous respect for all treaty obligations in the dealings of organised peoples with one another

Agree to this covenant of the League of Nations.

out both on the French and German side. At the same time it is known that many of the disarmament clauses were never carried out by Germany; and as early as 1931 secret rearmament was well on the way. But Germany had one genuine grievance against this part of the Treaty. The Allies never carried out their own promises that the disarmament would be a first step to all-round reduction. Hence the worst Armaments Race in history.

War Guilt

Next, there were the "war criminals" and so-called "war guilt" articles and Reparations. The first remained a dead letter. German propaganda pounced on the so-called "War-guilt" Article 231. In its anxiety to prove that Germany was an innocent victim, it tried to force into this article what is not there. Article 231 never said, and no one now believes, that Germany was solely responsible for the war: it speaks of her aggression. And aggression does and will describe broadly the facts of 1914, until we are dragooned into believing that Serbia invaded Austria, or Belgium invaded Germany. But Germany's case rested on much firmer ground, when it relied on the harsher tone of the Allies' Reply to the German observations on the Treaty, and on the implications underlying Reparations and some of the economic provisions, which were of a penal character. A "peace founded upon justice" should not include moral stigmata or any conception of a "criminal nation."

As to Reparations, they were the worst blot on the Treaty. Yet even here it is fair to point out that Governments lent to Germany quite as much as Germany ever paid in Reparations; and the whole business had fizzled out by 1932, before Herr Hitler came to power.

Not all Black

Such was Versailles—not white, but certainly not all black. The circumstances of its birth were wellnigh paralysing. Yet many solutions were just and full of hope for the future. Other provisions were the reverse, though a large number had expired before the Nazi régime. But the Treaty also provided an entirely new peace programme, and corrective of political and economic injustice. It was a tragedy that the Governments never used it properly. And it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that in German eyes the nuisance value of the Treaty was often uppermost. Study of the facts about Versailles does not warrant calling it a mere "treaty of revenge"—unless we are to follow the advice given officially to German teachers not to be "tainted with the curse of objectivity."

THE FIGHT FOR PEACE MUST BEGIN NOW

Roaring war planes across the Polish sky fling the mind back twenty-five years to the despair of another calamity, the courage with which it was confronted, the hopes which began to stir as soon as the first shock passed. Warning and stimulus is found in those old events. Especially those of us who still believe in and will still work for a saner, healthier, happier world are interested and helped by recollections of the struggle, undertaken without delay to build a League of Nations

SOON after the outbreak of war in 1914, G. Lowes Dickinson invited a group of people to study his plans whereby at the close of the War some international organisation might be set up to prevent war in the future. It was presided over by Viscount Bryce, and included Rt. Hon. W. H. Dickinson (now Lord Dickinson) and some other ten or twelve persons active in peace work. Early in 1915 a scheme was produced known as Lord Bryce's proposals.

In November, 1914, an article appeared in the "Contemporary Review" by Mr. Aneurin Williams, M.P., on "Proposals for a League of Peace and Mutual Protection Among Nations." The proposals were:—

(i) That at the end of this war a few of the most peace-loving nations should agree among themselves that any dispute arising between any two or more of them should be settled by peaceful means, by diplomacy, by friendly media-

tion, by formal arbitration, or by the Hague Court.

(ii) That if any members of the League should be attacked by another member, or by some outside Power, the attacking Party should be called upon by the other members of the League to submit its quarrel to peaceful settlement. Failing to do so, it should be coerced.

(iii) All questions not requiring the forcible intervention of the League should be settled in accordance with the existing treaty rights of the parties and the accepted principles of international law. But if any Power resorted to force, and so necessitated the forcible intervention of the League, the offender should be debarred from afterwards pleading rights, and should be compelled to pay damages.

(iv) A member of the League should have the right to withdraw on giving a notice of adequate length.

The interest in the discussions of Lord Bryce's group and of Mr. Aneurin Wil-

liams' article led to an informal meeting in Mrs. Walter Rea's drawing-room in Smith Square, Westminster, on February 5, 1915. There were present at this meeting Mr. Allen (Bedford College), Mr. and Mrs. A. W. Claremont, Mr. and Mrs. Percy Clarke, Rt. Hon. W. H. Dickinson, M.P., Senateur la Fontaine (Belgium), Mrs. Walter Rea, Mr. John Russell, Mr. H. N. Spalding, Mr. Gustav Spiller, Dr. Thompson, Professor Graham Wallas and Mr. Aneurin Williams, M.P. Mr. A. W. Claremont presided. The discussion was directed chiefly to Mr. Williams' article, but it showed that there was considerable difference of opinion as to whether it would be wiser to proceed with the limited scheme outlined by Mr. Williams or to advocate the complete abolition of war. In the end a Committee was appointed which after a few meetings brought out a scheme on the lines of Mr. Williams' proposals.

A movement was growing: it had to be given a name. When the group met on March 10, 1915, it was summoned under the title of Union of States Society, but somewhere between that date and May 15, 1915, when it was formally established the body became known as the League of Nations Society. It is interesting to recall at this time that among other names considered were Union of Nations Society, Union of States Society, and even League of Nations Union, a title which ultimately came into existence in 1918.

AN APPEAL TO EVERY HEADWAY READER

HEADWAY must be kept alive, because even in war-time, perhaps more than ever in war-time, it can perform a service of the highest value for which no other organ exists.

Members of the L.N.U. who subscribe 3s. 6d. or more a year to Union funds are entitled to twelve monthly copies of HEADWAY.

This is the peace-time rule. From their subscriptions 2½d. a month is allocated to the journal after publication. Part of each monthly 2½d. remains with the Union as a contribution towards its general expenses. In the uncertainties of war no one can say how much of present unexhausted subscriptions will be available for the future production of HEADWAY. Yet it is necessary if the battle for an ordered world is to go on, and in no other battle can victory win for mankind a tolerable future, that the case for reason shall be restated continuously and vigorously in the light of developing events.

Unless we begin at once to think out and discuss our peace terms and prepare ourselves to carry them out loyally and vigorously when the time comes we shall leave a dread penalty to be paid by our children.

HEADWAY'S editorial staff is ready to do its part by continuing its work without payment. Will you do your part by providing the money required for the unavoidable expenses of production?

HEADWAY,

19, Devereux Court, The Strand,
London, W.C.2.

I promise immediately on receiving a formal request to fulfil this undertaking to send 5/- (2/6) as a subscription for 12 monthly issues of "Headway."

Name.....

Address.....

NOTE.—If 30,000 readers send 5/- a monthly journal on the same scale as the present can be maintained for a year, subject to the exigencies of war.

SOCIAL HOLIDAYS IN AUTUMN



Is your holiday still to come?

The Holiday Fellowship has guest houses in many of the most beautiful parts of the country, which are available throughout the year.

Many people consider that the autumn is the best time for the holiday-maker—walking is easier then than in summer heat, and the countryside is in its most colourful dress.

After mid-September the charges are exceptionally low and rebates are allowed for long-period residence.

Evening social programmes are organised by the guests, and excursions are arranged most days each week.

A copy of "Autumn, Winter and Spring Holidays, 1939/40," giving full information, can be had on application to the Holiday Fellowship, 142, Great North Way, London, N.W.4.

NATIONAL UNION OF SEAMEN

SEAMEN THE WORLD OVER ARE UNITED IN THEIR HATRED OF WAR BECAUSE THEY KNOW WHAT WAR MEANS.

BRITISH SEAMEN GREET THE NEW "HEADWAY" AND WISH IT SUCCESS IN ITS EFFORTS TOWARDS FREEDOM AND PEACE.

W. R. SPENCE, C.B.E., *General Secretary.*
J. B. WILSON, *General Treasurer.*
GEO. REED, *Assistant General Secretary.*

**St. George's Hall, Westminster Bridge Road,
LONDON, S.E.1.**

When in Manchester

at any time you cannot do
better than stay at the

GROSVENOR HOTEL



Telegrams : Telephones :
GROSVENOR HOTEL BLACKFRIARS 7024 (3 Lines)
MANCHESTER Private Branch Exchange

SPLENDID ROOMS FOR CONFERENCES

ADJACENT EXCHANGE & VICTORIA STATIONS

This modern and well appointed Hotel is extensively patronised by tourists, motorists and business men. Comfort and attention may be relied upon, and every one of our 100 bedrooms is fitted with running water.

**SPECIAL TERMS FOR HEADWAY READERS :
10/6 PER DAY FOR BED AND BREAKFAST**

**One of the very few hotels in the North of England under the actual supervision of the Proprietor,
MR. GEORGE HARDMAN.**