

# HEADWAY

## IN WAR-TIME

*The Journal of the League of Nations Union*

No. 32

MAY 1942

PRICE 3d

### LEADING ARTICLE

## PROF. CARR'S SECOND THOUGHTS

By DR. GILBERT MURRAY, O.M.

Mr. Carr is a formidable controversialist. Formerly in the Foreign Office, and now a Wilson Professor, he is in a strong position for explaining how wrong President Wilson was. In his previous book, "The Twenty Years' Crisis," he defended the policy of "appeasing" Germany, and condemned the introduction of "idealism" into politics. His new book is a championship of the "New Revolution" now current in Europe.\* Mr. Carr believes it has come to stay and is destined, in Signor Mussolini's words, to "trample on the rotting corpse of Liberalism."

The unfortunate corpse sought for Peace and Security, it believed in the rights of small nations, it even imagined that ultimately all nations have a common interest in seeing peace and the reign of law established throughout the world. The adherents of the New Revolution are too vigorous and manly for that sort of sentimentality. They know that life is a perpetual war, and that it is power and effective planning, not

ideals of international justice or co-operation, that rule the world.

Mr. Carr has an easy case in insisting on the faults of the democracies; their lack of foresight, laziness, commercialism, their demand for rights and neglect of duties, the tendency of their political life to become merely a selfish struggle between organized capital and organized labour. I do not, however, quite see that these faults are due to excessive Liberality or Wilsonian idealism, unless indeed Mr. Carr's idea of a healthy nation is one worked up into a mood of heroism by perpetual warfare.

But we strike here on one of the regular stumbling blocks of political discussion. None of the terms has a clear and unmistakable meaning. What is democracy? Signor Gayda, when tired of trampling on the corpse, likes to explain that the New Revolution alone is really democratic. The Dictator appeals, over the heads of the bourgeois, straight to the masses of his people, who all obey and adore him . . . except, of course, the criminals in the concentration camps. Democracy may have many meanings; and as for Liberalism, all words in -ism are

\* **CONDITIONS OF PEACE** by E. H. CARR, Professor of International Politics in the University of Wales. (Macmillan 1942. 12s. 6d.)

notoriously slippery. By Liberalism in international affairs Mr. Carr means, quite properly, something like the principles of President Wilson or Mr. Gladstone; but by Liberalism in economic affairs he means a system of thought which was corrected a hundred years ago by John Stuart Mill and is not, so far as I know, supported by anyone to-day. No Liberal would differ from the principle that "welfare" rather than mere "wealth" should be the object of economic policy; or that a certain minimum standard of food, health, housing, educational opportunity and the like should, as far as possible, be guaranteed to every citizen. Very few would deny that, whether they like it or not, great extensions of State socialism after the war are inevitable. There is nothing new in these doctrines.

The main difference of view between Mr. Carr and the average well-informed Englishman is perhaps this. Most of us regard the period since 1918, or even since 1914, as abnormal; a time made monstrous by wars, slumps, anarchy and hideous international crimes. We do not believe that the methods which suit such a time are permanently the right methods for civilised society, any more than "scorched earth" is permanently the right method of farming. Mr. Carr seems to approve of the methods in question and tells us we cannot "go back to the pre-war world." Of course we cannot; but we can go forward to a more normal and "Liberal" world.

However, it is curious how an able and thoughtful man, starting from wrong premises but looking at the facts, may come to pretty sound conclusions. Most of Mr. Carr's concrete proposals are just what believers in the Covenant and the Atlantic Charter would themselves propose. I can imagine the ghosts of President Wilson and Mr. Gladstone nodding their heads in grave approval

of their supposed enemy. Mr. Carr insists that Isolation is dead. The interdependence of nations is the ruling fact. There must be an International Authority; probably something like the League, and probably built on the foundations of the League. Certainly the I.L.O. and the various technical services of the League must be retained and effectively developed, especially those that can be devoted to economic planning on a world-wide basis. In this new society Great Britain and the United States must accept the full responsibilities of their position and play their full part. Any failure in this duty means a third German War and ruin. (The book was mostly written before the entry of Russia into the War; but clearly Mr. Carr would welcome Russian co-operation.)

As to the first step in the settlement, Mr. Carr pleads strongly for the continuance of the great inter-allied organisations set up during the war for the controlling and rationing of food, coal, shipping and the like. I remember how General Smuts and Sir Arthur Salter urged the same policy in 1918, when it failed, through the refusal of America. This would enable the new League to make its first appearance in Europe as an unmistakable friend.

As for Germany, she must be "incorporated quickly" with the rest of Europe. All ideas of punishment, and even of reparation must be dropped. I think Mr. Carr is here carried away by "idealism" and has not faced the facts. Wrongs have been done which must, if possible, be righted; crimes have been committed which cannot be forgotten in the lands that have suffered and must not be lightly forgiven here. Mr. Carr, however, does not approve of small nations nor think much about their "rights." In order to give his planning authority a free hand he ends with a strange and, to my mind, rather ghastly proposal. The war should not

## MR. BEVIN ON THE I.L.O.

Officially welcoming the Emergency Committee of the International Labour Office at the opening of its session in London on April 20, Mr. Bevin, the Minister of Labour, described the I.L.O. as "an organisation destined to play a tremendous part in rebuilding the world of the future." It could contribute effectively to a peace based on social justice and social security. A people's war must be followed by a people's peace.

Mr. Bevin strongly denounced the policy of starving the organs of international co-operation of money. The work of the I.L.O. in the past, he said, had been handicapped by limited resources. He begged the Governments to realise that using it to the full was one of the best insurances for the preparatory work to enable the nations to transfer from war to peace—a far more difficult task than transference from peace to war.

"There will be plenty of dynamite about," declared Mr. Bevin, referring to the enormous problems which would have to be tackled in the post-war period. Nations must agree on the objectives to be attained. Everybody must discipline themselves in order that the world might be set on a course of peace and progressive development. No one person, no single organisation or State, could supply the complete answer. All must combine together with clear objectives and common principles such as those laid down in the Atlantic Charter.

### PROF. CARR'S SECOND THOUGHTS (Continued from page 2)

be terminated at any given time by any armistice or agreement, but continued until all Europe should "collapse and disintegrate." Then the benevolent allied armies should assume control, and, disregarding frontiers, proceed to the relief and reconstruction of the

There must be co-operation to get rid of misery and insecurity; to spread universal education (tearing out of history books the things that prejudiced one people against another); and to teach that all had a contribution to make to human progress.

Sir Frederick Leggett, speaking as the British Government delegate, said that the British Government needed no convincing that the I.L.O. must play a vital part in the resettlement of the world.

The Emergency Committee is the body reconstituted at the International Labour Conference in New York last November, to make possible frequent meetings on both sides of the Atlantic. It is planning practical measures to give effect to the resolutions on collaboration and reconstruction which the delegates of 35 nations adopted at the New York Conference.

To ensure the continuation of the closest collaboration between the League and the I.L.O., Mr. Alexander Loveday (Director of the League's Economic and Financial Department) came from Princeton to attend the meeting. There is also to be collaboration with the Inter-Allied Committee for Post-War Relief, whose chairman (Sir Frederick Leith-Ross) took part in some of the discussions. It was further decided to set up an International Advisory Committee of eminent authorities to help with the I.L.O.'s planning.

whole continent. This is New Revolution with a vengeance!

On the whole, however, I seem to see in Mr. Carr a certain saving grace of inconsistency, on which I congratulate him. We leaguers may feel that, like Balaam, he came to curse and stayed to bless.

GILBERT MURRAY.

# THE POST-WAR WORLD

By the RIGHT HON. F. W. PETHICK-LAWRENCE, P.C., M.P.

(In an address to the Hurtwood Branch of the L.N.U.)

Given that we win the war (which I have never doubted), we must also win a durable peace so as to make a worthwhile life in the days to come. This can be achieved only by thought, and thinking is difficult, tiresome and uncertain. Nevertheless, we must brace ourselves to the effort, for without it nothing worth while can be accomplished.

What kind of a post-war world do we want? We want peace, but what for? Is it for a return to a pre-war world of unstable nations and insecurity to individual lives; to monotonous and soul-destroying work; to equally inane and soul-destroying leisure; to gross inequalities of wealth, to lavish display of luxury alongside want and unemployment? It would be easy to slip back into all this with tired satisfaction. But this way leads to more wars, social strife and human degradation. There must be another answer. Theories and principles must be in accordance with the known facts if they are to work out. What are the known facts?

## What to do with Germany

There is a German people, and it is quite inconceivable that they should be exterminated; therefore, we must ascertain their characteristics in order to handle them aright.

There are a variety of theories about this. The Vansittart theory holds that the Germans are inherently aggressive, and always have been and will be. If this be true, the only thing is to keep them in a kind of cage for ever. I believe that to be impossible. If those were the facts, I should despair for the peace of the world and of human civilisation.

At the other end of the scale are the extreme pacifists. They say that the Germans are exactly like ourselves, and we have only to treat them to a just peace for them to settle down peacefully with us for ever. Both these theories are unacceptable. We have only to remember the fate of the Munich proposals, and that the Germans have no equivalent for

our words "Fair Play." The German people have great gifts, but also grave defects, e.g., a complete failure to see anyone's point of view but their own, and a docility which makes them commit atrocious crimes under the influence of certain leaders and ideas.

I am against vengeance, though not escape from just retribution. What is needed is stern realism, justice tempered by wisdom, and a settlement which will provide economic scope though not scope for the repetition of national crimes. The danger is that, once the armies are beaten in the field, there will be an orgy of massacre in Europe which will have to be checked early lest the situation should get out of hand. All this implies supervision which, in the light of what follows, need not be regarded as humiliation.

## League and Leadership

We live in a world of nations individually incapable of defending themselves against aggression, and who have never learnt to take common action against it. The League of Nations failed for three reasons:—

- (1) Nation A was unwilling to safeguard nation B.
- (2) It did not see that numbers alone do not count. One set of Powers may be numerically greater than another, but the first may be badly placed strategically.
- (3) It took no steps against rearmament.

A new world comity must mean some derogation of national sovereignty, and nations must be subject not to "policing," but to some form of inspectorate—something parallel to a factory inspectorate and with the same functions. This world comity will require leadership, and one of the leaders must be Great Britain. After the last war, we failed Europe by refusing to lead. The refusal was due partly to a desire not to dominate and interfere, but also to selfishness and indolence—for leadership means first and foremost service. It means collecting the feelings, views and intentions of those led. Leader-

ship will be a task of supreme difficulty and responsibility, and the duration of the British Empire may well depend on how it is discharged.

## Britain's Stewardship

Though we have probably governed our Empire better than others have done, both now and in the past, we have not done so well as we ought. Thinking people in possession of the facts, and of all parties, are agreed that the state of some of our dependencies must be improved out of all knowledge. There is the Indian problem; and in certain colonies the neglect of decades has to be made good. All difficulties, and there are many, must be faced and surmounted, or the Empire will disintegrate.

## Social Policy

What are the essential facts about the position at home?

We have discovered, if we did not know it before, that we in these islands are members of one family, and we cannot behave to one another as though we were strangers. Before this century, scarcity was inevitable. A financial and economic system was built, based on scarcity. Now that we have mastery of production in field, factory and workshop, there is a potentiality of abundance undreamed of before. But the old system designed for scarcity persists, and does not fit new conditions. The problems facing us are so complex, new and difficult, that all the best minds must go to them, not just a few in one sex and class; otherwise we are in peril of not solving them at all.

## Spiritual Basis

Finally there is one of the oldest facts in the world, one that is part of the spiritual insight of the wisest of the human race—the truth that "man does not live by bread alone." A post-war world built only on a material basis, without providing for the spiritual enlargement of man, will be a house built upon sand, and the storms of life will destroy it, and we shall have no shelter from the blast.

Conclusions based on these facts can here be stated only broadly. The whole present and potential resources at our dis-

posal must be available to meet the physical needs of all our people. All the medical skill we possess must be at their service without stint, so that we may get the maximum of health in the community. The minds of our youth must be developed by education, recreation and travel (prolonged into maturity in the case of the more gifted), so that they may give of their best in service to the nation. Industrial life must be so planned that never again is there large scale unemployment. That is, never again must the creative impulse of man be thwarted or denied, lest he deteriorate and perish.

## ATLANTIC CHARTER

(Continued from page 9)

(such as Point 5 demands). There must be an agreed and enforced limitation of the rights and powers of nations to behave anti-socially. You remember what the L.N.U. Statement of Policy said about that.

Lastly, the Allies call for restoration of the rights of self-government. Yes. But this freedom, like the other, cannot be left wholly unregulated. Certain essential interests of the *community of nations* cannot be protected unless the right of self-government is limited. For instance, a nation which claims for itself freedom to suppress or distort essential news rejects one of the basic conditions of peace and confidence. Moreover, the rights of *individuals* must be protected against abuse of the right of self-government. The four freedoms which President Roosevelt has outlined will not be achieved if each Government retains an absolute right to deal with Home Affairs as it pleases. We need not only a general Covenant of peace but also some kind of Charter of human rights. And both must be sustained by a representative and powerful international authority.

# WORLD AFFAIRS IN PARLIAMENT

By OWEN A. RATTENBURY

Ignorant attacks on the League of Nations still go on. In the House of Commons last month the old suggestion that Great Britain and the Dominions have paid, and are still paying, enormous sums to keep in being a useless if not dangerous organisation has been repeated.

## Fallacies and Facts

Mr. Culverwell, Member for Bristol West, asked the amounts paid to the League of Nations for 1941 by Great Britain, the British Dominions and foreign countries respectively. Quite an innocent sort of question! Mr. Richard Law replied that, since the answer was long and included a lot of figures, he would circulate it with the Official Report. That was not exactly what Mr. Culverwell wanted. He asked as a supplementary whether the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs did not think, in view of the Treasury's stringent control of exchange reserves, that it was time we should cease from contributing alone of all the countries in the world to this "defunct organisation." Mr. Law politely asked him to study the reply before putting questions upon it.

*Mr. Culverwell: "Surely my hon. Friend will agree that we alone of all the countries of the world, except a few of the Dominions, are contributing a substantial sum to the upkeep of these buildings, and does he not think it is time we should cease doing it?"*

*Mr. Law: "No, I would not agree, and if my hon. Friend studies the Reply, I do not think he will."*

*Major-General Sir Alfred Knox: "Has not this organisation done enough harm without us still subscribing to it now?"*

*Miss Eleanor Rathbone: "Is not this organisation still doing a great amount of good?"*

The reply circulated by Mr. Law did indeed show that the United Kingdom, India, Canada, Australia, South Africa and New Zealand had demonstrated

their support for the League by paying their 1941 contributions in full; but payments had also been received from a number of other States. It is interesting to note that, among our Allies, the Netherlands, Norway and Poland had made token payments. The Argentine Republic, although not expected to pay anything at all, had made a voluntary contribution of £1,420 which was accepted as such. Sums in respect of arrears had come in from Egypt, Iraq (in addition to current dues), Eire and France—from the latter the substantial figure of £44,546.

These figures, the reply pointed out, excluded payments amounting to about £24,000 made by members of the International Labour Organisation, who are not members of the League.

## Comparative Values

As a commentary on Mr. Culverwell's idea of "a substantial sum," it may be added that the total amount paid by the whole British Commonwealth in 1941 was about £135,350—a sum which any London suburb or small provincial borough would be very disappointed to raise as a result of a Warships Week. The disproportion between this sum which some people grudge and, say, the £90,000,000 more this year which the Chancellor hopes to raise from his extra tobacco taxes alone, is striking.\*

\*"I have no patience with the pennywise economies which grudge the English contribution to the League's structure."—Mr. Winston Churchill.

## HEADWAY

LEAGUE OF NATIONS UNION,  
11, MAIDEN LANE, W.C.2.

Owing to the intervention of the Easter recess, there is little to say about foreign affairs generally. Members have asked nothing about Vichy, knowing that probably there was nothing they could be told. One question was asked about Turkey, but that was simply to get the assurance that this country would do nothing to hinder any efforts that Turkey might be making to send foodstuffs to Greece. There were two questions about Japan and the Japanese: The number of Japanese interned in this country and the Dominions was very small. Probably, in that regard, the United States have a much bigger problem. Though in general the fate of our prisoners-of-war from Hong Kong, Malaya and Singapore is still unknown, gradually a little light seems to be seeping through the darkness.

## Ethiopia

Abyssinian affairs were the subject of a question by Mr. Mander, who asked the Foreign Secretary whether he would be prepared to consent to the liquidation by the Emperor of the properties confiscated by Italy during her occupation of Ethiopia; and whether property it is intended to sequester for disposal by the Peace Conference is only that acquired lawfully by the Italians

before their invasion. Mr. Eden had no reliable information and had received no request from the Emperor for advice in these matters. When Mr. Mander asked if he could have the assurance that we are protecting no enemy property in order that it may be handed back after the war, Mr. Eden most definitely gave that assurance.

The House takes it for granted that our relations with the United States and Russia are those one would expect from allies in a common cause. It is slowly beginning to realise how great is the contribution China is making and has made for four years (some of the members would say for ten years). Spain or Portugal or Switzerland are practically never mentioned, except as the medium of communication with our prisoners of war. Finally, there is a clear desire not to complicate Russia's tremendous difficulties by pointing out such an anomaly as that she is still at peace with Japan, although allied with us in our other warfare. This delicacy on the part of the critics—and they are by no means so reticent in other affairs—is perhaps as clear an indication as could be wished of the House's desire to do nothing which might embarrass the Government's relations with our Allies.

## ANTI-LEAGUE PROPAGANDA

Union members are urged to make use of every opportunity to counteract anti-League propaganda, by showing that the Union was not responsible for the unpreparedness of this country for war. When the international situation began to deteriorate, it declared its readiness to support rearmament, on the understanding that the armaments would be used in furtherance of a League of Nations policy.

Lord Cecil, the Union's President, voted accordingly in the House of Lords, and

there (March 2, 1937) explained his voting thus:—"We have got to secure peace if we can. I do not think you can secure it by pacificism or arguments. . . . For that reason I have never been able to vote against the armament policy of the Government. I still find myself utterly unable to oppose it. . . . I agree with every word about the urgent needs we have in this country upon which more money could be spent, but unless you can secure peace none of these things can be done, and as I am unable to agree that you can secure peace by pacificism I am bound to support rearmament. \*If you are to have international co-operation, we must be ready to do our part."

# ATLANTIC CHARTER

## THE POLITICAL PROGRAMME

By W. ARNOLD-FORSTER

Let us examine the Atlantic Charter, beginning with the first three Points—those which indicate a political programme for the peace settlement. In two further articles we will deal with the economic programme—Points 4 and 5, and with the peace policy—Points 6, 7, 8.

**Point 1. Their countries seek no aggrandisement, territorial or otherwise.** It was right to begin by thus repudiating any intention of exploiting victory for purposes of grab. The British Commonwealth and the United States who first made the Charter, are in this war, not to add to their dominions by conquest, but simply to defeat aggression now and to prevent it in future. All the 26 "United Nations" have now, by the Declaration of January 2, 1942, recorded the adherence of their Governments to the programme and principles of the Charter; so they too are formally committed to this statement of intention. Excellent so far as it goes.

But it will not be easy to achieve honest application of the principle. In the first place, it will be necessary to distinguish between "aggrandisement," which we denounce, and restitution, which certain Powers will justly claim. We could hardly say no, for instance, to China's just claim for recovery of the provinces stolen from her by Japan since 1931; but where should the line be drawn? For some Powers, such as Britain and the United States, territorial aggrandisement may have lost its lure, if only for the simple reason that these Powers have rich resources and ample responsibilities; but for other Powers, not in this position, self-abnegation

would be much more difficult. The man who has great possessions does not have to commit himself to any embarrassing moral restraints in subscribing to the denunciation of the simpler forms of theft. But the perennial struggle for political security and economic expansion will not suddenly subside. Some Governments will want annexation of this or that strategic point, as a national protection against future aggression; and it will certainly be difficult to resist such claims unless the peace settlement offers solid assurance of collective defence against aggression, and of equitable revision of the *status quo* by peaceful means. It will not be surprising if Comrade Stalin, for instance, turns out to be a very "tough guy" when it comes to the settlement of territorial questions in which the strategic security of the U.S.S.R. seems to him to be affected.

The fact is that we can only hope to make a success of Point 1 of the Charter if we also make a success of other Points, especially Point 8, which calls for "a wider and permanent system of general security." Renunciation of aggrandisement, like "abandonment of the use of force" is only one of the parts necessary for a working policy of peace and justice.

**Point 2. They desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned.** Here again it was right to assert the principle. The victors ought not to redraw the map arbitrarily, regardless of the wishes of the peoples who live in the lands in question. The victors should, on the other hand, support what is the paramount war aim of

all the peoples conquered by the Axis invaders—namely, eviction of the invaders and their quislings.

Note that the principle of Point 2 applies to Germany as well as to Germany's present victims. In effect, the Allies renounce any intention of forcing the break up of Germany proper.

Do not suppose that the principle can be applied easily and without qualification. In some cases, such as Norway's, no uncertainty about frontiers will complicate the issue; but in other cases, such as Poland's or Transylvania's, no free expression of the "wishes of the peoples concerned" can afford a solution to the problem of those who will have to draw frontiers.

It has been emphasised by many of us (most recently by Prof. E. H. Carr, in his "Conditions of Peace") that what is most needed is to alter "not the location but the meaning of frontiers." That is quite true. We shall not have solved the main problem of peaceful order unless the bonds of commonwealth cutting across frontiers, make these divisions far less disruptive than they were between the wars. But we deceive ourselves if we suppose that the fire of nationalism will quickly die down, or that "national self-determination" is something which the nineteenth century statesmen of Versailles thought important but which can be ignored by enlightened twentieth century statesmen of to-morrow. Plainly, the principle of Point 2 cannot be made to work unless there is an international authority competent to decide fairly what people shall be free to exercise this right of choice, what limitations should be set upon that freedom of choice, and what provisions are necessary to secure that that freedom is genuine. No good offering to the Czechs, for instance, an assurance of freedom to choose their territorial allegiance if those Czechs cannot get back to their own country from which Hitler has evicted them, or cannot express

their wishes without fear of victimisation. Above all, the purpose of Point 2 will be defeated if there is no collective defence against lawless violence. To set up another little Austria or Czecho-Slovakia or Denmark, with the label of freedom, will be only a mockery unless what is valuable in nationhood is protected, powerfully and impartially, against military or economic murder by some mighty gangster from the other side of their garden wall. Point 2, like Point 1, is only part of a policy.

**Point 3. They respect the right to all peoples to choose the form of Government under which they will live: and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.**

Note first that the Allies, in saying that they respect the right of peoples to choose their form of government, refer to "all peoples." In a later Point, however, they emphasise that Nazi tyranny must be destroyed. There is no reservation in the Charter which would exclude, say, India from its scope; though Mr. Churchill did emphasise, when he brought the Charter home, that it "does not qualify in any way the various statements of policy which have been made from time to time about the development of Constitutional Government in India, Burma or other parts of the British Empire." But the Allies say, in effect, that, despite Point 3, they will have no truck at any time with a Nazi regime in Germany.

The Allies call for restoration of "sovereign rights" to those who have been robbed of such rights. Every reader of HEADWAY will appreciate that if the rights of sovereignty are absolute, there can be no "order under law" (such as the Anglo-American Agreement of February 23, 1942, aims at); no "system of general security" (such as Point 8 of the Charter calls for); no "fullest collaboration in the economic field"

(Continued on page 5)

## UP AND DOWN THE COUNTRY

Outstanding among L.N.U. meetings during April was the visit of DR. WELLINGTON KOO to TORQUAY. His Excellency the Chinese Ambassador was deeply touched by the warm welcome accorded him. For a long time before his arrival there had been "standing room only." The whole audience crowding the Town Hall arose and applauded the representative of an allied nation which had already withstood aggression for so many years. After describing the war as seen through his country's eyes, Dr. Koo concluded: "There can be no doubt as to the final result—and this is no easy complacency, but the outcome of reason and thought." A collection amounting to more than £34 was taken for the China Relief Fund. The R.A.F. were very helpful and supplied band music.

WATERLOO, CROSBY, SEAFORTH AND LITHERLAND BRANCH held its twenty-second Annual Gathering in two parts on successive Saturday afternoons. At the first, in association with the Ministry of Information, Miss K. D. Courtney spoke on "The Atlantic Charter." A week later came the business proceedings presided over by Mr. James Macdonald, J.P. Both were very good meetings, despite an unfortunate local controversy caused by the Mayor's hostility.

The annual meeting of the WISHAW BRANCH was the event of the week, judging by the fine publicity secured in both local newspapers. Although no speaker of note had been secured, a lively discussion on the post-war League developed spontaneously, and the meeting was all the more valuable in that so many were able to contribute their ideas.

Monsieur G. Mathieu, for fifteen years senior French interpreter at Geneva, spoke on "Free France" at the Annual Meeting of the OXTED AND LIMPSFIELD BRANCH. The Branch's annual report showed that, while the membership was slightly down compared with the previous year, the average rate of subscription was now higher.

Two busy men, Mr. David Robertson, M.P., and the Rector of Streatham, found or made time to speak and preside re-

spectively at the Annual Meeting of the STREATHAM BRANCH. Mr. Robertson said that the League of Nations or its successor would be the instrument of the Atlantic Charter. The high-sounding phrases of the Charter could mean little or much; we had to decide how much they would mean.

At the Annual Meeting of the MORECAMBE BRANCH Mr. C. Hinchcliffe, the Secretary, attributed the Branch's sound position to the efforts of the collectors. Miss P. Fetherston, Youth Group Secretary, said that, although increasing calls on their time made frequent meetings impossible, it was still essential for young people to follow the course of events with an outlook framed in the ideals of the League.

At the Annual Meeting of the WEYBRIDGE AND OATLANDS BRANCH, Mr. Cecil H. S. Wilson (Chairman) announced that, thanks to energetic measures in the form of personal visiting by members of the Committee, *the number of subscriptions received for 1942 already exceeded the whole 1941 total.* The balance-sheet showed a healthy sum in hand. Miss G. Butler, Hon. Secretary of the Surrey County Federation, addressed the meeting.

The HARTFORD (CHESHIRE) BRANCH ensured a good attendance at its Annual Meeting by inviting the Northwich Townswomen's Guilds Choir to take part in a concert which followed the short business meeting. The Branch Chairman seized the opportunity afforded by the presence of an unusually large number of non-members to make a short speech explaining the purpose of the L.N.U., and inviting those present to attend the next discussion meeting. Some new members were enrolled on the spot.

MALDEN (SURREY) and STAVELEY (DERBYSHIRE) BRANCHES are among those which have been able to report slight increases in membership.

At the twenty-first Annual General Meeting of the L.R.F. on April 28, Mr. Vernon Bartlett, M.P., delivered his Presidential Address. At the monthly Buffet Luncheon, Mr. Leslie Aldous spoke on "The Atlantic Charter." "ETHIOPIA"

will be the subject of the next Buffet Luncheon—on Wednesday, May 13, at the Y.W.C.A.—when the speaker will be Mr. Emmanuel Abraham (Secretary of the Ethiopian Legation in London).

Visiting HASTINGS, the Dean of Chichester addressed a very successful afternoon meeting on the Atlantic Charter. The audience crowding the White Rock Pavilion included business men, at least twenty clergy and ministers, and some airmen. In the evening, another large and enthusiastic audience heard the Dean at BATTLE.

YEADON BRANCH, despite fewer opportunities of personal contact with members, has kept going magnificently in recent months. With the co-operation of the Churches and the Forces Institute, two services have been held, addressed respectively by the Bishop of Bradford and the Rev. Professor Marshall. Mr. E. Sutcliffe, Branch Secretary and Treasurer, has addressed the Women's Liberal Association, and the Rev. G. Bennett the Park View Women's Bright Hour.

HUCKNALL BRANCH claims to be the most energetic body in that town of 20,000 people, and this view is supported by the number of meetings arranged by the committee. The plan of these meetings has been to bring before the public representatives of the European countries now subjugated by Germany. The growing interest in international affairs has been shown by the eagerness to make use of question time. Arrangements have also been made for the speakers to address the Hucknall Rotary Club and the senior girls' school.

WESTMINSTER BRANCH is organising a "Brains Trust" meeting, to be held in the Central Hall, on Friday, June 5, at 7 p.m. Mr. P. J. Noel Baker, M.P., Major Victor Cazalet, M.P., Miss K. D. Courtney, and Mrs. Dugdale have consented to have their brains "trussed."

Dr. SUDJIC (Yugoslavia) has already paid a return visit to Scotland—partly under L.N.U. auspices, and partly under those of the Ministry of Information. He spoke in EDINBURGH, ABERDEEN, CUPAR, PERTH and BATHGATE, and at some of the Rotary Clubs in these places. EDINBURGH's latest luncheon meeting was ad-

dressed by General Marcel de Baer (Belgium).

Mr. John T. Catterall's speaking engagements during the past month have included three tours of meetings in SOMERSET and DEVON, LANCASHIRE and YORKSHIRE, and HAMPSHIRE and the ISLE OF WIGHT.

HIGHGATE BRANCH, which had not been holding meetings, has now embarked upon a series of discussions on "Social and Economic Reconstruction After the War." An introductory talk was given by Mr. Aldous, and it was then arranged to continue with regular monthly meetings.

A most successful meeting for senior pupils of the four Secondary Schools now in the town—the Girls' High School, the King Edward VI Grammar School, the Clarendon House Girls' School and the Chatham House Boys' School (the latter two evacuated from Ramsgate) was arranged by the STAFFORD BRANCH. The Essay Competition between the two Stafford Secondary Schools for a silver challenge cup has this year been thrown open to the two Ramsgate schools.

At the Prior's Field Girls' School near Godalming, Mrs. M. Harrod had an interesting audience. Of the 100 girls present, about 30 belonged to the L.N.U. Junior Branch, about 30 to Federal Union, and another 30 to an "International Club." All were keenly interested in the talk on the constructive work of the League and the I.L.O.

An officer in the R.A.F. wrote to the STREATHAM BRANCH that he believed his subscription was long overdue, but, as he had seen from a local newspaper that the Branch was still alive, he would like to maintain his membership. In trepidation the Secretary replied that his last subscription had been paid in 1937. By return of post, a cheque was received covering the full amount of back subscriptions, and including payment up to 1943. This shows the value of keeping up publicity in the local Press, and also how the work of the L.N.U. is still valued.

We regret to record the death, earlier this year, at the age of 86, of MISS JANET CARSON, who in pre-war days worked tirelessly for the L.N.U. in Paris.

# COLONIAL SETTLEMENT

## MR. WATSON REPLIES TO CRITICS

SIR,—It would take an entire number of HEADWAY to cover all the points raised by your correspondents in reply to my article on this subject. The argument of that article, however, was not that "all is well" in all our colonies, but that the conclusions of the Report on Colonial Settlement are not of general application because they are untrue of our East African dependencies. References to Jamaica, West Africa and Malaya do not affect that argument, much less strictures on South Africa, which is not a colony or a dependency, and whose administration is not predominantly British. I shall therefore continue to confine myself to East Africa, and begin by replying to Mr. Chapman's questions.

1. "Who after a study of the history of East Africa could agree that our empire there was acquired for humanity, etc.?" The answer is (a) your correspondent Mr. Peet, who has already pled guilty; and (b) anyone who reads with unbiassed mind *The Exploitation of East Africa* by Dr. Coupland (Beit Professor of Colonial History at Oxford). People who gravely debate whether natives were not better off when left to themselves can have no glimmer of a conception what the slave trade was like, or how deeply Livingstone's accounts of it stirred the conscience of the English-speaking world.

2. "Who is the authority . . . who declared in 1930 that probably nowhere in the world were relations between employers and employed better than in Kenya?" The answer is, the Government Commissioner for Native Affairs (Sir Armigel Wade). His testimony was anticipated by the Ormsby Gore Commission of 1925 (Report, Cmd. 2387, pp. 169-170), and the Hilton Young Commission of 1929 (Report, Cmd. 3234, p. 90). A member of the latter, Dr. J. H. Oldham (now Editor of *The Christian Newsletter*) followed the Report up with special articles in the *Times*, in which he acknowledged the good will of the settlers and pled for their more active association with the Government in the exercise of its trusteeship.

3. "Why is it that in those parts of Africa where it is impossible for white men to make a permanent home, the interests of the native receive more attention than in parts like Kenya?" Simple arithmetic suggests an answer. In the former regions, officials are free to devote a hundred per cent. of their time to native interests; in the latter, a smaller proportion. But the disadvantage, if it is one, is more than offset by benefits which Mr. Chapman overlooks. A vital factor in improving native conditions is what the Ormsby Gore Report describes (p. 170) as "the insistence of the settlers on the need of providing better educational facilities for the native population, and for increased medical, maternity and child welfare services." It is not easy to overrate the value of a vigorous and enlightened public opinion, like that of the Kenya settlers. Can it be imagined that the traffic in gin in officially controlled West Africa which Mr. Peet denounces would be tolerated for a week in Kenya, even if it were not barred by treaty?

The special points made by Mr. Chapman, which appear to be selected from Lord Hailey's *African Survey*, have all two aspects, as thus:—"The legislature had steadily refused to impose income-tax": but Hailey does not omit to mention that the tax was passed in 1937. "One-third of the revenue was raised by tax on natives": and two-thirds from the remaining 4 per cent. of the population. (According to an analysis of statistics made in 1922, and quoted by Lord Cranworth in the *Empire Review* in 1924, Europeans paid 150 times more per head in taxation, direct and indirect, than natives. But the data necessary for an exact and reliable computation do not exist. "9,000 natives were imprisoned for failure to pay tax": but the correct figure according to Hailey is 175, and in any case default in tax-paying cannot be condoned without injustice to the taxpayers, most of whom are natives. "Infant mortality was 400 per 1,000" (figure taken from a 1924 estimate in the complete absence of statistics), and "Educa-

tional facilities were provided for less than 15 per cent. of the child population": this in spite of the unofficial pressure already referred to. But it must be remembered that educational facilities for Bantu-speaking natives cannot be improvised or purchased ready-made.

As to white agriculture in Central Africa being "uneconomic," Africa may be a poor continent; the richer tracts, however, include the Highlands of Kenya, though the cream of the land there is, of course, native reserve. But white production in Kenya has been almost entirely a matter, not of joint-stock companies with their dubious blessings of limited moral and financial liability, but of individual pioneer enterprise. The test of cash dividends, therefore, even if not as some think inherently unethical, does not fit the case. Supporters of white settlement believe that it has justified itself by paying rich dividends in the form of human welfare and happiness, however this may conflict with "commonsense" materialism; and that it has, in fact, played an important part in fulfilling Lugard's Dual Mandate, even if money has been sacrificed in the process.

Mr. Ramsay Sibbald propounds the question, "What are colonies for?" and answers it by including among several unexceptionable objects, "the recruitment of man-power for military purposes": and he adds: "It is not necessary to include the spread of religion and culture." These propositions seem to me so alien to the principles of our Union that discussion of them in HEADWAY would be superfluous. His reference to "the failure of the British Government to ratify the territorial settlement of the natives in Kenya" has no foundation in fact. The Reserves have been duly proclaimed and gazetted. It is perhaps not surprising that such mistakes are made, in view of the scanty attention paid by the Press to colonial affairs, which is an unhappy reflection of the slackness of the interest taken in them by the British public. Such vital pronouncements as Sir Harold Macmillan's speech in the House in defence of the settlers against the attacks of Mr. Creech Jones; the searching comparison of educational policy and methods in West and East Africa made by the Rev. H. M.

Grace, ex-Principal of Achimota College, before the Royal Society of Arts last January; and Prime Minister Sir Godfrey Huggins' White Paper on Native Policy in South Rhodesia are to be found nowhere in our daily or weekly Press, but only in the columns of *East Africa and Rhodesia*, which I commend to all who take their trusteeship seriously.

I hope it will not be deemed inappropriate if I conclude with a reference to the municipal record of Nairobi, where I was Town Clerk for fourteen years. The municipal revenues were almost exclusively derived from non-native sources, native revenue being negligible in amount; yet from the start the municipality annually earmarked all its unspent balances for establishment of a native quarter. Non-native revenue thus earmarked, and later expended on native services up to 1919, when a Corporation was granted, amounted to over £8,000. Before that date public services such as roads, water supply, etc., had been provided by Government departments, that is to say, they were to some extent financed out of native taxation; yet the municipality had for years persistently pressed for a Corporation and for the right to finance all their own services from non-native sources by means of a rate. So far from the unofficial element exercising their "power of obstruction," as Mr. Chapman would imply, the boot was on the other leg. The native quarter scheme was held up for years by the Government medical department which claimed for a projected quarantine hospital the only site which could be regarded as entirely suitable. The Department was ultimately overruled by the Colonial Office, and the scheme was carried through, with a success that has, as I understand, been limited only by the Government's failure to find all the loan monies required for the purpose by the Corporation. One native quarter was the first area in Nairobi provided with a water-borne sewerage system.

These are no doubt parochial matters; but they are facts, and it seems to me that a philosophy which is unable to digest and assimilate them must be in need of comprehensive readjustment. Even com-

(Continued on page 14)

## "THE I.L.O. AT WORK"

Here is No. 2 of the I.L.O. series of illustrated brochures from Montreal, and a worthy successor to No. 1, which gave so lively a picture of the transplanting of the International Labour Office from Geneva to the hospitable soil of the New World.

That the plant continues to flourish is evident. Especially welcome is the full and vivid description of the recent International Labour Conference in New York—by far the most complete account of that historic meeting which has yet reached this country. The pages are bright with remarkable photographs, including one of President Roosevelt addressing the final sitting of the Conference in the White House.

Mr. M. R. K. Burge also contributes

### COLONIAL SETTLEMENT

(Continued from page 13)

mon sense must give ground when it collides with truth.

I am, etc.,

J. ARTHUR WATSON.

P.S.—Mr. Chapman's unfair criticism of the Imperial B.E.A. Co. must not pass without challenge. The failure of the company was due to the weakness of our Foreign Office in the face of German devilry. See the article on B.E.A. in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, from which the following passage is taken:—"To the judgment, foresight and patriotism of Sir William Mackinnon, British East Africa practically owes its foundation. Sir William and his colleagues of the company were largely animated by humanitarian motives in the desire to suppress slavery and to improve the condition of the natives. With this aim they prohibited the drink traffic, started industrial missions, built roads and administered impartial justice. In the opinion of a later administrator (Sir C. Eliot), their work and that of their immediate successors was the greatest philanthropic achievement of the latter part of the nineteenth century." Those who criticise such a record as uneconomic are surely condemning their own ethical standards.

an important article on "The London Office at Work," in which he tells how a new unit has been gradually constructed over here to maintain contact with the Allied Governments in London, to deal with colonial labour problems, and to furnish factual information about all social conditions in Great Britain which may be required at Montreal. There are now nine Governments centred in London, and a substantial number of the members of the Governing Body with whom it is possible to communicate. There are also groups of trade unionists from countries occupied by the Axis Powers. Further, most of the colonial territories of the world are in present circumstances controlled from London.

Blitzes, as Mr. Burge recounts in detail, have done their best to throw a spanner into the machine, but the work has gone on. And here is his footnote: "By the way, we remain in touch with Geneva. Letters and parcels reach us slowly from there, but as surely as from Montreal."

### WITH OUR ALLIES

Readers will be interested to know that the Czechoslovak League of Nations Union has been reconstituted on British soil, with His Excellency Dr. Benes as Hon. President and Dr. L. Feierabend (Minister of State) as President. "We are giving expression to the wishes of our oppressed people at home," writes Dr. Jiri Stolz, the Society's Vice-President. "We are very happy to have this opportunity of contributing to the reconstruction of a better and mightier League of Nations."

At the April session of the London International Assembly, Dr. Benes spoke on the rôle of the smaller nations in post-war settlement. Assembly members also met Professor W. Rappard, of Switzerland, who was on a visit to this country. Lord Cecil presided on both occasions.

### BOOKS OF THE MONTH

FACING THE FUTURE. By Lord Davies. (Staples and Staples, 3s. 6d.)

In this further collection of letters by "Robert the Peeler," Lord Davies recapitulates his philosophy in the light of pre-war and war-time experience. His main proposal, which does not emerge until late in the book, is that the 50-odd nations in the old League should form themselves into five or six groups roughly on a geographical basis, and that these in turn should become a Confederation of Federations. The Confederation constitution should be modelled on that of the League, with such modifications or additions as experience has proved to be essential for the functioning of the Rule of Law. The warning should be added that the author's discursive style will not suit everybody. It is never easy to treat a serious subject in light and colloquial language, and this attempt is bound to irritate some readers. The book could with advantage be pruned of much that neither adds to its argument nor enhances its literary merit.

THE U.S.S.R.: AN OUTLINE FOR STUDY AND DISCUSSION, by *Monica Luffman*, has been published by the Council for Education in World Citizenship (established by the League of Nations Union). In presenting in very brief outline essential facts and information about Soviet Russia, the author has avoided the deadliest sin in a work of this kind of leaving her bones too dry. The topics for discussion, suggested in a special section, are lively and intelligent; and there seem to be no serious gaps in the excellent short bibliography. Copies of the booklet (price 4d. each, post free, or 3s. 6d. a dozen) may be obtained from 11, Maiden Lane, W.C.2.

#### HEADWAY LANGUAGE GROUP

Elementary RUSSIAN Now Offered

Apply: M. DARNLEY NAYLOR,  
158, Henleaze Road, BRISTOL

### BOOKS IN BRIEF

Owing to lack of space this month, we confine ourselves to little more than bare recommendation of some of the new books which will most definitely repay reading.

A CHRISTIAN BASIS FOR THE POST-WAR WORLD. A Commentary on the Ten Peace Points. By the *Archbishop of Canterbury, A. E. Baker, Margaret Bondfield, Sidney Dark, Letitia Fairfield, John A. Hughes, Kenneth Ingram, A. D. Lindsay, Dorothy Sayers, R. R. Stokes, and Barbara Ward.* (Student Christian Movement Press, 2s. 6d.)

GERMAN WITHOUT TEARS. By *P. Wiener.* (Cresset Press, 6s.). The facts about Nazi-controlled education.

THE GREATEST SWINDLE IN THE WORLD. By *G. Borsky.* (New Europe Publishing Company, 1s. 6d.) Much-needed light on the Reparations Ramp.

PATTERN OF CONQUEST. By *Joseph C. Harsch.* (Heinemann, 8s. 6d.) Very able American describes Germany at war.

RUSSIA AT WAR. Twenty Key Questions and Answers. By *Vera M. Dean.* (Headline Book, Foreign Policy Association, U.S.A., 1s.). "Brains Trust" replies—fair, full and effective.

THE U.S.S.R. ITS SIGNIFICANCE FOR THE WEST. *Socialist Clarity Group.* (Gollancz, 2s. 6d.)

THE KREMLIN AND THE PEOPLE. By *Walter Duranty.* (Hamish Hamilton, 5s.)

FEDERATION IN CENTRAL EUROPE. By *M. Hodza.* (Jarrolds, 18s.). Social and economic forces in Central Europe by one of the most experienced democratic statesmen.

JAPAN INSIDE OUT. By *Syngman Rhee.* (Long, 10s. 6d.) Militarist background of Japanese foreign policy.

SOCIALISM, NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL. By *Dr. F. Borkenau.* (Routledge, 5s.) The extent to which the Labour and Socialist point of view has identified itself with the cause of Nationalism.

THE INDIAN STATES AND INDIAN FEDERATION. By *Sir Geoffrey de Montmorency.* (Cambridge University Press, Current Problems Series, 3s. 6d.) Background of a little understood aspect of the Indian question.



## POISON AND ANTIDOTE

*"Have we learned nothing in this war? The League was powerless to stop the first aggressor (Japan) in 1932, the second (Italy) in 1935, and the third Germany; but it was able to accomplish this country's undoing by disarmament, the scrapping of twenty capital ships, and the reduction of our Navy to a skeleton, and reduce us to unpreparedness at the outbreak of war. . . ."*

*"Surely by this time every sane and intelligent Briton knows that the only security for peace in this kind of barbaric world is to be fully armed and prepared. Is not the very suggestion of reviving the League in these awful days an insult to and a betrayal of the men and women who are fighting to preserve our very existence?"—(A correspondent in the "Western Morning News.")*

It is the correspondent who has learned nothing in this war. The naval reductions referred to, negotiated at a time when the menace of the German Fleet had been removed, and all the chief naval Powers were anxious to economise, were, in fact, achieved at conferences not called by the League. But, as regards disarmament in general, it cannot be too often emphasised that the League never asked or expected Great Britain or any other nation to go in for one-sided disarmament. On the other hand, if the common-sense aim of all-round reductions and limitations by international agreement, with an adequate system of inspection or supervision, had been attained, it would have

been impossible for the aggressors to make their colossal war preparations in secret.

Those who are now blaming the League for not stopping the aggressors are the very people who did their best to prevent it from taking effective action. In 1932 they argued that the quarrel between Japan and China was no concern of ours. In 1935 they shouted that "sanctions mean war." And when Germany, encouraged by the example of Japan and Italy, began her systematic depredations in Europe, they were the apostles of "appeasement."

In those days the League of Nations Union was in good company. Time and again that rebel statesman, Mr. Winston Churchill, implored his own country and other peace-loving nations to form a strong defensive union within the framework of the League, while there was yet time. But, as he pointed out in his broadcast on August 24, 1941, "none would listen."

This war has already conclusively proved that no nation's unaided strength can give it security against aggression. To meet their common dangers, the Allies have improvised a war-time approximation of "collective security." The League idea was not so far wrong after all!

There will have to be an International Authority after this war—the Atlantic Charter would be meaningless without it. But it must have "teeth," and it must be backed by human will.

### MAIN CONTENTS

	PAGE
Prof. Carr's Second Thoughts <i>By Dr. Gilbert Murray, O.M.</i>	1
Mr. Bevin on the I.L.O.	3
The Post-War World <i>By the Rt. Hon. F. W. Pethick-Lawrence,</i>	4
<i>P.C., M.P.</i>	
World Affairs in Parliament <i>By Owen A. Rattenbury</i>	6
Atlantic Charter: The Political Programme <i>By W. Arnold-Forster</i>	8
Up and Down the Country	10
Colonial Settlement <i>Mr. J. Arthur Watson Replies</i>	12
Books of the Month	15