

HEADWAY

S
1083

IN WAR-TIME

The Journal of the League of Nations

BRITISH LIBRARY
25 FEB 1941
POLITICAL AND
ECONOMIC SCIENCE
PRICE 3d

No. 14

NOVEMBER 1940

WORLD SETTLEMENT AFTER THE WAR

(STATEMENT OF POLICY ADOPTED BY EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF LEAGUE OF NATIONS UNION, 24TH OCTOBER, 1940.)

(The General Council, at its meeting in December, will be asked to give its general approval.)

INTRODUCTORY

The Executive Committee of the League of Nations Union has already issued two statements of policy on the subject of an international settlement after the war and the policy outlined in them has been endorsed by the General Council. Recent events, however, especially the collapse of France, have rendered necessary a review of the situation and a restatement of the policy of the L.N.U., though the main principles on which previous statements were based are still applicable.

We entered the war to check the attempt of Nazi Germany to dominate Europe and impose on other countries the tyranny by which her own people have been enslaved. We seek no enlargements of our territory or economic privilege. As the Prime Minister has said: "We do not covet anything from any nation except their respect." We desire that international relations should be governed not by force but by Freedom, Truth and Justice, in the benefits

of which all nations should equally share. To attain these objects we believe that the statement after the war should be on the following lines.

PRINCIPLES OF WAR SETTLEMENT

Preliminary

1. At the end of the war a conference of the belligerents must be held to deal with the special issues raised by the war; such as—the restoration of occupied territories, financial measures concerned with war damage, provisional measures to prevent the renewal of a policy of aggression by Germany, Italy and their allies.

2. As soon as an agreement on these points has been reached, invitations should be issued for an international Congress, consisting of the belligerents and some at least of the neutral States, to decide on the terms of a world settlement, including such financial and territorial arrangements as may be desirable for the establishment of good relations between all nations.

3. Whatever territorial or financial arrangements are made, the two vital problems to be solved will be the Maintenance of Future Peace, and Economic and Social Reconstruction.

4. These problems are closely related. Peace is essential to Reconstruction; Reconstruction is vital to Peace. Both depend on the Supremacy of Law.

5. The Supremacy of Law in this connection does not mean so much obedience to particular rules governing international intercourse as the recognition that the sovereignty of nations should be limited by certain fundamental principles such as good faith and justice and the rejection of force as the sole arbiter of international rights.

Peace-Keeping

6. If international good faith and justice are to be observed some authority must be brought into existence which can declare in any particular case what good faith and justice require. Similarly, if mere force is not to be allowed to determine international controversy, in other words, if aggression is to be prevented, some authority must be entrusted with the duty and given the power to prevent it.

7. It is on the question of what is to be that authority that the fundamental international controversy arises. The Germans hold that there can be no limit to the sovereignty of a State except its power to enforce its will. They think, therefore, that as they claim to have the supreme military power in Europe, they have a right to do whatever they think desirable on that Continent.

8. We, on the contrary, hold that no nation can be trusted to be judge in its own cause, and we point to the events in the Far East, in Abyssinia, in Austria, in Albania, in Czechoslovakia, in Poland before the war, and in other cases since

the war began, to show what horrible injustice and cruelty are produced by the German theory.

9. It seems clear that if we reject the selfish domination of a single Power we must look to a combination of Powers which will both have the moral authority to declare what justice and good faith require and will be sufficiently strong to prevent aggression.

10. That was the main idea underlying the League of Nations. It failed because its members were not prepared to run the risks inevitable if powerful aggressors were to be coerced into abandoning aggression.

In other words, the League Powers did not take their Covenant obligations seriously. A change of attitude on this point is essential if peace is to be preserved by international co-operation.

(a) If the British and French Governments with the other Members of the League had been prepared forcibly to prevent the Italian invasion of Abyssinia in 1935 we should probably not have witnessed the renewed attack on China and the attacks on Austria, Czechoslovakia and Albania, nor should we have been driven in circumstances of much greater difficulty to take up arms on behalf of Poland in 1939.

(b) That seems obvious to us now, and, indeed, the danger was clear enough to many people at the time. Why, then, did we and others act as we did five years ago?

(c) The answer is, in the first place, because we were still thinking in terms of British interests—that is, the British Government believed that the chief, if not the only, object of British Foreign Policy should be the protection of British commercial and territorial rights and the personal safety of British subjects from direct attack. It was said, for instance, that we were not interested in Abyssinia, forgetting that

we were deeply interested in the maintenance of peace and in the support of the machinery which had been constructed to maintain it.

(d) Secondly, it was said that other members of the League would not back us up. The allegation was in the main unfounded; but whether true or false, it created an atmosphere of hesitation.

(e) Thirdly, there was the view that if, in defiance of our obligations under the Covenant, we allowed Italy to conquer Abyssinia, she would be more likely to help us against Germany. The folly of this condonation of evil is now evident enough.

(f) Further, difficulties were caused by the wide extent and consequent vagueness of the League obligations. Each of the fifty-odd members of the League was in form bound to carry out against an aggressor in any part of the globe the onerous duties imposed by Article 16. And it was not quite certain what those duties were.

(g) It was partly due to this vagueness of League obligations that the members of the League were lacking in *esprit de corps* and were inclined more and more to look at aggression from a rigidly national standpoint—an inclination very much increased by the worldwide nationalist movement exemplified by Fascism and Nazi-ism.

(h) There was in consequence a tendency to minimise by explanation the meaning of Article 16, and to fall back on condemnation of the aggressor and appeals against him to the public opinion of the world. Many people, indeed, contended that this was a better way to keep the peace than by imposing sanctions. The experience of the Manchurian and Abyssinian cases ought to have convinced all impartial people that this was a mistaken view.

Reconstruction

11. It is impossible to say what will be the economic condition of the world at the end of the war. But all are agreed

that it is likely to be extremely serious and may be catastrophic. To meet these conditions there will have to be emergency provisions designed to mitigate starvation and set going again the machinery of credit and exchange.

12. But temporary measures will not be enough. A determined attempt to break down economic nationalism must be made. Tariffs must be lowered and other devices which have hampered trade must be abolished.

13. The work done in the last 20 years by the League and the I.L.O. must be speeded up and expanded with a much increased budget. This is true of the economic and industrial and also of the social and humanitarian work. It may well be that far-reaching changes will have to be made in the conception of State co-operation in, control of, and assistance to finance, trade and industry. If so, such changes may be international in character and will have to be dealt with by the international authority.*

14. Two other subjects will require courageous action: the racial, religious and linguistic minorities, and the administration of colonial territories. A great deal of experience has been gained in both subjects by the work of the League. It is not possible to go into details at present, but we would say that the following principles should be kept in view:—

- (1) No legal discrimination against any person on the ground that he is a member of a racial, religious or linguistic minority; and
- (2) Colonial Administration as a trust in the interests of all the inhabitants, and affording to all nations equal opportunity for their trade and commerce.

Machinery

15. To carry out the policy advocated

* A more detailed report on Social Reconstruction is under consideration.

in this Memorandum, the existence of an International Authority as nearly representative of the civilised world as possible is essential.

16. In the opinion of the L.N.U. the most appropriate International Authority would be the League of Nations, though some modification of the Covenant will have to be made to make it conform with the experience gained in the last 20 years.

17. Whether the International Authority, the first bulwark for the prevention of war, be the League of Nations reconstituted and modified, or some new organisation with a different name, the business of the Authority should be the maintenance of peace and justice and the improvement of the economic and social life of the world, through international co-operation.

18. The I.L.O. and the P.C.I.J. must also be continued.

19. If any member submits to the International Authority that the provisions of any treaty or other international conditions have become dangerous or inapplicable, the Authority should examine the matter and recommend such steps as may be desirable. If this recommendation is adopted unanimously except for the votes of States immediately interested, it should be binding on all States Members of the Authority. If it is adopted by a majority, it should be binding on those who voted in the majority.

20. The provisions for dealing with international disputes contained in Articles 10-17 of the Covenant should apply to the new organisation except that they should be redrafted so as to make it clear that while all members should agree that aggression is an international crime and that it is part of the duty of every member of the organisation

to do all it can to put a stop to it, and in no case to assist the aggressor, the extent of the coercive action, political, economic or military, to be taken by each member should be decided by that member.

21. In addition to and as part of the larger body, there should be one or more Regional Groups consisting of members who are prepared to utilise their whole strength in preventing aggression in particular regions, such as Europe. They should expressly agree that they not only regard aggression as an international crime but also that they are prepared to use all means, military as well as economic or diplomatic, to restrain the aggressor in that region.

22. Machinery in the nature of a Confederation of the Governments represented in each Regional Group should be established which should include at least a Regional General Staff. We do not think that any closer organisation such as Federal Union is immediately practicable.

23. Apart from special measures to prevent Germany and Italy from again plunging the world into war, a general reduction and limitation of armaments should be carried out by international agreement as soon as possible after peace has been made. It should be part of that scheme to abolish all national armaments specially suitable for aggression, including particularly national air forces. Such reductions should be carried out under the strictest supervision of the International Authority, which should extend to civil aircraft. As part of this disarmament, an international Air Force should be created to assist in keeping the peace. This Force should also be available for Regional Groups.

(Continued on p. 16.)

THE TASK NOW BEFORE US

By LORD LYTTON

IN 1937 I appealed to members to support the Union's work by giving donations, the payments of which would be spread over three years, in addition to their annual membership subscriptions. My appeal met with a generous response, and the final payments have, for the most part, now been made. Without them it would not have been possible for us to carry on as we have been able to during the war period.

We entered the war to check the attempt of Nazi Germany to dominate Europe and impose on other countries the tyranny by which her own people have been enslaved. We seek no enlargements of our territory or economic privilege. As the Prime Minister has said, "We do not covet anything from any nation except their respect." We desire that international relations should be governed not by force, but by freedom, truth and justice, in the benefits of which all nations should equally share.

To that end the Executive Committee has reviewed the Union's statement of policy—largely based on the union of England and France—and now puts forward the statement printed on pages 1-4.

To advocate and obtain public support for this revised policy is the task now before us.

A great willingness is being shown by Branches to carry on their work in that spirit of determination which triumphs over temporary feelings of doubt and discouragement. But some of them have had to suspend their activities because officers and members have been called up, or have been affected by evacuation schemes, or have undertaken some form of National Service. This has placed a heavier burden on our Headquarters, because, in order that our Union shall be in a position to exercise influence on the foreign policy of our country and so help to secure that victory, when won, shall be rightly used, we must not only keep our organisation in being, but keep our membership together and increase it.

It is unfortunate that the three years covered by my previous appeal should have come to an end just at this time of strain and stress. But we must do everything we can to bring about the right kind of peace. I am convinced that our work is more important now than ever it was, and that it would be a crime to let it be crippled for lack of funds.

I therefore appeal to all members who have not hitherto given donations spread over three years to do so now. To those who responded in 1937 I say "Thank you again, and will you please continue."

(A Form is enclosed for your convenience.)

THE LEAGUE AT PRINCETON

(From Our League Correspondent)

To enable as much as possible of the beneficial technical services of the League of Nations to continue in wartime, the New World is coming to the aid of the Old. Already the Economic and Financial Department—or a substantial part of it—has been transplanted from Geneva to Princeton, New Jersey. This, by a happy coincidence, is the former home of the late President Woodrow Wilson. In the near future, it is probable that the Health and the Opium Sections of the Secretariat will go there also.

More and more, these days, we are being reminded that there is a different America from that isolationist core which, when it so narrowly secured the rejection of the League of Nations after the last war, placed such a big obstacle in the way of the peace machine. It is the America which is now so eager to help Great Britain in the fight for freedom. It is the America which has volunteered to lend a willing hand in preserving the constructive work of the League.

The Invitation

Three great educational and scientific institutions at Princeton have taken the lead in offering the League a wartime home. They are Princeton University, the Institute of Advanced Study, and the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research.

Their original cable of invitation, received at Geneva in June, spoke in glowing terms of the growth of the technical sections of the League Secretariat, and of American apprehension lest the war should "do more than merely interrupt this work." "We are extend-

ing this invitation," they said, "because of the great importance which we attach to the effective and scholarly work of the technical sections of the League. We understand the difficulty of building up such an effective personnel as these sections now contain, and are most eager that they should not be dispersed, and that the work of these sections may not be interrupted by the war."

Geneva to Princeton

After the Economic and Financial Department of the League had accepted this invitation, a group of 32 persons, consisting of eight members of the staff and their families, set out on what proved to be a hazardous journey from Geneva. On the way from Switzerland to Portugal their bus collided with a tram near Grenoble, cannoned off into a pylon, and came to rest in a ditch. Almost miraculously, the injuries were slight, and the League party reached Lisbon after a slight delay. Mr. Alexander Loveday, the Director of the Department, travelled ahead to the United States by Clipper in order to make the necessary arrangements. His colleagues followed during September, and are now settling down to steady work at Princeton.

Ten experts, all well grounded in the economic and financial activities of the League and nurtured for many years in the League tradition, are now in the United States. It must not be assumed that they will constitute the total staff. One of the last acts of M. Avenol, before he ceased to be Secretary-General of the League, was to carry out serious reductions of the League

staff—and useful members of the Economic and Financial Department were dismissed along with their colleagues in other sections. Mr. Loveday will now have the right to recruit locally such additional staff as is necessary at Princeton.

A Full Economic Programme

As for the Economic and Financial Department's programme of activities for the future, this can best be described in the words of Mr. Loveday himself:—

"The work on which this group will be engaged will be mainly scientific and analytical. Ever since it started the League has endeavoured to keep Governments and the public informed about general economic tendencies and developments throughout the world by means of League publications on production, raw materials, trade, money and banking, public finance, etc. This work has been seriously impeded in recent months by the difficulty of communications between Geneva and a number of important countries. Some members of my department are therefore coming on this mission to Princeton to continue their studies of the situation from here. But the headquarters of the League and of my department remain in Geneva. We hope by having two centres of work to be able to keep in touch with developments throughout the world and thus obtain a balanced picture of the general

economic situation as it develops, in order to have a better understanding of the infinitely complex problems which lie before us. The invitation extended by the three educational institutions at Princeton has accordingly proved most opportune, and I feel greatly indebted to them for the generous offer they have made."

Health and Drugs

Princeton's offer of hospitality was not confined to the Economic Department, though that was the first to accept. It will be especially appropriate if, before long (as has been indicated above), the League's work for health and nutrition, which, in spite of present difficulties, is still being carried on from Geneva, has a new centre at Princeton, side by side with the great Rockefeller Foundation. It may be added that the League's Epidemiological Bureau at Singapore is still collecting and co-ordinating all information concerning the appearance and spread of epidemics, and is regularly broadcasting its health bulletins.

All three League committees dealing with the traffic in dangerous drugs have been "going to it," so the Opium Section of the Secretariat can also look forward to a busy spell of usefulness if it follows the Economic Department to Princeton.

DESPERATE AGGRESSION

There is little surprising in Italy's unprovoked aggression against Greece. Axis activity in South Eastern Europe and the Balkans, no less than Hitler's efforts to get the more active help of the Vichy Government, has been a confession that the direct attack on Britain has

failed. It has become a desperate necessity for Germany and Italy to try to find some weak spot elsewhere at which to strike. Britain's answer is plain. By supplementing Greece's sturdy resistance with aid promptly and effectively given, we may soon find the opportunity to turn defence into attack.

ON CARRYING ON

By J. HALL TODD

(Secretary of the Northants Federal Council)

Is there any point in carrying on the L.N.U.? Many supporters and workers have asked that question. Some—the minority, by all the indications—have decided that there is none, and have acted accordingly. A greater number have seen good reasons for continuation. There are still the waverers, who are open to conviction either way; and it is for the benefit of these people that I should like to set down some arguments.

Against carrying on, a powerful argument springs from the natural desire of so many people to concentrate on winning the war. Another point, too, is that the League was formed to prevent war, and the fact that we are at war now indicates a failure of the League. What is the use, therefore, of continuing to support an organisation which has failed, when so much effort is needed elsewhere?

So far as war work is concerned, a reply is immediately to hand. What is the use of winning the war if we lose the subsequent peace? Civilisation simply cannot afford a war every generation—and after all, why should it? The argument against supporting a League which has failed in some of its objects has many parallels. Has Christianity succeeded? Did not civilisation itself fail as much as the League when the war started? To be logical, if we throw up the League because it has had failures, we must also scrap our churches and all other attempts to make civilisation a little more than skin deep.

The Need for the Union

But the need for the L.N.U. goes

deeper. What sort of a peace are we to have? Does it need any previous thought or are we just to take what comes?

From the National point of view, war has always been easier to achieve than peace. The war organisation and expenditure of every nation has been greater than its efforts for peace. Need this be so? There have been many injustices—corridors, minorities, colonies, social conditions, etc., all affecting world stability. Need these be continued without effort to remedy them?

Of course the wrongs must be remedied, but these remedies need careful thought and preparation. If democracy means anything at all, it means *we* must think and *we* must organise. It can be left to others, of course, but if you feel like that, be honest and work for a dictatorship at once.

How the Union Can Help

How can we work best to prevent war? There are many suggested remedies—Federation, World Police Force, Collective Security and a reorganised League, and so on (I do not think anyone will include "Isolation" now—not even Lord Beaverbrook). Can we, on the basis of past and present experience, fashion a new World Order which will be effective? All these and many other questions must be answered. If you advocate democracy, you must be prepared to practise what you preach and take your share in finding the replies. That is where the L.N.U. can—and must—help. Few organisations in the country have

(Continued on p. 9, col. 1.)

THE LEAGUE'S CAUSE IN SWEDEN

(From a Correspondent recently in that country)

A letter, dated June 3rd, was received here the other day from Mr. Allan Degerman, the Secretary of the League of Nations Society and International Peace Campaign in Sweden. He sends thanks for the papers on *War Aims and Peace Aims*, which Mr. Arnold-Forster wrote for League of Nations Union Discussion Groups, and says that some of these were translated into Swedish and distributed for study by local Committees of the International Peace Campaign in Sweden.

(Continued from p. 8.)

a basis as broad and as free from party and religious bias as the L.N.U. and it is therefore in a better position than any to take the lead in working out these problems. If we allow the machinery of the Union to rust, we would lose much that cannot be replaced.

H. G. Wells puts these words into the mouths of the young men who are in the fighting forces to-day:—"We are here to clean up something you failed to clear up after 1918. Will you, too, get on with it, so that we can come back to a real worth-while life? What exactly are you doing to stop this foolery and brutality for ever?"

So, whatever you may be doing for the National effort, do not forget that NOW is the time to prepare the peace. If the tragedies, hatreds and vices which arose at Versailles are to be avoided, public opinion must be instructed and moulded NOW. That is the task the Union should face—and pray Heaven we may do it worthily.

Carrying On

Mr. Degerman and his colleagues are still carrying on their campaign for a collective peace system. Amongst other activities, they have published a pamphlet by Mr. Degerman showing the connection between the successive acts of aggression "*From Manchuria to Oslofjord*," and arguing the case for a new world order in which better provision would be made for carrying out the essential purposes of the League's Covenant. The pamphlet has a brilliantly designed cover—a map of the world, with a zig-zag line "*From Manchuria to Oslofjord*," which indicates without a word how the failure to restrain a gangster in 1931 encouraged another gangster in 1935, and so on. Already, since the pamphlet was published, many another dreadful zig-zag has to be added to the diagram of "Lightning war" let loose.

"Just now," our Swedish friend wrote in June, "I received HEADWAY for April. It is a long way, but we must keep the contact." Yes, let us keep these contacts as well as possible, even though Stockholm seems a much longer way off than it did in June. All good wishes to our fellow-workers there, in a time when their work must be extremely difficult.

Sweden's Dilemma

For the present, Sweden is hardly less at Hitler's mercy than Denmark and Norway; and the Swedish Government, like the Finnish, has yielded to German pressure in ways which both we

and the Norwegians naturally resent. But it must be terribly plain to the Swedish people that, if the British Alliance were to fail in its task of self-defence and liberation—if Hitler's tribal dominion over Europe were not broken—the freedom of the northern democracies would be lost.

It must be plain, too—we know it is very plain to our fellow-workers in Scandinavia—that freedom and peace for their countries cannot be achieved through "neutrality" in face of aggression, but only through a collective peace system. No peoples will understand better the need for a reliable collective defence against such violence as they have suffered from: but no peoples will realise more clearly the risks of solidarity unless certain conditions are fulfilled.

The Rebuilt League

They are likely to insist that a rebuilt League must have more effective control than the old League ever had over the coercive power necessary to prevent aggression; and that the new League must devise means to carry through such changes of national rights as are found desirable in the general interest. They will ask whether British policy in future will be steadfast, predictable—as Mr. Chamberlain's policy was not—in accepting a proper share of the risks of "collective resistance to all acts of unprovoked aggression."

Being militarily weak, and having suffered from blockade as well as from invasion, they are likely to press for an all-round disarmament, properly supervised, and for such "freedom of the seas" as will make the power of com-

merce-prevention an international sanction, not an instrument of national policy. Being neighbours of Russia and Germany, they will certainly point out with grim realism that no broken guarantee of collective defence can effectively protect them unless Russia's power becomes harnessed to a purpose which is compatible with their own desire for peace and freedom, and unless post-war Europe can offer to the ambitious, energetic youth of Germany opportunities for a satisfying life in peace. Despite all the bitterness left by their experiences in this war, they will surely hang on to the truth that Europe cannot be healed unless healed as a whole; the bulk of the German people must somehow be won into loyal partnership.

Northern Democracy

And, as practised democrats who have gone far in eliminating class privilege, these northern peoples are likely to stress the importance of a social revolution at home in countries where capitalism and feudal tradition have left excessive powers in the hands of a privileged class. Having learned much about the true "greatness" of a nation since the days of Charles XII, Swedes will watch to see whether the British in their handling of the Indian problem and of colonial responsibilities can lead to a revolutionary change in the relationship between the rulers of colonial Empire and the ruled. In short, when the time comes, after the indispensable overthrow of Nazi tyranny, our colleagues in Scandinavia will have much to bring to the world's pool of constructive energy for building a commonwealth of nations.

THE BRANCH FRONT

"Victory will not be won merely by engines of war, but by absolute purity of motive and clarity of mind as to the ends we seek." So declared Dr. Sydney Berry in his address at the United Service of Intercession held at St. Martin-in-the-Fields by the London Regional Federation. We need, said Dr. Berry, to set before the public the kind of society we would like to see. It is not enough to say we are out to destroy Hitlerism; it is not enough to say we are out to restore the freedom of nations who have been subjugated. We should just be back to the pre-war world with its hopeless and tragic lack of effective planning. We must present to the world a picture of the order we would build up; a picture in which the League of Nations was bound to form a part. "Well worth while" was the L.R.F.'s verdict on the Service. Almost continuous air raids up to Service time threatened to jeopardise it, but fortunately the L.R.F.'s faith was justified and further raids held off until ten minutes after the conclusion of the Service.

Warnings or no warnings, the Streatham

Branch also decided to hold a United Service of Prayer for Peace on Saturday, October 19. The address was given by the Dean of Chichester.

In Leicester Cathedral, on Armistice Sunday, the Provost will preach on "The Crisis of Modern Civilisation."

If a well thought out programme counts for anything, our Oxford Branch is certain to attract record interest during the autumn and winter. In addition to the annual Service on November 10, a series of meetings on the changing face of Europe and the Far East has been arranged. The speakers include the Master of Balliol, Senor Castillejo (Spain), Mr. H. J. Timperley (on China), and representatives of Free France and Holland. After Christmas, it is intended to follow up by collecting the views of the free nations on Planning in the political, social and economic fields.

Bournville Works Branch, too, is active. Its programme of monthly meetings, arranged up to April next year, will give members a useful survey of League and Union activities in war-time.

We regret to record the death in an air raid of ALDERMAN J. O. THOMPSON, C.B.E., D.L., J.P., and Mrs. Thompson, Mayor and Mayoress of Chelmsford. A fine record of public service in many diverse fields has been cut short. The loss to the Union's work in the Eastern Counties will be heavy. Alderman Thompson played a prominent part in the formation of the Essex Federal Council in 1926. Until his death he remained a most active chairman, being always ready to speak at Union meetings and to perform in Union plays.

The Brotherhood Movement and the Essex Territorial Army Association were two of many other causes to which Alderman Thompson gave devoted service. He was Editor and part proprietor of the *Essex Chronicle* and associated papers.

Chelmsford Cathedral was filled to overflowing for the Memorial Service, at which the Executive Committee, the Essex Federal Council and the Chelmsford Branch of the Union were all represented.

BOOKS OF THE MONTH

LET THE PEOPLE KNOW

Civilisation to-day depends upon books. They provide inspiration, learning, excitement. They have become the vital prop of living. Without books we cannot build, we cannot heal, we cannot understand. Through books we can share ideas, achievement; and bridge space and time. Books are the dynamic of free discussion, without which there is no certain hope for the human race to go forward.

Here are some books which can help us in our forward march towards a more just and true inheritance. Four deal with the tragic fall of our ally, France. *THE LAST DAYS OF PARIS*, by *Alexander Werth* (Hamish Hamilton, 8s. 6d.), gives an invaluable record of the grim days of May till the Armistice, and, from a long experience of France of to-day, an analysis of the causes of her collapse. Among these were the weakness of the Executive *vis-à-vis* the Legislature, the Maginot mentality, the hostility of important people to the Republic and to the war, especially a war with Italy. But causes went deeper than Fascist leanings or even conspiracy. Post-war France's determination to be *avare du sang* struck a fatal note—reluctance to face up to the responsibility of a great nation.

G. Waterfield's *WHAT HAPPENED TO FRANCE* (John Murray, 5s.) endorses and fills in the tale. Political individualism and false optimism were heavy handicaps; but more destructive was the fact that France's leaders were really more afraid of the popular movement succeeding than Hitler. Popular leadership given a chance, says Mr. Waterfield, would have saved the day.

Then there is *TRUTH ON THE TRAGEDY OF FRANCE*, by *M. Elie-J. Bois*, until recently Editor of the *Petit Parisien* (Hodder

and Stoughton, 7s. 6d.), which will be welcomed by all who read his brilliant articles in the *Sunday Times*. All three authors see in the victory of Great Britain hope for the rebirth of French civilisation and the French people. Finally, *DE GAULLE'S FRANCE*, by *James Marlow* (Simpkin Marshall, 7s. 6d.) tells us just what we ought to know about De Gaulle's career, and the great work he is doing to-day for the freedom of France.

It is a most wholesome thing for us to see ourselves through other folks' glasses. In *WHY ENGLAND SLEPT*, by *J. E. Kennedy* (Hutchinson, 7s. 6d.), an American of a free and inquiring mind tells how slow we were to learn the lessons of history preached continuously in the German school of Bismarck, the Kaiser, the Reichswehr and Hitler. Great Britain has learnt her lesson. Mr. Kennedy is sure America will learn hers. Never again must it be possible to say, "The Old Tiger was a sucker to trust the words of an American President."

Messrs. Macmillan are to be thanked for two additions to their 3d. War Pamphlets: *FOR CIVILISATION*, by *C. E. M. Joad*, and *THE RIGHTS OF MAN*, by *H. Laski*, which are probably the best of the series. Here we have professional thinkers, on left and hitherto Pacifist lines, facing up squarely to the implications of the new totalitarian war. "The defeat of the Allies," says Mr. Joad, "would bring consequences very different from those which have attended the defeat of nations in other wars. . . . This is veritably a war for civilisation." "In defending, as we are in this war," declares Professor Laski, "the concept of the rights of man against the claims of naked power, we defend a cause as high as there is in the record of mankind." Yes, that is precisely what we and you and the busman believe. It is

good to have professionals say so too.

ENLIST INDIA FOR FREEDOM, by *Edward Thompson* (Gollancz, 2s. 6d.), is a book all should read, for India is on the front page. The historical part is lively and very helpful. The problem of to-day and to-morrow really centres round the question of the Minorities. Are they, under the guise of the need of protection, to be able, in fact, to block the more rapid advance of India as a whole to satisfactory self-government? Partition is no answer. But judgment on British Imperialism, which we look to as a dynamic for peace, depends—especially in the eyes of the other great Democracy—a good deal on our Indian record.

Three books remain. *STALIN'S RUSSIA AND THE CRISIS IN SOCIALISM*, by *Max Eastman* (Allen and Unwin, 7s. 6d.), deserves a much longer review: a really big book. Here we have first-hand evidence, from an extremely able student of socialist theory, who personally knew and knows the figures on the Russian stage, of the utter failure of Socialism in Stalin's Russia. Instead of a "society of the free and equal," a new oppressor class has grown up, with the result that except for anti-feminism and anti-semitism Stalin, in fact, has beaten Hitler all along the line. The real enemy of democracy is the totalitarian state of mind. Socialism, to live and grow, must cut away from this. If Democracy wins the war, there is life and hope in the practices of Northern Europe, in the civilisation of Sweden and the Scandinavian countries, where humane and democratic civilisations have been achieved, where social research and invention have been given a juster scope. Today, the very political institutions and social habits of democracy are in deadly danger. So Mr. Eastman would defend them fiercely on all fronts.

THE MALADY AND THE VISION, by *T. R. Fyvel* (Secker and Warburg, 10s. 6d.), deals with world affairs leading to the war. The outstanding cause has been the predominance of the mere money values of Western civilisation, which led to the paralysing inertia of democratic faith and

practice in the last ten years. On the other side was a Germany which was just different from ourselves in the West—a Germany still partly mediaeval folk-mind (plus extreme industrial efficiency), conscious of her military origin and accepting authority (at the last moment idealised as unity) instead of freedom. Conflict was inevitable. But there is a double lesson here for Democracy.

THE BETRAYAL OF CHRIST BY THE CHURCHES, by *J. Middleton Murry* (Andrew Dakers, 5s.), is dominated by a deep religious feeling, and there is a measure of justice in the challenge thrown down to the Churches that they have failed in their duty to their Founder and to the common man. Many, too, are convinced with Mr. Murry that the sickness of the world can be cured only by a return after the war to more frugal lives, simpler forms of religion, a more sincere brotherhood. But it has to be admitted that the inspired note of much of this book is marred by omissions, by inconsistencies, and by some real inaccuracies of fact. For example, that the Churches have fallen short of their mission is not denied. The Archbishop of York's recent broadcasts have largely turned on this point. But this is not the whole story. There has also been the failure of the ordinary man and woman, of the laymen, of all those who in the days of crisis unload the responsibility of their own shortcomings on some institution. Mr. Murry admits that it is "unjust to thousands of devoted souls" to generalise about the Christian Church. But this does not apparently prevent him from so doing. Or, on questions of fact, take such statements as "the war of 1939 was not willed at all," and "the perverting of the League of Nations into an instrument of domination" condemned Europe to totalitarian war. This kind of thing simply will not do. What sort of domination could it be that allowed Germany inside four years not only to free herself but to become a menace to the whole world? What was Germany preparing for in those four years? That is what every Nazi knows.

“THE PRICE OF INCONSISTENCY”

(Dr. Murray's article in HEADWAY for September has brought us much correspondence, mostly appreciative. The following critical comments have been contributed by a distinguished scholar who, because of the special nature of his wartime service, wishes to remain anonymous.)

The views of Dr. Murray on international affairs must always win respect and a large measure of agreement from members of the L.N.U. But his article in your September issue on “The Price of Inconsistency” fails, in my opinion, to give due emphasis to some points of vital importance.

In the first place I do not think it at all certain that “a constant League of Nations policy” on the part of this country “would have brought us permanent peace.” There would have been a much greater chance of this had the U.S.A. joined the League; but it is surely clear by now that many sometime member States, including several Great Powers, cherished ambitions quite incompatible with those of other members and with the principles of the League; also that Britain was not in a position to enforce such an adjustment of claims as would have satisfied these States without war.

Still less is it obvious to me that, assuming that some 90 per cent. of mankind desire peace and only “some 10 per cent. are out for wars of conquest,” the 90 per cent. can impose their will simply by “standing together.” Standing together is not enough unless they stand equipped with sufficiency of modern armaments and trained to use them. It is here that not only we failed, as Dr. Murray points out, but nearly all the “good boys” of the League, such as the Scandinavian States, failed as well—whether from lack of resources, love of ease, pacifist doctrine, ignorance of the mental processes of other nations, or intellectual coward-

ice. Time and again idealists passionately advocated policies likely to provoke war, without considering whether the necessary force was available on their side or without willing the means to provide it.

In his section headed “The Future,” Dr. Murray argues that the British Empire “can only maintain its extraordinary world position if its natural strength is supported by the good will of the world,” and that therefore it must stand for the principles of Peace, Good Faith, and the Reign of Law. Agreed, but if one is to judge from the events of the last twenty years, this support will avail it little unless it and other peaceable nations supplement their “natural” strength by the organised strength which depends on their maintaining in peace the trained man-power, the armaments and the alertness which may be needed for their defence. Otherwise the world will again be exposed to aggression from the States which do not neglect the military virtues. Members of the L.N.U. will do well to face the possibility that when this war is over it will be necessary to continue compulsory service for the purposes of national and international security.

J. B.

Dr. Murray writes:—

I do not think the differences between J. B. and myself are very vital.

1. When I say the 90 per cent. ought to “stand together” against the gangsters I mean, of course, that they must be ready to fight the gangsters, and let the gangsters see it.

(Continued on p. 15, col. 1.)

FROM “HEADWAY’S” POST-BAG

War Aims in Brief

SIR,—We are not fighting to preserve unchanged a civilisation which has many faults. We are not fighting for a negative peace, a mere absence of war, such as now exists in Poland, and would spread far and wide if Hitler were to win. We are fighting for a better world than any we or our fathers have known: a world planned politically for security, economically for prosperity, and psychologically for freedom, justice and unity.

The political planning must lead to a society or commonwealth of nations which controls the common concerns of its citizens (and, eventually, of all mankind). Chief among these common concerns are the nature or use of armed force and the settlement of international disputes by the administration or amendment of international law, including the revision of unfair treaties.

(Continued from p. 14.)

2. I do not mean that Great Britain alone in a naughty world could impose peace. The first deserter from the 90 per cent. was America. But experience of the League convinces me that peace could still have been preserved if Britain and France and their allies had from the beginning stood firm for the Covenant. The Powers which are now enemies of the League were always testing the strength (and the honesty) of the League Powers, and only advancing where they found a weak spot.

3. The Union never advocated unilateral disarmament. Personally I used to say that, if we allowed the Disarmament Conferences to fail, we should have to “arm like the Devil.”

G. M.

The aim of economic planning is to raise the standard of living all round by gradually opening the door to all the earth for all its people. Our planet can amply meet the needs of all her children if planned production and freer trade allows to each his share. As the prosperity of the commonwealth grows with that of its citizens, it will become better able to provide for their social welfare, and particularly for the conditions of their work, for their health, and for their education.

Psychological or educational planning is needed to create better people in the better world. In thought and deed they must be citizens of the commonwealth, feeling for it a loyalty greater even than their patriotism. To this sense of unity their education must add a mutual friendliness that makes for justice and mercy, and a common supreme purpose that ensures freedom because it makes each seek first to do what the others wish him to do in the interests of all.

MAXWELL GARNETT.

The Athenaeum, S.W. 1.

(Compare Dr. Garnett's letter published in “The Times” on October 4, 1940.—ED.)

“Looking Up”

SIR,—I was delighted to hear in a recent Radio (B.B.C.) discussion between Mr. Wickham Steed and two other speakers that “the membership and activity of the L.N.U. is looking up,” and trust most sincerely that this is so.

With this encouragement, I am *not* one of those who propose to lie low while this bestial imbecility of so-called “war” goes on and until it ends, but one who intends to be as active as he possibly can.

Near Ilfracombe. C. G. NEWHOUSE.

(Mr. Wickham Steed said: “I do know that of late the L.N.U. has begun to look up

again. Its membership and its subscriptions are increasing. It is working more and more closely with the New Commonwealth. Another taste of war has made a lot of people reflect that organisations which wanted to put an end to war cannot have been so very wide of the mark after all.")

Sacrifices Needed

SIR,—One feels that the letter from Mr. N. Hargreaves in this month's HEADWAY should command the support of every member of the Union. There has been far too much vague talk of democracy, international co-operation and freedom, and far too little consideration of the real meaning of these words, and of their implications. Either that, or the users of the terms lack the courage of their convictions. We talk of the necessity of allowing Ethiopia (for example) the right of self-determination; are we prepared immediately to allow India the same right and risk whether or no the Indians are prepared to help us win the war?

WORLD SETTLEMENT AFTER THE WAR

(Continued from page 4.)

24. Where possible, any economic and social questions specially affecting particular regions might be transferred to the Regional Groups, as also similar questions dealing with Minorities or Refugees.

25. In conclusion, we desire to insist that neither the system for keeping the peace which we have suggested here, nor any other, can succeed unless the nations genuinely accept the view that Peace is the greatest of national interests and are consequently ready to co-operate with all their strength in the maintenance of a Peace founded on Freedom, Truth and Justice.

We build federated United States in fantasy; is it appreciated that on any council of such international body elected on any democratic basis, Great Britain would be entitled to say five representatives, America twelve, the Dominions one each apiece, Germany eight, Italy four, Japan six, Russia eighteen, India thirty-five, China forty, and so in proportion? Are we prepared to risk the majority of the rest of the world agreeing with our own estimate of our worth and righteousness?

Coming to the question of sacrifices, is it a reward of virtue that the people of Great Britain and America have the highest standard of living in the world, the largest proportion of unemployed population and some millions of practically destitute colonial and native populations, or is this just a matter of previous aggressions we now regret? In which case, are we prepared to surrender some of these advantages on condition that such surrender benefits the rest of the world, or is it a case of "what we have, we hold"—if we can? I have no doubt we can for some years, but should we?

Tunbridge Wells.

W. DURELL.

P.S.—Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa and India will not need our manufactures after the war. They are now building their own plants. So what?

"If these hours be dark, at least do not let us sit deedless, like fools and fine gentlemen, thinking the common toil not good enough for us and beaten by the muddle; but rather let us work like good fellows, trying by some dim candlelight to set our workshop ready against to-morrow's light."

William Morris