

HEADWAY

IN WAR-TIME

The Journal of the League of Nations Union

No. 11

AUGUST 1940

PRICE 3d.

EDITORIAL

“BE OF GOOD HEART”

DAY by day, hour by hour, the people of Britain are fitting themselves for the sternest ordeal which has ever nerved the resolution of any generation. Steady, sober determination was there before. In the anxious weeks since the collapse of France, this has not slackened. Rather, the more urgent challenge has stiffened the fibre of the whole nation. No longer is any one of us content to sit back in the easy confidence that time will be on our side. No longer, we feel, can we afford to wait on events and leave the initiative, as so often in the past, to the Dictators. Victory now demands active, conscious effort on the part of one and all. We must mobilise all our resources—use to the utmost the power that is in us. Failing and faltering hands have left the sword of freedom in virtually our sole keeping. We are trustees of its keenness, until we can return it with honour to its sheath.

Nothing, whether the tyrant's threats and menaces in days of waiting or his blows in the hour of battle, must swerve us an inch from the purpose to which we have dedicated our all. In defending ourselves it is no less our duty to encourage others with an example of

steadfast fortitude. For the moment we can count upon few allies near at hand to give effective aid. Yet, outside Nazi-ridden Europe, millions of men and women see in our “beleaguered fortress” the outpost of their own freedom. In Europe, many who for the present can do little except bemoan their servile lot are turning in our direction eyes that are eager and imploring for our victory. So, three hundred years ago, John Milton heard the learned men of a terrorised Europe speak of England as the last bulwark of philosophic freedom. How much more to-day can we, echoing Milton, “count it happy to be born in such a place,” and “take it as a pledge of future happiness that other nations are so persuaded of our liberty.”

None can doubt the magnitude of our task; but the reasons are multiplying why, as Lord Halifax has said, “we may well be of good heart.” With sound common-sense, the other day, General Smuts urged those with any doubts at all about the ultimate certainty of our victory to “look beneath the surface of events.” He gave weighty reasons for his confidence. “The British people,” he said, “are to-day as united as never before under

leadership of unrivalled brilliance and courage." Leadership is one, but not the only, factor making for our victory. Nazi Germany, too, has produced leadership of a boldly unscrupulous kind, swift to perceive the weak spots in democratic structure and to strike at them in shattering succession. Perhaps, in the past, we have been inclined to under-rate the evil immensity of that leadership.

But, behind our British leadership, the world sees ranged the solid responsibility of our men and women, not spurred on to fight by lies and deceit, but free people knowing why they are fighting. General Smuts spoke of the failure of Germany's "supreme effort" at Dunkirk. That was a tribute to our Fighting Services. It was no less a triumph for ordinary men in little boats, who had hastened from creeks

and rivers and fishing villages. Their spirit will be matched, when other calls come, by that of the man-in-the-street and the woman-in-the-home.

Above all, we are steeled to venture and endure by the rightness of our cause. It says much for the confidence thus engendered that, even with the threat of invasion hanging over our heads, we are able as a nation and as individuals to look above and beyond immediate apprehensions. "A nation of free men and women. An international society of free nations." That, as interpreted by General Smuts, is our aim and vision. Lord Halifax sets before us the same conception of "a community of nations, freely co-operating for the good of all." Through the heat and smoke and din of war, that Ideal ever looms as "Truth at a distance."

SERIAL MAP SERVICE

"War-time is map-time." HEADWAY, some months back, warmly welcomed, as of special interest and value to our readers, the *Serial Map Service*—an opportune venture which the Phoenix Book Company were launching at the very moment of the outbreak of war. The ten monthly issues of this Service which have so far appeared have fulfilled expectations. Original subscribers now have a remarkable collection of detailed maps covering all developments of the war which, together with the explanatory text supplements, have enabled them to keep abreast of, and often ahead of, events.

The publishers' outlook is closely akin to that of our Union, as this extract from their first editorial shows:—"The mass of the British people are concerned only that there shall be jus-

tice in the world, moral, political and economic. . . . For long they have said that an end must be put to this barbarity, not only because the thing is evil in itself, but lest, like a cancer, it spread. If ever the British people embarked upon a crusade it is now."

Major Hamish Wilson's article on the Battle of Flanders and France, illustrated by black-and-white maps, is a feature of the latest issue. Other maps (with letterpress) clearly show Britain's oil supply, the economic and strategic position of France, and the economic position of Italy.

A year's subscription, including a book-style ring binder, costs 23s. 6d., post free. All inquiries should be addressed to the Serial Map Service, Dunham's Lane, Letchworth, Herts.

THE FAR EAST

Unwelcome developments have recently taken place in the Far Eastern situation. Many Union Branches and members have expressed grave concern, and their anxiety is shared in other quarters. The following pronouncement on the subject has been made by the Executive Committee:—

The Executive Committee of the League of Nations Union deplors the decision of H.M. Government, announced in both Houses of Parliament on July 18th, to close the Burma road into China for a period of three months;

Is of the opinion that such action merely tends to encourage Japan to proceed further in her aggression in the Far East;

Recalls the resolution of its General Council of November 30th and December 1st, 1939 (*see below*);

Urges H.M. Government, in framing its further policy in the Far East, to maintain its adherence to the Nine Power Treaty and to the other treaties by which it is bound, if possible in close co-operation with the U.S.A.

The General Council resolution, to which reference is made above, reads as follows:—

The General Council of the League of Nations Union applauds the Chinese people's resistance to conquest by Japan;

Believes that for the sake of justice and world peace, economic and political help should be withheld from Japan, but should be granted to China;

Hopes that the recent withdrawal of British troops from North China and gunboats from the Yangtse River does not imply recognition by the British Government of the legitimacy of Japan's occupation of any part of China;

Warns the people of Britain against any attempt at so-called mediation in the Far East that would confirm the Japanese occupation of Eastern China, and allow the Japanese army to consolidate its temporary gains in China preparatory to further advance;

Requests the British Government to follow the firm policy of the U.S. Government towards Japan, preferably in close co-operation with the U.S.A.

RUSSIA'S FOREIGN POLICY

EXPLAINED BY AN AUTHORITY ON SOVIET RUSSIA

A CAREFUL study of the foreign policy* of Soviet Russia during the last ten to fifteen years shows that it is not so bewildering as is sometimes imagined. As in the case of other totalitarian States, Russian policy has often meant just what it says. After all, there are advantages in the boasted frankness of Communist politicians. There is, in plain fact, one determining, constant factor in recent Russian foreign policy. It lies in the strategic security of the Russian State and the safeguarding of Russian interests. Nothing else. There have been apparent changes of policy, even sudden ones. In reality, it is only the method of obtaining the end in view which, in the light of new circumstances, has been changed. The end remains unaltered.

Under the Weimar Republic, when German moderates were in the saddle, Soviet Russia's relations with Germany were excellent. German trade fostered her Five Years Plans. Russia served Germany as a military parade ground and munition factory base, from which Germans could cock a snook at Versailles disarmament.

Russia's Dilemma

But when the extremists came to power under Hitler with his psychological hatred of Communism, and *Mein Kampf*, with its frankly avowed intention of a conquest of the Ukraine, became Germany's foreign policy, the

* An excellent short account of Russia's foreign policy by Miss Barbara Ward has recently been published in the Oxford Pamphlet series; price 3d.

situation was changed. Soviet Russia was faced with two alternatives. Was Hitler in earnest? Or were his roarings mainly for home consumption?

For the time being Soviet Russia decided to take Hitler at his word, though she never burnt her boats, but maintained economic and political relations with Germany even at the peak of Anti-Comintern venom. She turned to a policy of co-operation with the Western Powers in a system of collective security, and joined the League of Nations in 1934. In one way this policy was cynical enough, for it rested on no respect for international law or the sanctity of treaties. But for all that, the experiment of co-operation, on Russia's side, in the "palmy days of Litvinov," was probably quite genuine, for co-operation, collective action of some kind, did appear then to be the only practicable alternative to a lonely exposure to the menace of German aggression.

Distrust of Communism

Unfortunately, full co-operation was never achieved. There were many reasons for this. Great Britain and France never understood, until too late, what Nazi policy and methods inevitably meant. Distrust of Communism in general still lingered in the West, and it was hardly relieved by the untimely machinations of the Comintern outside Russia. The Axis, anti-Comintern front, of course, played up this situation for all it was worth. In the Spanish Civil War the Interventionists managed to tar nearly all the Spanish Government's acts with the brush of

Communism. And the frightful "purge" inside Russia—quite dwarfing Hitler's "blood bath" of 1934—alienated democratic sympathies.

But the acid test of this policy of co-operation, this collective security, was unquestionably the Czechoslovak crisis. Here Soviet Russia realised only too well what the surrender of Czechoslovakia meant for European peace and security. She was, it is plain, willing to fight, but she would not fight alone. And Great Britain and France refused to fight at all. The result: Czechoslovakia was driven to surrender, and by the end of 1938 Soviet Russia was isolated in Europe.

Rival Bids

In 1939 Germany took Prague. Great Britain and France replied by guaranteeing Poland and Roumania against German aggression. As war drew nearer, both sides now made bids for Russia's support.

Unfortunately, Germany had the best cards. On her side she abandoned her *Mein Kampf* Ukraine policy; and, having no scruples about the liberties of any third party, arranged for a partition of Poland and the cession of strategic outposts on the Baltic to Russia. The only thing she asked of Russia was to be neutral. The Allies, however, were asking Russia to fight in what was now mainly their war against Germany, though they themselves had refused to fight Russia's war in the previous year, if not earlier. Soviet Russia had always kept relations with Nazi Germany going. So she plumped for the German offer.

Everything which Soviet Russia has

done since follows closely out of this German agreement—Russia's share of Poland (though she took it for herself first), her strategic occupation of the Baltic Provinces ending with the acceptance of a Soviet form of government by Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, her costly war with Finland and its big strategic gains, her recent occupation of Bessarabia and parts of Bukovina.

Has Germany Gained?

So far it cannot be said that Germany has gained much from Russia save her neutrality. For Russia has been so placed that she has been able constantly to maintain a balance of power, keeping her out of the fight, but at the same time prolonging it—in the hope, doubtless, that in the end both combatants will become exhausted. Soviet Russia, it is probable, dislikes both Germany and the Allies equally (though this is not the same as fearing both equally). This means, that she is unlikely to intervene—and the Finland campaign showed she was not in a position to carry on a first-class war for long—or to redress a balance tipping dangerously to one side or the other. Only in the event of her strategic security seeming to be directly menaced by German or Italian action, as, for example, in the Balkans, would it seem that further action by Soviet Russia can be anticipated. And it will be to obtain more security—for Russia.

And what of Great Britain and Russia? There is only one basis for rapprochement—*strict realism*, one in which military expediency goes hand in hand with no compromise on the principles for which Democracies stand. A big dilemma. Can it be solved?

OUR AIM

IN THE LAST WAR

IN THE YEARS OF PEACE

and

NOW

League of Nations Union War-Time Summer School, September, 1940.

It has not been possible to arrange a Summer School at Oxford this year, but the Executive Committee invites Branch Secretaries, Speakers, Discussion Group Leaders and students of international affairs—whether members of the Union or not—to a *Week-End School*, to be held at

Knebworth House, Hertfordshire, from Thursday evening, September 12th, until Monday morning, September 16th. Fees for full conference, with board, £2 7s. 6d. Fees for lectures only (without board) 10s. 6d. or 3s. 6d. per day.

The School will be opened by the Rt. Hon. the Earl of Lytton, and speakers will include some of the leaders of international thought in our own and other countries. Attendance will be limited to not more than fifty, and, in considering applications, the committee will so far as possible give preference to those who are in a position to influence public opinion by their speaking, writing, teaching—or in other ways.

Early application should be made to the Secretary, League of Nations Union, 60, St. Martin's Lane, London, W.C.2.

Lord Lytton's house at Knebworth is at present occupied by the Froebel Educational Institute, and accommodation will be simple.

The Committee reserves the right to cancel the School if there are not sufficient applications, or if conditions in this country make it inadvisable to proceed.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA.

In recognising the Czechoslovak Provisional Government in London with Dr. Benes at its head, the British Government have done the right thing at the right time. Debarred by Munich and its aftermath from defending freedom on their own soil, many of the Czechs have, nevertheless, been playing a valiant part in this war. Our recognition will hearten them in their struggle. Other peoples, too, will be strengthened in the conviction that Britain is mindful of the high moral grounds on which she took up arms.

M. AVENOL.

M. Joseph Avenol, Secretary-General of the League since 1933, and previously Deputy to Sir Eric Drummond, has resigned. We may understand his feelings since the collapse of his country, France, in the war. His going, however, is not expected to affect the continuity of the work which the League is still able to do in war-time. The committee of three, which is temporarily to manage the affairs of the Secretariat, consists of experienced officials, well-grounded in the League tradition. This triumvirate should command confidence.

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT'S MESSAGE

A strong American committee has been formed to help in preserving the League's non-political activities in this dark period. Dr. Woolley, the chairman of this committee, has received the following striking message from President Roosevelt:—

My Dear Dr. Woolley,—

I have received the preliminary announcement that you are forming a committee to support the non-political and humanitarian activities of the League of Nations, which have been crippled by the outbreak of the European war. Please allow me to say that I hope your committee will get full and adequate support.

Without in any way becoming involved in the political affairs of Europe, it has been the continuous policy of this Government for many years to co-operate in the world-wide technical and humanitarian activities of the League. Certain of them indeed are not only worthy, but definitely essential.

The League's Health Organisation, for example, must in no way relax its efforts in preventing the spread of epidemics: war-time conditions definitely increase the danger. The world-wide efforts for better nutrition standards have already shown that the way towards solution of health problems may also be the way towards definite improvement of economic conditions.

The international Narcotics Control system has been of the greatest value in combating drug traffic. The child welfare work has won the sym-

pathies of every friend of children. The League's committees on intellectual co-operation have outlined non-political programmes furthering the mutual appreciation of artistic and cultural values essential to common civilisation.

Secretary Hull, in a letter to the Secretary-General of the League, dated February 2, 1939, said:—

"The League . . . has been responsible for the development of mutual exchange and discussion of ideas and methods to a greater extent and in more fields of humanitarian and scientific endeavour than any other organisation in history. The United States Government is keenly aware of the value of this type of general interchange, and desires to see it extended."

Realising, as we must, that these essential and non-political activities are handicapped under war-time conditions, I am glad that your committee has undertaken the task of providing support to the end that their work may continue. However Governments may divide, human problems are common the world over; and we shall never realise peace until these common interests take precedence as the major work of civilisation.

Very sincerely yours,
FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

HOME GUARD

One of our most energetic branch officers, convalescing in the West Country after an operation, met a Devon farmer in the L.D.V.—the Home Guard, as we must now call it. Talk turned naturally on the war and the possibility of invasion. The farmer's comment was simple and direct:

"Happen they'm come, us'll deal with they!"

We pass this on, believing sturdy courage of this kind to be infectious. Our branch officer's comment was that she felt "able to cope with invasions or anything."

A PEACE WORTH FIGHTING FOR

By ETHEL A. WAITE

(The Union hoped that the final report of its discussions with the French Society would include a document dealing with the functions of the I.L.O. in the post-war settlement. A special committee at Headquarters is studying the I.L.O.'s future. Miss Waite, a prominent L.N.U. Youth Group worker, here stresses the importance of such matters. League organs, e.g., the I.L.O. and the Health Organisation, are already at work on some of the problems which she raises.)

The message from the Executive Committee tells us that "the only subject for our branches and members to discuss at the moment is 'How can we win this battle?'" This is, of course, true, for we are fighting for our very existence—for the only hope of remedying the faults of our civilisation instead of petrifying them for years to come. The members of the L.N.U. have been trained to influence public opinion, and it is our job to use our experience. But the crux of the problem is not how much superficial courage we can put into people with whom we have contact, but whether we can point them to the possibility of a peace worth fighting for.

When the testing time comes the people of this country will acquit themselves well; but at present we are all meeting people who say "The forces of international anarchy are so strong that we can never establish a decent world order"; or, more seriously, those who say "Under the old order there was poverty, injustice and inequality—we can only suffer this under Hitler—let us give up the struggle."

Our Answer

To the first set of people we have given adequate answers over the last twenty years, and in "World Settlement after the War" have set forth the principles of our new world order, even though the details will be changed by events.

The second statement needs careful answering, and here members of the L.N.U. have all the resources of the I.L.O. and the League's Humanitarian Services to draw upon. It matters little to a man, who is preoccupied with the problems of labour and living, how many miles east or west a European frontier is to be drawn. The relative merits of Democracy and

Fascism are unreal to him if under Democracy he lacks the elementary rights of a human being. Members of the L.N.U. must explain that social progress in any one country is dependent on world conditions, world trade, and world use of raw materials.

What Victory Means

I should like the executive to consider including in its "Peace Aims" some of the following points which will give the people heart to fight this war, and will show them that victory for this country will be of benefit to them individually.

1. The ratification of conventions already passed by the International Labour Organisation, but not yet accepted by this country, such as the forty-hour week, holidays with pay, abolition of fee-charging employment agencies, and the many conventions on conditions of employment at sea

2. Immediately hostilities cease the I.L.O. must initiate international action on the following lines:—

(a) To find work for the flood of demobilised labour. Material damage done in the course of the war must be repaired by international public works, financed internationally.

Further public works should be undertaken such as roads, housing, hospitals.

Migration of labour should be under the auspices of the I.L.O.

Adequate rates of pay should be established by consultation between the workers' organisations, the employers, and the Governments.

(b) To prevent a return to pre-war conditions of unemployment, conventions

should be passed for a shorter working week and holidays with pay.

(c) The problem of providing for unemployed or disabled workers may be too great for impoverished nations after the war. International pooling of ideas and experiences should provide advice to Governments, and rates of pay should be recommended by international experts.

(d) Shifting of populations, such as emigration from the ex-belligerent countries to the Dominions, and the return of refugees to their home countries, to be under international direction.

The World's Resources

3. Steps should be taken to call a World Economic Conference with a view to:—

(a) Freeing trade, so that the world's produce can be moved easily to the places where it is most needed.

(b) Ensuring a fair share of food, clothing, etc., to all citizens.

(c) Reorganising finance, so that money again becomes a convenient means of exchange and not a means of controlling markets and policies.

4. In the early post-war years we shall be faced with problems of malnutrition, epidemics, together with national health organisations which have broken down. The League's Health Services should be used to:—

(a) Formulate an adequate standard of living which Governments should maintain for all their people.

(b) Organise control of disease along the lines followed at the end of the last war.

(c) Advise Governments on the setting up of national health services which will provide adequate facilities for everyone.

I am not suggesting that such things as frontiers, colonies, arbitration, etc., are not important. We have already acknowledged that; but my experience of talking to the ordinary man and woman is that they need some solution to their own personal prob-

lems. My suggestions are by no means exhaustive, and I hope that other members will add to them. Can we not draw up a social and industrial "World Settlement" comparable to our political one?

The Battle of Britain

We must make people understand that they are not being asked to fight to preserve the old order with all its injustices and inequalities. That was breaking down before the war, and will have collapsed by the end of it. The battle is for what shall replace it—Fascism with its new vested interests of power, its low standard of living, its suppression of all development; or a democracy which, although it will still have faults, contains the means of adjustment and development.

At the General Council, the Dean of Chichester deplored the desire of young people to be spared suffering. The young members of the L.N.U. have never tried to avoid suffering if by it they could try to achieve some advance for mankind. Our members now are in the forefront of the battle, but we do desire to spare and be spared the unnecessary suffering from future wars which could be prevented from social injustice which could be remedied. For us, for all members of the L.N.U., and for all ordinary men and women, the way to win the Battle of Britain is to raise a standard to which all men will be drawn.

Of course, people will say that the L.N.U. is not the Government, and that we may not achieve our kind of victory. Let us tell them that these matters are to their advantage and can only be achieved with their assistance.

If you like this copy of HEADWAY and are not a member of the Union, you should be. An annual subscription of 3s. 6d. or more will ensure your receiving HEADWAY regularly each month.

AN UNKNOWN ALLY?

We can guess at Hitler's war aims. Indeed, we know them too well. What of the war aims of our unknown ally, submerged, decimated, silenced but still living—the democratic Germany which was Hitler's first victim? What prospect does it see of resurrection and co-operation in the European Family of Nations?

Here is the record of an interview with a representative of the "other Germany." In publishing it HEADWAY does not necessarily endorse all the opinions expressed.

LOOKING back over the last two decades, we German "moderates" in exile can clearly see the causes which have given rise to this gospel of self-sufficiency and self-seclusion, so ardently preached by the Nazis. Hitler has used it as a prelude and preparation for war and military power; but you will agree, I think, that for one reason and another it has been a fashionable policy in many countries since the last war.

Yes, it is the very antithesis of the League of Nations ideal. Was Germany at any time attracted in spirit to the League?

Among the politically educated, yes. You will remember that, under the far-sighted policy of Dr. Stresemann, the Treaty of Locarno was signed in 1925. But this followed too soon upon the occupation of the Ruhr. The disillusioned population—impoverished by inflation, hard pressed by the after-effects of the war, badly led as they had since been by inexperienced leaders—were now hardly to be convinced that any profound change had really taken place in foreign relations.

But the Kellogg Pact?

That, too, was a triumph for Stresemann's personal influence. Even there, however, political observers at that time were pointing out that mere declarations for the outlawry of war were not enough; they must be implemented by deeds such as, for example, the broadening of the basis of the League. Only

a year later Stresemann died. That blow to international co-operation was followed by the great economic landslide which was to shatter the entire foundations of the post-war system.

But surely the withdrawal of the Army of Occupation before the date appointed was a constructive contribution to the cause of a final peace?

The politically educated, again, recognised it as such, but I am bound to add that the occupation itself had gravely retarded the profound change of mentality—the change from a war to a peace mentality—that was so urgently needed by a proud but defeated nation. But to return to Germany's drive for economic self-sufficiency. Even the Brüning Government had moved in that direction. But solely for economic reasons. There was nothing of "dictatorial violence" in those days. The leaders of the Weimar Republic were so scrupulous that they did not even stop the Nazi movement.

And so came Hitler!

Yes, and now the picture changes. In 1933 Hitler left the League and the Disarmament Conference. You will not expect me to catalogue his iniquities from the scrapping of the Armaments and Training Clauses of the Treaty of Versailles in 1935, through the occupation of the Rhineland in 1936, support of Italy's aggression in Abyssinia, participation in the Spanish war from 1936 onwards, his pact with Japan in consequence of which China was again

invaded in 1937, the occupation of Austria, up to "Munich" in 1938 and the subsequent destruction of Czechoslovakia. All these things were tolerated, and in some way or another even recognised, by the very Governments which had prevented Germany and Austria from signing a Customs Union in 1932.

There is one point that puzzles many of us. How was it that Hitler met with so little opposition in Germany that his people allowed him to carry out these aggressions in their name?

All the reasons cannot be given in a short interview. First, the Weimar system and its leaders were completely outwitted by Hitler. . . .

As were far more experienced statesmen outside Germany without the excuse that they allowed their patriotic emotions to be played upon.

And now at long last the world sees, in Czechoslovakia, Poland, Norway, Holland, Belgium, France and elsewhere, what the Nazi terror means. Yet—and now we are believed when we say this—for years the Nazi régime has been making a concentration camp of Germany. In fact, in answer to your question, the power of the Gestapo has more than any other cause contributed to that strange lack of criticism that apparently endorses Hitler's actions, that veil of silence that falls over each successive victim. Then there is his or his supporters' organising power—their genius for using modern scientific means of reaching and hypnotising the people.

Now about the future. First, who is to succeed Hitler?

Rather the question is, *what* shall succeed him? How shall Germany be reconstructed?

Which brings us to this: Against such a background as you have described, how is this reconstruction to be achieved?

Let me remind you of the great strength in Germany of local traditions. Permeating her history, this has persisted through all changes. German towns and villages, districts and provinces, have never lost their capacity for the conduct of local affairs, both public and cultural. In these will be found the real sources of strength and rejuvenation.

Where do you look for the leaders of this movement?

I almost think the German people have had enough of "leaders." However, under pressure of Nazism, all the better minds have sought refuge in the comparative obscurity of minor positions, well away from the glamorous centres of Nazi pride.

Is, then, the democratic movement still alive in Nazi Germany?

Indeed it is—although, of course, it is illegal, decentralised, local. Under various disguises the genuine culture, the free character, of the people finds ways of expressing itself unobserved by Nazi spies and unrecorded in the Press. Then the proud professional tradition in such spheres as craftsmanship and research has not yielded to the devastating Nazi influence. Although Trades Unions and similar organisations have been officially banned and merged into a shapeless body called the Labour Front, people of the same profession or craft have continued to meet at their places of work in working hours. Fundamentally, I believe such groupings have remained untouched.

That is one side of life. Has anything else managed to survive?

Yes. It would take a much longer period of oppression to destroy Germany's true culture. Some who would carry it on have gone into exile. Those who remain have, for the time, lost all influence upon education and shaping the destinies of their country. Though they have retired from the scene into dark and unobserved places, Germany's real sources of strength are there when the time comes.

So you believe there will be a foundation on which to build up a democratic structure and the instruments for free self-government?

I am sure of it. Some of us think that the first reform must be strong local government, in villages, towns and provinces. We can envisage a Parliament, with professional and cultural groups, the Church and the Law strongly represented; the supreme authority in the fields of social affairs, economics, education, science and art, but devolving a great deal of the administration upon the local authorities. We should encourage variety rather than uniformity—the German is really a great individualist!

NAZI BARBARISM IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA

By Dr. Edvard Benes. Allen & Unwin. 6d.

This brochure, based on the speech recently delivered by Dr. Benes before the Press Club in London, describes in grim detail the measures which are being adopted by the Nazi authorities to stamp out the fundamental values of Czech national life and to bring about mass Germanisation in Bohemia, Moravia, and Slovakia. A systematic *spiritual* assassination is the basis for *material* destruction;

Do you mean that Parliament would not control policy?

Not at all. Responsibility for policy could rest with a specially selected body of experienced statesmen, drawn partly from Parliament and partly from among men and women who had distinguished themselves in professional and diplomatic careers.

One last question, of great importance. Will this new Germany be able to live at peace with her neighbours?

If such reforms as I have suggested were introduced and Germany had a democratic constitution, she would be fully prepared to co-operate in setting up a new European system, where the joint responsibility of all for all would take effect in a new and stronger League or Union. A large section of German "moderates" would like to see the League's authority backed up by a League force, to which national forces would have to bow. To such a body the new democracy of Germany would readily entrust its problems. Their solution must be a task for the whole European Continent, with the help of others whose fate is linked with it. Such a task demands, and I trust will call forth, from all, courage, frankness and mutual understanding.

and the absolute immorality of the Nazi régime is most strikingly revealed in its interference in economic life.

Dr. Benes holds up the fate of Czechoslovakia as a warning to all neutrals: by the time Nazism arrives in their countries, that will be the state of affairs everywhere. In order that the still free nations of Europe may retain their freedom, the other nations, especially in Central Europe, must also be free.

BOOKS OF THE MONTH

IS GERMANY A HOPELESS CASE? By Rudolf Olden. With introduction by Gilbert Murray. Allen & Unwin, 4s. 6d.

Dr. Gilbert Murray's modestly brief introduction is not the measure of his share in this little volume. He and Dr. Edwyn Bevan considered it of vital importance that the British people should be reminded of the existence of a genuinely Liberal and peace-loving element in Germany. They urged Rudolf Olden to undertake the task. And so, with detailed historical argument, the author answers the charge that Germans have always cherished world-devouring lusts, and that the whole German people is behind schemes of conquest. "Always," he argues, dates back only to about 1880; divided opinions have played into the hands of the militarist class.

Napoleon, "the real founder of German nationalism," first drove those who were striving to build a German nation as a cultural unity into alliance with the Prussian military monarchy, which was un-German in essence and mentality. Bismarck later succeeded in seducing the Liberals, who sacrificed freedom in the hope of attaining unity. Olden does not seek to gloss over these events, nor the shameful *Gleichschaltung* (standardisation) of Social Democracy in 1914, when the Social Democrats allowed themselves to be won over by the military command. In his opinion, too, the new German democracy after the war was camouflage—a large-scale attempt to avoid the consequences of defeat. Ebert, working in dark secrecy, brought the army back to its old power.

Nevertheless, under Stresemann, "the only statesman of bigness and imagination whom Republican Germany produced," the prospects of winning Germany for peace and saving Europe from a fresh catastrophe were bright. Disillusionment came when other countries failed to respond. It was ironic that, after Stresemann's policy had been buried with him, the series of concessions to Germany began, and Hitler became the "spoilt child" of the Western Powers.

Although masses of Germans, learning like children from the treatment they have received, have come to think that power is everything, maturity will rid them of unhealthy cravings. It is not true that Germany cannot change. In 1914, "a couple of deft tricks, a couple of lies" were sufficient to line up a freely elected body of representatives behind the generals. A quarter of a century later, whips, revolvers, and an army of secret police have been necessary to achieve a similar result. Olden is convinced that the coming defeat for Germany will precipitate the generals and gangsters into the abyss—provided some foreign Power does not rescue the villains of the piece and set them up again as rulers.

L. R. A.

A FEDERATED EUROPE. By Lord Davies. Gollancz. 3s. 6d.

Far more readable and less dogmatic than much of the literature on Federation, Lord Davies's book caters not for "the wise and prudent" but for the ordinary person. At the outset the distinction between Federation, involving direct representation of peoples, and Confederation,

with representation of their Governments, is explained. Without pinning himself to either solution, the author urges a fresh start at the end of the war, retaining and developing a great deal that is indispensable in the present League. Assuming our victory—for, if Germany wins, there will be no Federation or Confederation and, of course, no League—the distance that can be travelled will depend upon the state of public opinion. Lord Davies outlines plans for both Federal and Confederate institutions, drawing up to a point upon the procedure and practice of the League and the I.L.O. He does not profess to fill in all the details—that is the job of the experts.

Time and again Lord Davies insists that no post-war system will be able to stand the strain and stress of national rivalries and divergent interests unless its constitution is supported by both moral and physical force. What is essential is the will to make the plan work.

FEDERAL UNION IN PRACTICE. By
H. R. G. Greaves. Allen & Unwin. 5s.

For many readers the reviews which Mr. Greaves has contributed to HEADWAY will be an excellent recommendation of his own book on Federal Union. His treatment of the subject is predominantly historical; two-thirds of his space is devoted to a scholarly analysis of the growth of federations in the U.S.A., Switzerland, Canada, South Africa, South America, the Spanish Republic, Australia, and Germany—a storehouse of detailed information for the serious student. Against this background he proceeds to discuss federal machinery and the minimum of conditions for its satisfactory working.

It is frankly admitted that the path is beset with obstacles and dangers, and that the necessary factors are by no means often to be found in existence together. Fear cannot be over-emphasised as a motive force. Mr. Greaves suggests that extended

application of economic planning, such as has developed in association with the League or between Government Departments, might well solve some of the problems of federation.

THE THREE WEEKS' WAR IN POLAND.

By Clare Hollingworth Duckworth, 6s.

For ten days of the Polish campaign Miss Hollingworth was the only Anglo-Saxon war correspondent in Poland. Her vivid narrative carries the reader along at breakneck speed through a confusing turmoil of events, with close-ups of raids and retreats, the ruthless bombing of open towns and machine-gunning of civilians. All the while one sees the war moving too fast for the Poles, whose "fantastic improvidence" helped the German pincer movements. This is a tale of incompetence and sabotage—of mines not exploded and factories not blown up. "Invasion is easy when one has such good friends in the country invaded."

Yet Miss Hollingworth's book is something more than an excellent piece of journalism. Her comments on military strategy are shrewd, and her League of Nations Union training enables her to appreciate the underlying significance of all that she reports. On the "worst moment of the war," she writes:—"I thought of my years on the staff of the L.N.U. and the organising of the Peace Ballot. All that we had worked for seemed lost. . . . Or should we, after all, build a new and better League of Nations?"

The concluding section on the consequences of the war reveals an intimate knowledge of the Balkans and Balkan politics. Miss Hollingworth regards the loss of the Eastern Provinces to Russia as final. A resurrected Poland, she thinks, will need inclusion in a larger group of countries, a maturer hand in its Government, and a completely new economic basis.

FROM "HEADWAY'S" POST-BAG

Appreciation

Sir,—I would like to express my deep appreciation of the messages and contents of the July HEADWAY. Always good, it is this time better than ever, going to the very heart of the world's necessity in the realm of international relationships. We need the League of Nations now more than ever, strange though it may seem to many to say so, in view of the world strife and the defection of some of its members. And we shall require the services of the League in a higher degree still when peace returns, for the foundations of a true, worthy, righteous, lasting and brotherly peace can only come by the concrete expression of those principles which the League lives to maintain.

And the League does live, even although its Secretariat has been reduced to sixty. I wish that messages of encouragement could be sent by Union branches up and down the country to those devoted men and women who are still keeping the League's flag flying. Another excellent gesture would be for Great Britain to pay not only her own contributions, but those of all her allies to the League of Nations whilst the war lasts. Thus we should still further evince our faith in the cause of international law and fraternity. The cost would be far less than we spend in a single day on the war, but the moral effect would be invaluable, in addition to solving many practical problems which are arising.

It is indeed true that the knowledge constantly being collected and co-ordinated by the League is a sane corrective of many errors, and it would indeed be a calamity if such branches of the League's work were to cease through lack of funds.

Guildford.

J. R. PHILLIPS.

Sir,—A younger member of the Union associated with the local senior branch and at one time secretary of the Youth Group, I am due for military service any time now. I was beginning to feel that the Union was crumbling away, and won-

dering whether it was any use my continuing to be a member. HEADWAY'S report of the General Council Meeting, conveying the enthusiasm amongst those attending and particularly amongst the Executive members, has reassured me. The encouragement in Miss Courtney's invitation "to light candles and to keep them burning" makes me proud of my association with the L.N.U.

May I take this opportunity of thanking those responsible for the rearrangement of HEADWAY? It is much more acceptable in the new form.

Burnley.

HERBERT HOLDEN.

A Reasonable Peace

Sir,—I read Mr. S. M. Scott's letter in the June HEADWAY and his criticism of my own letter with much interest. Admittedly my suggestion that the League should make a last effort to effect a reasonable peace is quite impracticable at the moment. Nevertheless, it still remains the League's chief concern, and a time may arise when the League's influence could be made effective. In the last war Lord Lansdowne's statesmanlike letter had a shameful reception, because the only vocal public opinion in existence was that of a narrow and belligerent Nationalism. Let us see to it that such a situation does not again arise.

The only adequate words with which to describe the present situation are the sombre and prophetic ones of Lord Acton: "Absolute power corrupts absolutely. All great men are bad."

Or are they mad?

Kettering.

W. A. PAYNE.

The Neutrals

Sir,—I must confess to great disappointment with the June number of HEADWAY. In our desire to maintain equilibrium, have we lost the power of righteous indignation? Even Mr. Wickham Steed seemed to concern himself chiefly with criticism of the small countries for not entering the

struggle earlier. Did the League include an active America and a right-minded Russia to lead the world in opposition to intolerable wrong, it would be different, but, in the circumstances and with so many fearful examples behind them, how can small nations be asked to commit hari-kari?

(Miss) VIOLET REED.

Burnham-on-Sea.

[The most "fearful" examples found no salvation in neutrality.—ED.]

Plans For Peace

Sir,—All the "plans for peace" seem to be based on one or another or both of two postulates: (1) It is possible to build up and maintain a force more powerful than any force that can be formed by any outside or secessional group of States; (2) National interests can be made subject to an international authority and (what is nearly the same thing) the international differences which have given rise to wars in the past, and the present, can be satisfactorily settled by a tribunal as matters of law or equity.

If the second of these could be accepted—but I see no reason why it should—the first might well follow. The difficulty I see in accepting it is that the causes of war are never clearly defined by those who advance that idea, so it is impossible to say whether these causes are amenable to the treatment suggested. Mr. Chamberlain indicated that we ought not to intervene in Europe unless *our own interests* were threatened. Since we went to war under his leadership we must assume that our interests *were* threatened and evidently more threatened by an attack on Poland than by one on Czechoslovakia. But what were these interests? If we can know that clearly we are at last in a position to decide whether we could safely refer them to an outside authority. Until we do know we cannot, with any intelligence, even discuss the proposal.

There is, however, no need to despair. War is not a supernatural event beyond human comprehension and control. We used to have that attitude to epidemics. Some of us at least have learnt from common knowledge of these that we are likely to waste our time trying to control war before we have defined its causes. It is a good thing to be even so far as that on the way to the solution of our problem.

W. RAMSAY SIBBALD.

A League of Peoples

Sir,—Soon after joining the League of Nations Union—twenty years ago—I suggested to my committee that what was needed was not a league of Governments, but a league of peoples. Events have fully confirmed that opinion, and to-day there is an immensely widespread and steadily growing realisation that the failure of the "League of Nations" to achieve its primary objective is due primarily to the fact that it has never been a League of Nations, but a League of Sovereign States. While, however, the New Commonwealth and Federal Union Societies are engaged in painstaking and scientific investigation into the alternative proposal, the League of Nations Union maintains, officially, a non-committal attitude, to the mental confusion of its loyal members, who, in steadily growing numbers, certainly not seeking "a psychological funk-hole in time of trouble," but, seeing in world federation the only hope for established peace with security, are urgently desirous for unification of effort in the first steps to its achievement. From such I believe the demand to be for a definite official pronouncement as to whether the L.N.U. stands for a restoration of the League on the old basis or a new constitution based on federation.

Wallasey.

A. C. TENNANT.

[The Appendices published in the July HEADWAY show clearly where the L.N.U. stands.—ED.]