

HEADWAY

IN WAR-TIME

The Journal of the League of Nations Union

BRITISH LIBRARY

8 OCT 1943

OF POLITICAL AND
ECONOMIC SCIENCE

No. 49

OCTOBER 1943

PRICE 3d

EDITORIAL

S1083

VOICES ON COMING VICTORY

Mr. Churchill, in his Harvard speech, spoke eloquently of the privilege and responsibility of living in "this tremendous, thrilling, formative epoch in the human story," and of the need for us all to "rise to the full level of our duty and of our opportunity." His exhortation was no mere oratorical gesture to his audience. The past month has brought sufficient good news from the various war fronts to stir the most sluggish spirit. So swiftly have events been piling on top of one another that any record of Allied victories must needs be out of date before it is printed. The general picture, however, shows the Nazi stronghold to be doubly menaced, as never before, by immense land, sea and air assaults from the West and the South, and by relentless Russian progress from the East along a front of 700 miles. Almost certainly, the most desperate fighting is still ahead. Salerno provided a warning against expecting the rest of the war to be a walk-over for the Allies. Yet who can doubt that "the ultimate end" (in the words of Field-Marshal Smuts) is "now clear and certain"?

What our statesmen can usefully say in public about the conduct of the war is necessarily circumscribed by the importance of not revealing our military and strategical plans to the enemy. As

victory comes nearer there should not be the same need for caution and reticence on the subject of the post-war plans of the United Nations. Assuredly the intelligent and thinking sections of public opinion are eagerly ready for more detailed official pronouncements on world settlement than have yet been offered. Nevertheless, in the past month, three or four important speeches have been heard, all noteworthy because of the expression which they give to extremely relevant fundamental principles.

Mr. Churchill

World anarchy or world order were the alternatives which the Prime Minister set out fairly and squarely in his Harvard speech on September 6th. Outlining the system of close co-operation which had been built up for war purposes, he expressed the opinion that it would be most foolish and improvident to break up this smooth-running and immensely powerful machinery the moment the war was over. It should be kept in working order until we had set up "some world arrangement to keep the peace," and until we knew that arrangement would really give us protection from danger and aggression.

We are bound, said Mr. Churchill, to look ahead to those days when we have

finally beaten down Satan under our feet and find ourselves with other great allies at once the masters and the servants of the future. With a brief reference to the various schemes of achieving world security which were being studied and proved, he continued:

"We have all seen the fine work that was done a quarter of a century ago by those who devised and tried to make effective the League of Nations after the last war. It is said that the League of Nations failed. If so, that is largely because it was abandoned and later on betrayed: because those who were its best friends were, till a very late period, infected with a futile pacificism: because the United States, the originating impulse, fell out of the line: because, while France had been bled white and England was supine and bewildered, a monstrous growth of aggression sprang up in Germany, in Italy and Japan. We have learned from hard experience that stronger, more efficient, and more rigorous world institutions must be created to preserve peace and to forestall the causes of future wars. In this task the strongest victorious nations must be combined, and also those who have borne the burden and heat of the day and suffered under the flail of adversity."

Field-Marshal Smuts

In his broadcast on the occasion of the fourth anniversary of the war, Field-Marshal Smuts followed a summing up of the present outlook with a statement on post-war policy.

"Let unity of planning now be followed by unity and speed of action," he said. "When victory has been won, we shall be faced with the colossal task of rescuing what is left from the destruction. A broken, destitute, starving old world will call for relief and restitution and the opportunity of being set going again. Let that be our reparation policy, in contrast to the ruinous policy of that

name of the last peace. Unless that new policy is followed, our western society may dissolve in a chaos of suffering and despair. If it be followed, in a true Samaritan spirit, not only will the self-inflicted wounds of our mother continent of Europe be healed but a new atmosphere will be created among the nations in which the planning of a new world order could be carried out—a world order in which a new human society can arise within the framework of organised international peace and order. That is our goal. Let all our efforts be directed towards attaining it after victory has been won."

Mr. Cordell Hull

Even more significant was the speech on the organisation of peace, delivered by Mr. Cordell Hull, American Secretary of State, on September 12th. It has been widely accepted as clarifying the American Government's attitude towards the use of force for the prevention of aggression. Oddly enough, in some of the earlier truncated versions published in certain British newspapers, the real kernel of the speech was omitted. They concentrated upon six principles, or rules of international conduct, enunciated by Mr. Hull, which were important enough, especially that on co-operation between nations as the most effective method of promoting the political, the economic, the social and the cultural well-being of the American nation and all nations. "Post-war co-operation to maintain the peace," commented Mr. Hull, "is for each peace-seeking nation, scarcely less essential for its self-preservation than is the present co-operative effort to win the war." So far, so good. But here is the passage from the speech which puts all the rest in the shade:

"It is abundantly clear that a system of organised international co-operation for the maintenance of peace must be based upon the willingness of the co-operating nations to use force, if neces-

sary, to keep the peace. There must be certainty that adequate and appropriate means are available and will be used for this purpose. Readiness to use force, if necessary, for the maintenance of peace is indispensable, if effective substitutes for war are to be found."

A Word from Wavell

Leadership in war is easier than in peace: Field-Marshal Lord Wavell—to whom the L.N.U. sent good wishes when he was designated Viceroy of India—shrewdly pointed this out at the Pilgrims' luncheon which he addressed in London. He continued:

QUEENSWOOD CONFERENCE

"A Better Britain and a Better World" was the title of a Conference for nearly 400 Sixth Form boys and girls, organised by the Council for Education in World Citizenship, which was held at Queenswood, Hatfield, Herts. They had come from all parts of England, Wales and Scotland. In some cases, the local Education Authority had covered members' expenses; some had come unaided; others had won scholarships in their schools or had been helped by their school governors. In all, representatives of over 150 Public and Secondary Schools found themselves at Queenswood, discussing with their contemporaries problems which they will soon have to help solve.

Queenswood provided ideal accommodation for such a course, and its modern, beautifully equipped buildings standing in extensive grounds were enjoyed to the full by the members, who greatly appreciated the honour of being the first conference ever to meet in this lovely school.

Such eminent people as Sir Francis Fremantle, O.B.E., M.D., M.P. for St. Albans, who gave the opening address; Mr. Robert Carter, Librarian of the Royal Institute of British Architects; Miss Josephy, Chairman of Federal Union; S. I. Hsiung, author of *Lady Precious Stream*; Dr. Margaret Mead, the American anthropologist; Professor H. Levy, the Dean of Canterbury; and Lord Lytton spoke to the Conference and discussed many current national and international problems with the members. Their lectures met with warm appreciation and a ready response from the audience. Each meeting concluded with a veritable barrage of questions.

Perhaps the most striking thing about this

"It has always seemed to me a curious fact that money is forthcoming in any quantity for a war, but that no nation has ever yet produced the money on the same scale to fight the evils of peace—poverty, lack of education, unemployment, ill-health. When we are prepared to spend our money and our efforts against them as freely and with the same spirit as against Hitler . . . we shall really be making progress."

The League of Nations was always handicapped and kept short of necessary funds by the same cheeseparer mentality!

Conference was the untiring enthusiasm with which the boys and girls filled every minute of the day. In addition to two lectures each day there were frequent meetings of discussion groups led by experts in which the members got down to the careful study of various problems such as the Future of Education, Racial Minorities, International Co-operation for Peace, and so on. On the last day, each of the nine groups produced a report for presentation to the whole Conference. As well as these planned activities, there was time for recreation and informal conversations with the speakers. It was a lively and healthy gathering, which worked well together.

The members, all of whom had been on the land or were doing some other form of National Service during the holidays, were fully alive to the importance of winning the war and winning it as quickly as possible. They did not forget the plight of young people of their own age now suffering under Nazi domination in the occupied countries of Europe. The Prime Minister of the Netherlands, who is now living not far from Queenswood, received a deputation bringing a message "of greeting and of hope for the future" which he promised to communicate to Dutch Youth. Perhaps the attitude of the young people is best expressed in the words they themselves used in this message: "All of us here are determined to give what practical support we can to your own magnificent struggle. . . . We salute you and we are convinced that it will not be long before the nightmare of Fascism is banished from the earth and we can join with you to rebuild a broken world."

M. L.

A LOOK AT THE INTERNATIONAL HORIZON—III.

By HUGH VIVIAN

Let us now consider the future position of our Empire as it affects International Affairs. Its place in the future League of Nations or World Commonwealth or whatever the International Authority of tomorrow may be called will be of particular concern to all who believe—and their number is not confined to Conservatives—that the preservation of the British Empire is not irreconcilable with the newer ideal of internationalism in the modern sense.

There has been a great deal of muddled thinking about the British Empire. Indeed, many hold that the term still popularly used is out of date and misleading. Field-Marshal Smuts, when introducing the Bill on the Statute of Westminster in the South African Parliament, strongly advocated the claims of the more embracing word "Commonwealth." Recently our own Prime Minister, with great effect, combined the two—"British Empire and Commonwealth."

The fact remains that, in certain circles, the argument is often heard that a great part of the evils of the world can be laid at the door of what they please to call "Imperialism" and that responsibility for a mighty Empire must inevitably conflict with allegiance to an International Authority. Equally, of course, there is an opposite view that the responsibilities in addition to the advantages of possessing an Empire should make us wary indeed of committing ourselves in the realm of international politics; the view that our commitments to the self-governing Dominions and our responsibilities to our Colonies must have priority and that Empire Trade Preferences must continue, if necessary, to the exclusion of other countries.

No Violent Solutions

Harsh words have been used about the Empire, often by those who have not travelled in it nor seen for themselves the improvements (political, economic, social and educational) which have been brought about in so many of its territories; often

by those who have not even studied its history, and the comparatively peaceful and frequently reluctant way in which it was acquired. Hard facts are all against the more violent and extreme solutions which have been proposed for dealing with the colonial problem.

Two such solutions are handing the colonies over to international control and allowing them complete and immediate self-government. After detailed and critical examination by those most qualified to judge, neither to-day finds general favour. For example, in recent valuable reports prepared with the aid of experts, both the League of Nations Union and the Anti-Slavery and Aborigines Protection Society rule out international administration because of insuperable practical difficulties. It is further to be doubted whether any international body which has so far existed or shown promise of existing could deal efficiently with the great problems of defending colonial territories against potential aggressors or of directly governing, in the best interests of all, the diverse colonial races with their majorities and minorities.

As regards self-government, this has already been achieved—although Americans and others do not always seem to realise it!—by the Dominions—a substantial part of the Empire. Elsewhere, in less advanced territories, it would be in the best interests of nobody to grant political independence before conditions were ripe for it. Besides the colonial peoples have stood by us so loyally, especially when we alone were continuing the struggle against Nazism, that they are entitled to some consideration, as regards both their wishes and their interests, in such a vital matter as their future form of government.

Politically, our continued control of the administration of our colonial Empire is fully justified by our record (which is not so black as some like to paint it), and also by the absence of any likely substitute for it. That does not mean an unimaginative policy of pure and simple "what we

have we hold." The process of advance towards self-government must continue all the time. India has been promised, and may expect, something like Dominion status as soon as possible. Other territories may take a much longer time in achieving self-government, though certain colonies—e.g., Malta, Jamaica and Ceylon—have already advanced far along the path towards political independence. It must be our policy, operating within the general framework of the principles of the Atlantic Charter, to continue and encourage such advances.

No Complacency

At the same time, an attitude of complacency regarding either the past or the future is the last thing which is required. Evolution from our pre-war policy is necessary in many fields, particularly perhaps, the economic. What is often forgotten is that, with the process of advance of self-government, the whole meaning of Empire has changed and is changing, *via* the theories and practice of Trusteeship and Economic Partnership. In both these fields, there is room for international advice, loans, expert assistance, and so on. Even if we believe that our reputation as an Imperial Power was not built upon exploitation of the resources of that Empire for our own selfish purposes, and that economic like military disarmament can only come gradually and not unilaterally, enlightened colonial aims cannot be pursued in isolation from the rest of the world. If we are all fully to enjoy the better world towards which we are looking, there will be room for greater production as well as better distribution; this is an important aspect of the colonial question. Here again the Atlantic Charter, to which all the United Nations, including the Dominions, have subscribed, puts the matter in a nutshell when it promises, broadly speaking, access for all on equal terms to the plentiful resources of the earth.

So, while there is no need to be ashamed of or to apologise for our Empire, we should do well to heed sound advice for the future put forward in good faith. No doubt we are proceeding broadly along the right lines. Still, there is substance in the criticism that a quicker

tempo is needed. In other words, up to the present, we have not gone—perhaps for a variety of reasons have not been able to go—as far as we might have done. There should have been more education for self-government, more economic development, in the colonial territories. The fault has been more *laissez faire* than anything else. Even we have not been enough interested in our Empire or spent enough on it.

Mutual Advantage

As far as the International Authority is concerned, there can be no doubt at all that a powerful British Empire, well and unselfishly governed primarily for the benefit of the actual inhabitants of the territories administered and secondarily for the equal advantage of all other countries, must be a great asset in ensuring world peace and plenty. Conversely, effective support for the International Authority is essential for the survival of the British Commonwealth; for we can never hope fully to develop the territories for whose welfare we are responsible, and to improve the lot not only of their inhabitants but of all mankind, if we are to be plunged every generation into wars of ever-increasing violence and momentum. Further than that, we shall need an internationally regulated share in world markets before we can hope for that expansion of industry and agriculture which alone can cure Unemployment and Want throughout the world.

Thus there is nothing necessarily illogical in being at once an "imperialist" and an "internationalist." When Mr. Churchill, the co-ordinator of the Atlantic Charter, the greatest international declaration of our time, said that he did not become the King's First Minister in order to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire, he was (as usual) right. The cause of international peace and international co-operation will never be served by anything so crazy as the disintegration of one community of nations which, over a large part of the earth's surface, has come near to attaining those ideals. Let us rather foster its natural development.

POLITICS AND THE L.N.U.

By K. M. BUTLER

The League of Nations Union made a wise decision when, at its inception, it decided to divorce itself from party politics. It is, however, to be regretted that, instead of the words "non party" to describe this impartial attitude, the more elucidating term "all party" was not used. The words "non party" may be misinterpreted to mean that members may not be actively engaged in party politics. In fact, it is essential that many of our members should be so engaged. The more supporters of the L.N.U. who actively participate in political matters and obtain executive positions in their own political organisations, the better equipped shall we be to put our plans into action.

Ours is a democratic country which believes that the people and not, as in Nazi Germany, the State should determine our domestic and foreign policies. We cannot be true democrats unless we help in the administration of "Government of the people, by the people, for the people." The L.N.U., which hopes to influence public opinion, has an additional responsibility to bear, for, as Lord Cecil reminds us, "the Union cannot do anything by itself. It can only make recommendations to the Government of this country; and through the Government to the Governments of the world." Those recommendations must come from the people through their chosen representatives and the people, in order to make their voices effectively heard, must take an active part in political matters—remembering that national and international questions are so inextricably bound together that the one cannot be divorced from the other.

Recriminations are only useful when they point a lesson for the future, so we might consider some past inconsistencies and see where that lesson lies. First of all, we should bear in mind that it was not the League of Nations which failed, but the people who failed the League. It was due entirely to a lack of political understanding on the part of the peoples of the Member States, including our own.

After the last war it was generally agreed that an international authority was

the solution to the maintenance of peace; so the League was set up, to which we all paid tribute without always fully understanding the ways and means by which the articles of the League Covenant could be implemented. Lord Cecil tells the story of a speaker addressing a meeting of 1,000 people all in favour of the League, but who found that only three of his audience had read the Covenant. A sorry reflection, but unfortunately typical of the enthusiastic but uninformed public opinion which paved the way for the present war!

In the past we have had too much lip service to the League and too little courageous action. Why? Because so many allowed themselves to drift away on the tide of ignorance and expediency. They had become straws in the wind of the wrong type of political propaganda; the political propaganda which professed to support our principles, albeit with a very different interpretation. So we came to blame the politicians for leading us away from the paths which we intended to follow; yet no politicians can fool the people unless they allow themselves to be fooled. There is not a single Member of Parliament who could follow a line of action to which his constituents are opposed—unless the people, who make up that constituency are so apathetic that they do not know or care sufficiently to make their voices heard.

We have always had a few clear-sighted and courageous men who have warned us when we were taking the wrong path. The wisdom of their words was not always understood, nor was it seen clearly that actions which seemed purely domestic could influence our foreign policy. Take, for instance, the years between 1931 and 1939, when we could have saved the League and the peace of the world.

What happened? Threats of war came—eventually wars, although they were not called wars in those days. The L.N.U., spurred on by its clear-sighted leaders, worked hard to arouse people to a sense of realities. But the issue was undoubtedly

confused by the absorption of many in domestic affairs, which attracted more limelight than the victims of aggression abroad. Narrow national remedies to the problems of unemployment and industrial depressions resulted in bickering and retaliation, bringing economic chaos to the whole world.

Paradoxically, side by side with growing danger, a craze for "economy" was calculated to make a wide, popular appeal. Reduce everything which may be considered to be a burden upon the taxpayer was the war-cry of many politicians. Even when re-armament became a regrettable necessity, many who professed to support the League clamoured against it. There were, it is true, voices like that of our present Prime Minister demanding to know how we could fulfil our bargain under the Covenant, should military sanctions be invoked, if we had not sufficient strength to stand firm with others in resisting aggression. But those voices were lost in the din; and it was not until the danger was nearly upon our own doorstep that many people realised how inconsistent our policy had been.

There were even meetings held throughout the country at which speakers thought it necessary to apologise for the sanctions clauses in the Covenant. Some thought Article 16 was going too far; that, although the principles were agreed, we ought not to bite off more than we could chew. Fear and timidity, shared by some fair weather supporters of the League, were helping to drive the last nail into the coffin of world peace.

Shall we commit such mistakes a second time? Or have we learned the lesson that we ourselves were responsible for failing our principles? The young people who are being trained in world citizenship to-day are our hope for to-morrow. But it is this generation who, without those advantages, will have to lay the foundation stones for the building of world peace. Our children may add to and improve upon what we have created; but, unless the foundations are sound, the edifice must totter, as it did before.

What can we do? We must aim at the abolition of ignorance and the triumph of reason over sciolism. We

must determine not to form irresolute ideas upon subjects which rule our destiny. We must realise that peace demands two things—Intelligence and Courage: Intelligence to understand what it means and how it is to be achieved, and courage to face the risks and sacrifices which the preservation of our principles may demand of us.

Peace will not come by professing allegiance to a League of Nations. It will come when we, the people of the world, make it clear to our Governments that we will not tolerate aggression in any part of the world; that we realise all the implications, and will stand by our leaders in the furtherance of that aim; and, conversely, that we will resist with all our might any Government which attempts to frustrate that aim; that, by our active and enthusiastic participation in political matters, we shall see that any infirmity of purpose is strengthened by our will. Our criticism will be just, because backed by sufficient knowledge of current affairs and international happenings to distinguish between vacillation and determination.

If we do this, which political party we support will be beside the point. The important thing is that all parties shall know that we are determined to support the International Authority which is set up to administer justice and preserve the peace. For the first time in our history we shall have an international policy supported by all parties—not just the lip service of the past, but a political unity strengthened by the support of an intelligent community.

Changes of Government will no longer imply changes of foreign policy, with disastrous consequences in international affairs—which has been a weakness of our democratic system. No longer will there be the fear of "different interpretations," because the people will understand only one interpretation, and that a rigid adherence to the case set down in the new League. The democracies are fighting and dying for freedom. We who are left must accept the responsibilities of democracy by working, learning and fighting for that lasting peace, without which we cannot hope to establish our doctrine of liberty, justice and equality throughout the world.

THIS SOVEREIGNTY BUSINESS

By GORDON DROMORE

The theory of national sovereignty was invented and developed by political theorists, who were not interested in the relations of States with one another. Every State, by virtue of being a State, was regarded as being endowed with certain fundamental, inherent, natural rights—including the rights of independence, of being the sole judge of one's national interests, of making war (if need be) on other States, and so on.

A Double Challenge

Now quite apart from the fact that the relations of States which our theorists ignored have to-day taken the centre of the stage, the theory of national sovereignty seems open to challenge in two directions. On analysis, as a logical theory, it is one-sided and incomplete. For how can there be fundamental rights without fundamental duties? Or why should the social bonds between man and man or State and State be less natural than the individuality of man or State? In fact, why should there be only a one-way traffic? An operative reason, no doubt, is that unrestricted national sovereignty is mainly based on the idea of power politics, and power tends to extreme interpretations, of which the latest is the German theory of the State—a *reductio ad deum absurdum*. To-day there is ample evidence that this idea of power politics is being profoundly modified by more constructive ideas of co-operation, and service. Civilisation, outside the hermetically sealed Axis walls, is moving in the opposite direction to that of unrestricted sovereignty which, to be frank, denies the possibility of development in international relations.

In the second place, brought to the acid test of historic actualities, the theory of national sovereignty simply breaks down. For States are not persons: they are merely institutions, or in other words organisations which men set up for themselves (and can equally well change for themselves) for securing certain objects of which the most fundamental is a system of order within which their

common life can be carried on (and the shrinking world, be it noted, is continually stressing the interdependence of this common life and that of other States). States have no wills except the wills of individual human beings who direct their affairs.

But, it will be objected, there is more to this business of nationalism, of national sovereignty, than the practice of dictators or the playground of political theorists and lawyers. Is it not the case that the present war is driving home a whole number of lessons here which cannot safely be ignored?

The War and Nationalism

Let us look at Europe and across the seas. Another side of this problem of national sovereignty is everywhere finding expression, to-day in the sincerest national feelings of masses of peoples—revolving round a passionate desire for freedom and a real determination to survive as an independent nation. These emotions the war has intensified, unified and lifted to a higher plane; for they have proved to be the ultimate defence against destruction by Axis barbarism. It is well to be quite clear about the reality and depth of these national emotions. For there seems to be a real danger in certain quarters of reaction against sins laid at the door of unrestricted sovereignty as exercised by Great Powers, notably the Axis, hardening into an *idée fixe* of opposition to all sovereignty; but especially (for it is so much more convenient) that of small States and nations. Against this wolf-lamb theory we cannot be too much on our guard. It is a flat denial of the Atlantic Charter:

Let us mark what three Big Men have to say about the matter. "The tendency to regard small States and nations," writes Harold Butler, "as the causes of war or international disputes is an exaggeration or the generalisation of individual, isolated facts. It was not the small States or nations which devised Nazism and Fascism." Sir William

Beveridge puts the case more positively: "Without any surrender of belief in democracy, it may be suggested that for the next peace settlement the purpose should be to make the world safe for small nations." And Vice-President Wallace of the United States defines wise, constructive relations between small and big nations thus: "Older nations have the privilege to help the younger nations get started on the path of industrialisation, but there must be neither military nor economic imperialism." There is a vital distinction, in fact, between leadership and domination.

Co-operate or Perish

But the war, at the same time, has brought out positive change in the attitude of nations, other than the Axis, to the practice of international co-operation. As a practical policy Isolationism is dead. In fact, the whole psychology of international co-operation is more potent and prevalent to-day than was ever deemed possible 25 years ago. "Countries now work together," said General Smuts only the other day, "in harmony on common principles without seeking to conquer each other. . . . The *Herrenvolk* idea is going." All peacetime co-operation has been vastly intensified by the realised needs of war. For war has proved one thing even to the most blind—that co-operation is the sole alternative to German or similar domination. There is no question that the scale and tempo of co-operation heightened by war must be prolonged into peace. Europe must co-operate or perish.

Finally, there is the question of approach—of the plain meaning of this transaction between States called co-operation or collaboration. The truth is that we commit a serious blunder in talking as though pooling national powers for essential common ends were the same thing as surrendering these powers. If we are in the group, the nation which exercises these powers, we are going to increase, in the short or long run, the value of them, so that they are stronger in co-operation than they ever were in separation. Obligations which we and other nations voluntarily assume in common are not a surrender but an extension of

sovereignty, precisely as the power and position of a citizen of London are greater because he is also a citizen of Great Britain. The problem of national sovereignty, of the actual power of States, indeed, is similar to that of democracy. Democracy does combine freedom—the idea of belonging to oneself—with community—the idea of belonging to others. True, democracy has not yet fully solved its problem, but few believe for a moment that it cannot be solved. So, in the larger world, it cannot, surely, be "beyond the political genius of mankind to reconcile national individuality with international collaboration."

UNION NOTES

Mr. C. W. Judd, Assistant Secretary of the League of Nations Union at the time of Major Freshwater's death, has accepted the Executive Committee's invitation to become Acting Secretary of the Union. During the war Mr. Judd has been Secretary of the Council for Education in World Citizenship and also Secretary of the London International Assembly. In his first Branch Letter, he stresses that there can no longer be any question in our Union of just "holding on." We too must "go on." Between now and the end of the war we must try so to strengthen the Union that it will be, in every part of the country, a live organisation that will, by its numbers and influence, give weight to the Union's policy now, and provide solid foundations on which those who are now fighting can build with us in the future the more youthful, vigorous and powerful movement that we all of us want our Union to be after this war.

The next meeting of the General Council of the L.N.U. has been fixed for December 9th and 10th, 1943, in London.

The Executive Committee has authorised the preparation of a series of short popular leaflets forcefully putting the present case for the League and the Union.

UP AND DOWN THE COUNTRY

Pride of place this month must be given to a monster open-air meeting in HYDE PARK addressed by our Staff Speaker, Mr. John T. Catterall. Reports indicate that it was "the best ever" and "a triumphant success." The audience, totalling well over a thousand in number, made other meetings close by look trifling by comparison. Not once was there any semblance of an interruption and, when the speaker finally "closed down," the whole audience burst spontaneously into loud and prolonged applause. A policeman on duty there described it afterwards as a meeting unique in his many years of experience in the Park.

Among the more important meetings arranged by Union Branches, Dr. Gilbert Murray, O.M., spoke in the Town Hall at PETERSFIELD, and Miss K. D. Courtney visited HANLEY. The Dean of Chichester, speaking at DORKING, took as his subject "The League and World Reconstruction." Mr. T. Aghnides aroused great interest at NEWCASTLE with his talk upon Greece.

Professor Arthur Newell, well known for his ceaseless efforts to promote Anglo-American understanding, had a busy month of speaking for the L.N.U. His biggest meeting was at LEEDS, where he addressed the lunch-time audience at the MONTAGUE BURTON works. He had other successful gatherings at SHEFFIELD, HEADINGLEY and the BRADFORD ROTARY CLUB. In the South he spoke at ROMFORD.

Major-General J. W. van Oorschot's engagements for the Union included a garden meeting at LETCHWORTH, which provided further evidence of the throbbing life of our local Branch. Over 200 persons were present, including many friends from other countries. Thanks to the energy and enthusiasm of Branch workers, the programme included teas, stalls, music and dances. The General spoke on "Holland's contribution to international fellowship after the war." The Chairman of the Branch, Mr. A. Fuller, made a strong appeal for support of the Branch and membership in order to

help create public opinion to meet the great problem of reconstruction.

Addressing the ST. ALBANS Women's Adult School, Major-General van Oorschot spoke on "The people who made their own country." He also visited BLACKHEATH.

At the Annual Meeting of the ESSEX FEDERAL COUNCIL Mrs. Du Bredin, a representative of our American Allies, gave an address on "American Public Opinion," and then spent some time answering questions fired at her from the audience. Mr. H. R. Sparks, from Headquarters, added a few brief remarks. It was good to see such an excellent number of Branch representatives present. In spite of the difficulties of travel, more attended than in 1942—a fitting tribute to the work of the Council and its Secretary, Mr. E. C. Prior.

Both interest and good attendance were fully maintained at the September Buffet Luncheon arranged by the LONDON REGIONAL FEDERATION. Senator Henri Rolin, as President of the Belgian League of Nations Society and deputy delegate at many Assemblies of the League, was fully qualified to deal with the subject "Will the small nations survive?" He warned those present of the perils of further dividing the territories held by the small nations which, he pointed out, would involve economic as well as political dangers.

Mr. Geoffrey Mander, M.P., is to address the next L.R.F. Luncheon on Tuesday, October 12, at 1 p.m., in the Y.W.C.A. Lounge.

At the Annual Meeting of the WOOD GREEN AND SOUTHGATE CIVIC BRANCH, statements on "World Settlement after the War" were contributed by Mr Beverley Baxter, M.P. (Conservative), Mr. R. J. Romeril (Labour), Mr. Verrall Reed (Liberal) and Mr Leslie Aldous (L.N.U.). In a lively discussion which followed, the speakers were bombarded with questions.

STOKE (COVENTRY) BRANCH, with the aid of a new Secretary and a nucleus of most enthusiastic members, has set out to make itself "as flourishing as some of the larger Branches." New members figure prominently in the latest batch of

counterfoils sent in. It is hoped to get more through discussion groups, and there are excellent prospects of reviving a Junior Branch. These results are all the more creditable since the Secretary, Miss E. Nicholls, is a busy person—she is a Youth Organiser, a lecturer for H.M. Forces, and has to be away a good deal at Summer Schools and Conferences; but she still finds time to do a good job of work for the L.N.U.

An informal Tea Party arranged by the EASTBOURNE BRANCH secured a satisfactory audience, despite other attractions the same afternoon. The Branch Chairman and the Secretary gave accounts of the Union's General Council Meeting in London, and Mrs. Saunders described the Government's regional committees for the care of Jewish refugees now in this country.

SEAFORD'S Garden Meeting was well attended and from every point of view was an unqualified success. Mr. John T. Catterall's spirited address aroused the keenest interest, one immediate result being that eleven new subscribers joined the Union.

WHITTINGTON BRANCH, which Mr. Catterall recently visited, does not find it easy to increase the membership as several supporters have died or left the village. There have, however, been *no refusals* to renew subscriptions. In fact, thanks to a number of members who have increased the amounts which they pay, the total receipts are actually higher this year than at any time since the war.

At SHREWSBURY Mr. Catterall addressed the SHROPSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL in the Shire Hall. His other engagements during September included the LEYSIAN MISSION (a most flourishing Branch), STAMFORD HILL, MADELEY AND COAL BROOKDALE (public meeting and a talk at the High School), and CHURCH STRETTON.

ROTARY CLUBS which had L.N.U. speakers during September included:—ASHFORD (Mrs. C. Riley on "France To-day"); ENFIELD (Mr. T. Filipowicz on "Poland" and Captain E. A. Steen on "Norway"); MAIDENHEAD (Mr. Norman Mackintosh on "Canada"); MORDEN (Mr. Catterall answered questions on a previous talk on the League which he had given); STAINES (Mrs. Riley on "France To-day"); and ST. ALBANS (Count O.

Scheel on "Denmark" and Major-General van Oorschot on "Holland").

Other organisations which received visits from L.N.U. speakers were:—LANCING WOMEN'S INSTITUTE (Miss Heneker); ASTWOOD BANK and FECKENHAM WOMEN'S INSTITUTES (Miss Olive Lodge on "Yugoslavia"); CARSHALTON MARRIED WOMEN'S ASSOCIATION (Mr. Catterall on "Russia"); NORTH HARROW WOMEN'S CO-OPERATIVE GUILD, BURNT ASH YOUTH CLUB and Bow Old People's Meeting (Mr. Leslie Aldous, Editor of HEADWAY); LAMBETH METHODIST SISTERHOOD (Mrs. Riley); and ST. PHILIP'S CHURCH, KENNINGTON (Miss S. Teichfeld on "Poland").

OVERSEAS NEWS

The 21st Annual Report of the WELLINGTON (NEW ZEALAND) BRANCH OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS UNION expresses gratification at the interest maintained and intensified in its work of seeking to preserve the vision of the great ideal of the League through all the changing phases of a momentous year. Faith in this ideal, it points out, has been shown in other parts of the Empire, e.g. in TASMANIA, where the Government has made a substantial grant to the TASMANIAN BRANCH OF THE L.N.U. to further its indispensable work.

Meetings in WELLINGTON—held mostly in the afternoons owing to black-out restrictions—have been well attended and, as a result of the knowledge gained from the addresses, new members have joined the Branch.

The Annual Meeting last year was addressed by His Lordship Bishop Holland, who spoke on "The Shape of Things to Come." Speakers at other meetings were Count Wodzicki, Consul-General of Poland; Mr. M. F. Vigevene, Consul of the Netherlands; Dr. W. A. Riddell, High Commissioner for Canada; Professor R. O. McGechan; Rev. D. W. Newall; and Mr. C. R. Palairat.

The JOHANNESBURG L.N.U. reports that its usual activities were maintained during the past year. Lunch meetings have continued to be popular and have included a series of talks on the Atlantic Charter.

FROM HEADWAY'S POST-BAG

Union Membership

Sir.—The League of Nations Union exists to educate public opinion in the principles of the League of Nations—in world collaboration for peace. We enrol members with that object, the mass of whom pay less than the 3s. 6d. annual subscription, for which they could get HEADWAY and education from its columns. From 23 years' experience as secretary, and then treasurer, of a large branch I find that those who are really interested will pay the 3s. 6d., but it is the smaller subscribers on the whole who require education and they seldom, or never, attend the meetings. Merely to pay 1s. a year, and hear or read nothing about the cause, is practically no support of it. For years I have sent the *News Sheet* each month to members who pay less than 3s. 6d. The cost of 12 members and postage for a year comes to 1s. 3d., so they should pay at least 1s. 6d., but it will repay the Branch, even if its bank balance is small, to send the *News Sheet* in any case, as I have found by experience. It would strengthen our Branches greatly if the majority of our members (who are the subscribers of amounts under 3s. 6d.) were enlightened, encouraged and inspired by a monthly message.

Hampstead, N.W.3. M. RIDGES.

"Prussians and Germans"

Sir.—The review under the above title in your September issue accepts the view that "Weimar was, in fact, largely a façade for Prussian militarism," and states that "no real democracy could breathe under these grim conditions." I lived in Germany during almost all the years of the Weimar Republic and found democracy very alive indeed. Progressive movements were most vital and most active. Such boldly free State enterprises as the Juvenile Delinquent Institution at Itzehoe in Holstein, the Women's Prison in Berlin (as well as other prisons known to me), the Municipal "Fürsorge" work in Berlin (most ably seconded by the private centre in the Neue Friedrichstrasse) were at that time markedly ahead of us in England and we could learn from their spirit still. The bookshops in Berlin always had a great sale for anti-war literature, the theatres and cinemas had their greatest successes with anti-war plays and films. I shall never forget "Wunder um Verdun," which I saw in September, 1932.

The progressive work I have cited, and much more that I could mention, was carried out by or encouraged by the Prussian State. The word "Prussian" as condemnatory epithet is simply a convenient cliché that

saves us the great nuisance of thinking. It seems needful to remind ourselves that from November, 1918, to July, 1932, the coalition governments of Prussia were (with two brief interludes) always led by Socialists.

It was not in Prussia but in Thüringen that the first Nazi government was formed—in August, 1932. It was not from Prussia that the Nazi leaders came. Hitler is an Austrian; Goering, Streicher, Himmler, Hess Bavarians; Goebbels is of Westphalian and therefore almost certainly of Saxon descent. The Prussians, though colder (*kaltchnauzig*) and less artistic than the southerners, are—speaking generally—too matter-of-fact to produce such fantasts. Peoples change, of course—sometimes rapidly—but that was how I found them.

Certainly the Republic did not get rid sufficiently of reactionary, nationalist officials. My long experience teaches me that this is always a damned tough job, whether in Germany, France, America or Britain. Will our governments all manage it better after the war? On the answer to that question much depends. More than on any suppression of any selected peoples.

Letchworth, Herts. HAROLD PICTON.

Sovereignty

SIR.—The August number of HEADWAY only reached me recently, and I see that the question of Sovereignty, raised by "Public Official," has not been followed up in the September number. May I point out that according to Prof. Brierley the word has for long lost its original meaning. The formation of a World Council with power to legislate and to enforce its laws will no doubt be the ultimate solution of humanity's problems, but it will be many years before it reaches perfection. In the meantime there is a doctrine of "Fundamental Rights" for States (see pages 39-45 of Professor Brierley's "Law of Nations"), and if this was generally recognised it follows that every State (which after all is only an association for the preservation of a right order), has the obligation to respect the rights of others.

In other words, "Rights" involve "Duties," and this is the basis of international as it is of civil and moral law. The question is whether peace should be organised on authoritarian or democratic principles. The essence of democracy is to promote and preserve the common good, and the authority which is necessary to enforce its laws is the true authority, "the power of Right over Might," as Peter Drucker has it in "The Future of Industrial Man."

Oxford. J. M. SCOTT.

WORLD CITIZENSHIP SUMMER SCHOOL

Before the war the Union held each year—usually at Oxford or Cambridge—a large Summer School in this country, in addition to its various Schools and courses at Geneva. Since the war smaller weekend schools have been held at Knebworth and elsewhere, but no school was held in 1942.

This year the Council for Education in World Citizenship combined its own annual Summer School and International Conference of Teachers in one big World Citizenship Summer School, to which it also invited members of the Union who are not themselves engaged professionally in educational work. Three hundred people attended the School: the largest the Union has ever held and certainly the most representative, for the members and speakers came from Belgium, China, Czechoslovakia, France, Poland, Spain, the U.S.A. and Yugoslavia as well as from Great Britain.

In place of the cloistered buildings of a college, we met in a large Ministry of Supply Hostel in South Wales where accommodation was shared with war workers: an atmosphere that perhaps gave greater reality and urgency to war-time discussions. The realism of many of the lecturers was therefore very welcome. It was their purpose to enable members of the School to bring up to date their knowledge of international affairs and of the bases of agreement for future international collaboration that have already been found in such declarations and agreements as the Atlantic Charter, the findings of the Hotsprings Conference on Food and Agriculture and the proposal for a United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. And in this part of the programme we had the great advantage of hearing Dr. Feierabend, Czechoslovak Minister of Finance; Dr. George Adamkiewicz, of Poland; Mr. C. Y. Hsieh, of China; Professor Arthur Newell, of the U.S.A.; Commandant Tilgé, of the Fighting French; and Miss K. D. Courtney and Mr. Arnold Forster, of Great Britain. Professor Brodetsky spoke on the Jewish Problem and Miss Freda White on Problems of Colonial Settlement.

At the same time the School was made fully aware of the need for a closer intellectual understanding of other countries, and it is hoped that the paper on Intellectual Co-operation between the Two Wars, read by the Rev. Gwilym Davies, M.A., Honorary Director of the Welsh Committee for Education in World Citizenship, may shortly be published so that it may reach a far wider public. At a session presided over by Mr.

R. Gould (President of the National Union of Teachers), Dr. Stefan Drzewieski, of Poland, in a brilliant analysis of the typical British character and processes of thought, examined the contribution that Britain could in future make to closer understanding with the continent of Europe and those attitudes of mind which it will be necessary to overcome. Mr. H. C. Shearman opened a discussion on the greater opportunities for international education which would be provided in Great Britain by the new education bill and gave some account of the work already being done by such bodies as the Workers' Educational Association, Dr. J. Ewart Smart spoke of the film as an instrument for international understanding, and Dr. Goldstücker, of Czechoslovakia, on Education for International Understanding in the Youth Movements. One morning was devoted to the work of the Council for Education in World Citizenship and of its Joint Commission with the London International Assembly, the principal speakers being Sir Percy Watkins, Mr. Evan T. Davis and the Secretary of the C.E.W.C.

It was a particular pleasure to the School to be able to meet in Wales, where they were welcomed on the first evening by the Rev. Gwilym Davies, and throughout the week those members who came from other countries were especially interested in the way in which the people of Wales have managed to preserve their own language and culture and in which many of them appear to have found in international work a means of expressing their sense of nationality. One afternoon was spent on a visit to Cardiff, where all the members were entertained by Lord Davies, and where they were officially received at the City Hall by the Lord Mayor and Lady Mayoress, and visited the Welsh National Temple of Peace and Health. On the final evening they had the opportunity of hearing a programme of Welsh singing provided by a well-known choir conducted by Mr. Tom Pickering.

Many members of the School were particularly grateful for the opportunity to find fresh courage and inspiration for their work in the very beautiful service on the Sunday morning conducted by the Reverend Dr. Hnik, of Czechoslovakia.

The thanks of the Union and of the C.E.W.C. are especially due to Miss L. E. Charlesworth and Mr. Evan T. Davis for their indefatigable work as Hostess and Chairman, to Miss Courtney, and to Professor C. A. W. Manning for a brilliant presidential address.

NANSEN PIONEER CAMP

In the last number of HEADWAY Mr. Laurence Housman warmly commended Professor Blensdorf's plans for a Nansen Memorial Monument. "Nansen," he wrote, "already one of the world's most famous men for his great and adventurous achievements in scientific exploration. . . . earned and won . . . a yet higher and nobler reputation . . . had our statesmen and politicians had hearts like this, we should not to-day have been at war." HEADWAY was therefore glad to give publicity to the proposal that there should some day be in Norway or at the seat of the new international authority a monument of such symbolic power as will influence the hearts and minds of all who see it. But there is also, already in existence, a living memorial to Nansen, a movement in which the Union can take special pride, the *Nansen Pioneer Camps*.

A Living Memorial

It was Fridtjof Nansen's firm conviction that "It is in the wilderness, in the solitude of the forest, within sight of the wide expanses, that character is formed. And it is men of character that our Age most sorely needs." It was from Fridtjof Nansen therefore that the Camps for boys and girls, organised each summer by the Education Committee of the League of Nations Union in some of the most remote and lovely parts of these islands, drew much of their inspiration; and it was after him as a great pioneer of discovery and of human welfare that they were named.

The Camps were continued by the Council for Education in World Citizenship until the summer of 1940, but the Council had not proposed to hold further camps until after the war, when more normal conditions would make camping once more a practical proposition and many former leaders might be expected to return from active service. However, so much interest in the camps as an imaginative method of education for world citizenship was expressed by leading educationists from other countries in the Council's Joint Commission with the London International Assembly, that the Commission urged that another camp should be held again this year in order that boys and girls and their leaders from all the United Nations might have an opportunity to take part.

A United Nations Camp

By courtesy of the Royal Norwegian Ministry of Education, the camp was held at Norway's own School in a castle set amid the heatherclad hills of Scotland. It lasted for

ten days and was attended by boys and girls from Belgium, Czechoslovakia, France, Greece, Holland, Norway, Poland, the U.S.A. and Great Britain, some of them coming from their own national schools, which have been established in this country. Many of them had seen bitter days and occasionally around the camp fire at night, between the gay songs and national dances which we learned together, we heard of their grim adventures in reaching our shores.

Each day began with physical training led by one of the Czechoslovak leaders, well known in the Sokol movement of his country. After breakfast and camp inspection there was a short ceremony outside the castle when the flag of one or other of the countries represented was unfurled, a message was read by a pioneer representing that national group, and all the Camp joined in singing that country's national anthem. Perhaps the most moving ceremony of all was the flag parade led by the local Home Guard pipers' band on the Sunday afternoon when each national group presented its flag to the Norwegian Minister of Education and asked him to carry it to Norway, when Norway is once more free, and to hold it in safe keeping until the boys and girls from all the United Nations can meet in Nansen's own brave country for another Nansen Pioneer Camp and take their flags back home. In presenting their flags to the Minister, all the members of the camp dedicated their lives to the service of their own country to the end that each country might seek its true greatness in the measure of its contribution to mankind.

The Vice-Chancellor of the University of Aberdeen and other distinguished people visited the camp to speak at Camp Assembly, but much of the most interesting and lively discussion was in three smaller groups or "tribes" (Whales, Polar Bears and Reindeer) into which the camp was divided. Here the discussions ranged from the schools of every country to the problems of future international collaboration and what to do with Germany after the war.

Some of the most enjoyable hours were spent in practical work for our Norwegian hosts, felling trees and clearing the paths in the woods around the castle, or trekking on the mountain sides. On the last day a young pine was planted in front of the castle as a "Tree of Liberty" to commemorate the visit of the camp.

Throughout the ten days of the camp we lived, from the Great Chief (the Norwegian Minister of Education) to the youngest pioneer, as one big family and found in all our discussions a bond of unity in common aims and ideals for the future. We were

rightly reminded that Nansen was not only a pioneer of Arctic exploration, a scientist of considerable repute and a citizen of the whole world, quick to champion the cause of the prisoner of war, the refugee and all who needed help, but also a great patriot who played a leading part in securing by peaceful means the independence of his country. His life of hard work, hard living, patriotism and broad humanitarianism provide a great example for all young people who would fit

themselves to-day to serve their country and the world, and the members of the camp showed a very lively sense of their national and international obligations. At the end of the camp children from each of the occupied countries broadcast messages to their people at home, telling them what they are trying to do here to fit themselves to be worthy to carry on the struggle and, when victory has been won, to help to rebuild their countries and the world.

BOOKS OF THE MONTH

FAITH AND WORKS. By Lionel Curtis. (Sir Humphrey Milford, Oxford University. 2s.)

This latest pamphlet by Mr. Lionel Curtis is the fruit of comments from a number of friends and reviewers on his earlier two, *Decision* and *Action*. His central aim—the prevention of war by federal solutions—remains. Only the area involved and the *tempo* show some change. There is the same imperative need of vision which, to be true to itself, must be expressed in action. "Where there is no vision, the people become a mob."

In brief, Mr. Curtis now proposes that the business of ending war and the functions inseparable from it must be entrusted to an International Government or Authority formed by two or more self-governing nations. They must possess the power to make the security of those nations whom they are defending a first charge on the resources, material and human, of them all, the necessary revenue being distributed in proportion to their taxable capacity on expert assessment. All other power—taxation between citizen and citizen, the general composition and social structure of the nation—are to be reserved to the national government. Realisation of these proposals for general security, Mr. Curtis is convinced, lies first and foremost in the merging of the peoples of the American and British Commonwealth under one organic government charged with common defence. Nothing short of this will complete the task of the Atlantic Charter.

Once you grant the central thesis that in the matter of ending war a federal experiment alone can fill the bill, no more logical or stimulating statement of the

minimum needs can be found than this pamphlet. But it is just this assumption which is not immune from criticism; Mr. Curtis hardly realises the justifiable strength which this war has brought to nationalism, as well as the actual lines along which many countries have, as a matter of fact, been revising their ideas of war and the practice of co-operation. Almost alone national spirit has shown sufficient moral vitality to put up a fight against Germany, and the collapse of the Germans will not lessen this spirit or bring it nearer to federal experiment. At the same time, it is not realised how sectional and regional in Europe were Nazi concepts of war or peace. The Nazis moved on a different plane from the Allies. "Germany," Field-Marshal Smuts said the other day, "was the only nation in Europe to start war for the *old* ideas." But then and now other countries have more and more grown to work together in harmony on common principles, without seeking to conquer each other or upset local loyalties. The end of the war, by the removal of the main obstruction in the way, may well confirm this type of development of co-operation on a basis of *confederation*. On its actual record, what is none other than a central League principle is bound to play an important part in post-war reorganisation of peace.

FRESHWATER MEMORIAL

The subject of a Memorial to Major Freshwater is at the moment under consideration by the Executive Committee. Plans will be announced in the November issue of HEADWAY.

A HANDBOOK FOR THE INFORMATION OF RELATIVES AND FRIENDS OF PRISONERS OF WAR. (His Majesty's Stationery Office. 2d. net.)

This little handbook is heartily recommended to any reader with a relative or a friend who is a prisoner of war in Germany or Italy (but not Japan). Here are to be found short, concise answers to a score of questions which inevitably come to the mind regarding the way in which prisoners are being treated, what organisations are looking after their interests, where to apply for news of them, how to communicate with them and so on. Such a collection of authoritative information was long overdue. Now that it has been made available in handy form, we are glad to see that the job has been well done.

THE LANGUAGE PROBLEM. By E. D. Durrant. (Esperanto Publishing Company, Ltd., Rickmansworth. 7s.)

Mr. Churchill's unexpected advocacy of Basic English, in his Harvard speech, has stimulated public interest in the question of an international language. Extremely topical, therefore, is Mr. Durrant's contribution to the discussion, which is something more than a merely propagandist exposition of the origin and development of the only constructed language which in some degree has stood the test of time. Throughout this book of 168 pages he conceives of language as a "social instrument," stressing the purpose of international friendship and co-operation. Among the historical chapters there is a very full account of the League of Nations enquiries into the subject, in the course of which the memorandum prepared by the Intelli-

gence Section of the L.N.U. is quoted. The use of Esperanto in the I.L.O. is mentioned. Later we read of some little known practical uses to which Esperanto has been put; and totalitarian hostility to the language is shown to be significant. "Looking Forward," the author tries to foreshadow possible lines of progress in the era of post-war reconstruction presupposed by the Atlantic Charter.

Famine Relief is the special subject of the latest number of *The Knight Crusader*, an international magazine produced by *Youth* in the interests of international goodwill. Copies (price 3d.) from the Editor, High Cross, Bishops Tawton, Barnstaple, N. Devon.

RECOMMENDED

- THE BRITISH COMMONWEALTH. Its Place in the Service of the World. Sir Edward Grigg. (Hutchinson. 5s.)
- PLAN FOR BRITAIN. Collection of Essays prepared for the Fabian Society. Various authors, including Sir William Beveridge and Mr. Cole. (Routledge. 6s.)
- A BETTER BRITAIN IN A BETTER WORLD. Ramsay Muir. (King and Staples. 2s.)
- ADVENTURES OF A YOUNG SOLDIER IN SEARCH OF A BETTER WORLD. C. E. M. Joad. (Faber and Faber. 6s.)
- BARNARDO OF STEPNEY. A. E. Williams. (Allen and Unwin. 12s. 6d.)
- WEALTH AND WELFARE. H. W. Foster and E. V. Bacon. (Macmillan. 12s. 6d.)
- THE BRITISH PACIFIC ISLANDS. Sir Harry Luke. (Oxford Pamphlet on World Affairs. 6d.)
- TRANSATLANTIC. Monthly Publication edited by Geoffrey Crowther. (Penguin Books Ltd. 1s.)

MAIN CONTENTS

	PAGE
Editorial: Voices on Coming Victory	1
A Look at the International Horizon—III. By Hugh Vivian	4
Politics and the L.N.U. By K. M. Butler	6
This Sovereignty Business. By Gordon Dromore	8
Up and Down the Country	10
From Headway's Post-Bag	12
Union Summer Schools	3, 13, 14
Books of the Month	15