

HEADWAY

IN WAR-TIME

The Journal of the League of Nations Union

BRITISH LIBRARY

11 APR 1945

POLITICAL AND
ECONOMIC SCIENCE

No. 66

MARCH 1945

PRICE 3d

EDITORIAL

THE CRIMEA CONFERENCE

"BIG THREE" ON WAR AND PEACE

Memorable pages of history are being written as Nazidom totters into a chaos of military defeat and disintegration. On the military side, every day adds something new to the United Nations saga. Only the shallow-minded, however, glorify these victorious episodes for their own sake. We welcome them, not from lust of slaughter and conquest, but because they are necessary stages in the task of ridding the world of Nazism and making it safe from aggression. We are fighting for more than a breathing space between wars. If, this time as in the past, battle only breeds fresh battle, we shall have failed in our aim.

There is cause for thankfulness, then, that the meeting of three men on the shores of the Black Sea momentarily banished military successes from the main headlines of the newspapers. For eight days our Prime Minister, President Roosevelt and Marshal Stalin held their long-expected conference, at Yalta in the Crimea, while the Axis vainly threw out guesses that they were in half-a-dozen other places. At the end of it all they announced their plans for final victory, the utter destruction of Nazism in Germany, joint action to help the liberated countries of Europe, and "the earliest possible establishment with our allies of a general international organisation to maintain peace and security."

The Big Three's statement has enjoyed a good Press virtually everywhere except in Germany and Japan. There the chief war criminals were anxiously hoping for

something which they might be able to turn to their own advantage—either signs of disunity among the allies or indications of weakness of purpose.

The statement brings them cold comfort. Their propaganda services are driven to the futile expedient of denouncing the Big Three's plan as a "Magna Carta of misery." More and more Germans, we may hope, will realise that their own leaders are responsible for the misery, which must increase if those leaders prolong the war already lost by Germany.

First, then, the statement is important as conclusive evidence that the essential unity of Great Britain, America and Russia has not been impaired by differences of opinion on this or that problem. Too often, in official communiqués, fine-spun phrases are used to conceal deep-seated disagreement. There is nothing of that kind in the direct and straightforward language of the Yalta declaration. One feels, in reading it, that it means what it says.

Especially welcome is the announcement that a Conference of United Nations is to meet at San Francisco, in the United States, on April 25, 1945, to prepare the Charter of the general international organisation, along the lines proposed in the informal conversations at Dunbarton Oaks. First, however, the Government of China and the Provisional Government of France are to be taken into consultation, and will be

invited to join in sponsoring invitations to the Conference.

The time is short, but the League of Nations Union must make the most of it in pressing on with its studies of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. As reported elsewhere in this number, meetings and discussions on the subject are being held all over the country, and the Union is busy supplying speakers both to its own branches and to other organisations. In accordance with its promise to the General Council, the Executive Committee (through an expert sub-committee) has been making a detailed study of the proposals. Already seven meetings have been held. Every suggestion put forward at the General Council has been considered, and views from the New Commonwealth, the London International Assembly and other bodies have been heard. A final report and recommendations will soon be in the hands of Branches.

After they have had time to digest the Executive's report, it will be possible to hold the proposed Special Meeting of the General Council, with the object of determining the policy with regard to Dumbarton Oaks to be pursued by the whole Union. The date provisionally fixed for the General Council Meeting is Thursday, April 5. A definite announcement will be made as soon as possible.

SOME ISSUES ARISING OUT OF THE GRADUAL LIBERATION OF ENEMY-OCCUPIED COUNTRIES*

In most of our discussions during the war-years of issues connected with the post-war settlement we have assumed that hostilities would cease before the many difficult problems created by the war would have to be solved, and that their solution would be debated at a conference of all the nations that had been united in war against the Axis Powers. It has recently become clear that this assumption was fallacious. The insistence on the unconditional surrender of the enemy means that there will be no armistice stage as at the end of the last war. There will therefore be no definite moment when war will cease and peace will begin. The gradual liberation of countries hitherto occupied by Germany, the collapse of resistance in the satellite countries such as Italy, Hungary, Bulgaria and Roumania, and the progressive occupation by allied forces of Germany itself are creating problems which properly belong to the stage of peace, but which have to be dealt with while hostilities continue.

It is both the right and the duty—as Mr. Eden has recently reminded us—of the Union to mobilise an effective body of public opinion on the subject of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. In that responsibility the whole Union—every Branch and member—must share. Only thus can we help our Government to discharge that “sacred obligation” which the Big Three declared that they owe to their peoples and the people of the world.

There is a challenge to all of us in the closing paragraphs of the statement of the Crimea Conference:—

“Only with continuing and growing co-operation and understanding among our three countries and among all the peace-loving nations can the highest aspiration of humanity be realised—a secure and lasting peace which will, in the words of the Atlantic Charter, ‘afford assurance that all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want.’”

“It is considered that victory in this war and the establishment of the proposed International Organisation will provide the greatest opportunity in all history to create in the years to come the essential conditions of such a peace.” In grasping that opportunity, let the whole Union be eager to take its proper share.

The Executive Committee of the League of Nations Union has been watching with considerable anxiety the emergence of these problems and the way they are being dealt with, and they feel that the time has come to inform their Branches of their views on some of them.

In the interest of the future peace of the world we think it essential that territorial adjustments should rest either on the consent of the parties concerned or on the authority of a collective decision. Neither of these conditions can be fulfilled during the war. None of the Governments of the countries that have been occupied rests upon popular election or has the necessary authority to pledge the consent of its people to territorial

**It is thought that this statement, drafted for the Executive by the Chairman, Lord Lytton, in the light of previous discussions, will be of interest to the Branches and HEADWAY readers.*

changes. The machinery for obtaining collective authority for such changes does not exist and cannot be created till after the war. We have no wish to postpone decisions because they are difficult or controversial. The sooner these questions can be settled the better for peace. But the conditions for a satisfactory settlement after investigation by qualified experts and full discussion do not exist.

The opinion which we represent, and which looks to us for guidance, is the opinion of ordinary people who may not understand the intricacies of diplomatic negotiations, the complexities of racial problems or the economic needs of other countries, but who have a very shrewd sense of right and wrong, of what is ethically just or unjust. If they are to support an international organisation, if they are to defend a peace settlement, or fight for a cause, they must be satisfied that these things are broadly just and right. These people have welcomed the Atlantic Charter because the principles therein stated are generally understood to satisfy this test. What they will not understand is if a document purporting at the beginning of the war to define the principles we are fighting for is disregarded in any settlement made at the end of the war.

The proposals made at Dumbarton Oaks aim at the establishment of a security authority which will maintain peace in the future against any intending aggressors. We welcome these proposals, we think they can be improved, and shall be submitting our suggestions for their improvement. But however perfect this instrument may be made we would again remind our Branches that it can never be more than an instrument. Its effectiveness will depend on the will to use it. We must learn from the experience of the League of Nations. That instrument was not effectively used to make changes by negotiation owing to too great a regard for the sanctity of treaties: neither was it used to resist the first stages of aggression through a fear of war and a latent sympathy with the claims of the aggressors. That must not happen again.

In order that the chances of securing an enduring peace may not be lost before the war is won, we urge H.M.G. to pursue the following objectives in all their negotiations with allied Governments.

(1) That, whatever Governments in countries recently occupied by the enemy may be temporarily recognised either by themselves or by any other of the United Nations, they will use all their influence to secure the ultimate realisation of what the Prime Minister described in the House of Commons on January 18th as “Government of the people, by the people, for the people set up on a basis of free universal suffrage. Elections with secrecy of ballot and no intimidation.” In some cases a large

number of the population has been forcibly removed during the war. As many of these people as possible should be brought back to their own countries before the new elections are held.

(2) That in the meanwhile, and as liberation proceeds, they will make every effort to secure—as in Italy, France, Belgium and Greece—Provisional Governments as representative as possible of all sections of the population other than those who have collaborated with the enemy or who have Nazi or Fascist sympathies.

(3) That on all questions involving alterations of frontiers, the transfer of territories and the movement of populations, no final decisions should be made, and no action by any other country should be recognised as final, until hostilities have ceased, and a meeting of the duly constituted Governments of all the United Nations can be held.

(4) That in considering what action they will themselves advocate or support at the Conference which will decide these issues, they will adhere to the principles of the Atlantic Charter which have been accepted by all the United Nations and were reaffirmed at the Yalta conference; and that, if any departure is made, or seems to be made, from the terms of the Charter, they will make it clear why such departure is considered necessary in the interest of the peace of the world. We recognise that the interpretation of each separate point of the Charter must be subordinated to its object as a whole which is stated to be the establishment of “a peace which will afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries and which will afford assurance that all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want.”

We think that if the various problems as they arise are dealt with on these lines such temporary measures as may be taken during the war will not prejudice the justice or stability of the final settlement. We gladly recognise that the official report of the Crimea Conference gives ground for believing that the decisions there taken were in general conformity with what we have advocated, and we rejoice to learn that agreement has now been reached between all parties in Greece.

Our Address:

HEADWAY

11, Maiden Lane, London, W.C.2.

Telephone

1EMple Bar 6140

CEWC

By MAXWELL GARNETT

While these words are being written about the past, Mr. Churchill, President Roosevelt and Marshal Stalin are busy by the Black Sea looking forward to the future. They are discussing, to quote the first report of their meeting, "proposals for the earliest possible establishment of a permanent international organisation to maintain peace." On February 6, the day before this report appeared, Lord Cranborne told the House of Lords that the building of machinery for closer international co-operation was "our most essential task at the present time," and he added, speaking for the British Government, "surely the right line for pursuing that aim is represented by the League of Nations and the Dumbarton Oaks proposals." The Allied leaders are, no doubt, beginning their present discussions with this scheme: the tentative proposals worked out by the British, American and Russian Foreign Offices at Dumbarton Oaks last summer. In his opening address to that conference the American Secretary of State, Mr. Cordell Hull, declared

"We are fully aware that no institution—especially when it is of as great importance as the one now in our thoughts—will endure unless there is behind it considered and complete public support. *The will to peace must spring from the minds and hearts of men and women everywhere.* Because we believe that to be true we regard education as the foundation upon which all schemes for international co-operation must be built."

Lip Service Not Enough

The first League of Nations paid lip service to this truth when, in 1923, its fourth Assembly unanimously passed Dame Edith Lyttelton's motion that

"The Assembly urges the Governments of the States Members to arrange that the children and youth in their respective countries where such teaching is not given be made aware of the existence and aims of the League of Nations and the terms of the Covenant."

But the first League did little to implement this resolution beyond establishing,

in 1926, an advisory sub-committee of experts. The real business of persuading the Governments to act upon it was left to the unofficial League of Nations Societies in the several countries or to anyone else who cared to try. The new League, planned at Dumbarton Oaks and now being discussed by the Big Three, must adopt a more realist attitude to what is fundamental. Secretary Hull saw this clearly enough when, from his words already quoted, he went on to tell the Conference that his American delegation had

"throughout the war advocated that a permanent International Organisation for Education—to promote the advancement of education generally and in particular of education for world citizenship—should be one of the principal parts of any new international authority established at the end of the war."

It is to be hoped that the plans for a United Nations Organisation for Educational and Cultural Reconstruction formulated in London last April (by Mr. Butler's conference of Allied Ministers of Education) will come before Congress in the near future and, when accepted in Washington, be quickly ratified by most of the other United Nations.

The Union's Spadework

But to return to the first League. The League of Nations Union has always shared Mr. Hull's belief that education must lay the foundation for a lasting peace. In 1925 the first two of the three objects for which the Union was then incorporated by Royal Charter were definitely educational. In 1927, acting on a suggestion by the Union's Secretary, the President of the Board of Education expressed a wish to receive the views of the teaching profession concerning the instruction of children and young people in the work and aims of the League of Nations; and, on June 8 of that year, the principal associations of teachers joined with the Union in declaring how the schools of Britain might help to promote the peace of the world. In 1929 this declaration was followed by a report on League teaching from a joint

committee representing all the principal associations of teachers and of local education authorities.

Co-operation between the Union and the associations of teachers and of local education authorities took place through the Education Committee of the Union until just before the outbreak of war in 1939. It was this committee which, throughout most of the inter-war years, focussed the national effort to educate young people in international affairs so that they might become good citizens of a wider world community as well as of their own country and of the British Commonwealth.

Birth of CEWC

The Union had, however, been bidden by its Royal Charter to perform other functions that were not purely educational. Its third object was "to advocate the full development of the League of Nations so as to bring about such a world organisation as will guarantee the freedom of nations," *et cetera*. The discharge of this duty at a time of high political tension sometimes made sparks fly. As war came nearer the Union seemed to be increasingly involved in political controversy. In these circumstances the associations of teachers and of local education authorities felt, and the Union agreed, that they could all, including the Union, do more for the education of world citizens in British schools if they ceased to function through a committee that was in theory responsible to the Union's executive even though there was no interference in fact.

The Council for Education in World Citizenship—commonly called CEWC—was therefore established as an autonomous body. It includes representatives of the teachers' and local education authorities' associations as well as of the Union and other bodies, together with co-opted members. The Board (now Ministry) of Education, the Scottish Education Department, the Ministry of Education for Northern Ireland, the Secretary-General of the League of Nations and the Director of the International Labour Organisation may, each of them, appoint an observer. The close co-operation between CEWC and the Union is assured by their sharing the same head office.

A Fine Record

CEWC has done wonders during the five years of its existence, all of them war years. Its annual report for 1944 is good to read. Best of all, perhaps, is the account of the conferences arranged and directed by Miss Luffman, who succeeds Mr. Judd—now Secretary of the Union—as CEWC's chief officer. One of these conferences was the annual Christmas holiday lecture course attended by more than 2,000 boys and girls in the Central Hall at Westminster; it has already been fully reported in HEADWAY. Other "inter-schools" conferences brought together some 7,000 boys and girls in various places up and down the country. Week-end courses in London attracted more than 2,000 young people.

These more spectacular activities were made possible by the steady work done, all the year round, in 315 school societies and many regional groups who were helped to plan their programmes by Miss Luffman and her staff. There was, for instance, a successful Essay and Poster Competition connected with the Health Charter Study Group. The number of boys and girls in the United Kingdom who correspond, under CEWC's auspices, with boys and girls in the United States, Australia, New Zealand, Canada and South Africa increased to 5,000. A message from the Prime Minister, verses by the Poet Laureate, and a B.B.C. talk for the schools were secured, and CEWC itself prepared much other material, for the celebration of June 14 as United Nations Day. An Armistice Day message to the schools was written for CEWC by the Rt. Hon. Richard Law, M.P., Minister of State at the Foreign Office.

CEWC sees to it that education for world citizenship does not end with school life. Requests for help from youth organisations became so frequent that a special officer was appointed and a conference was held with representatives of the principal youth organisations and other persons interested in this side of CEWC's work. Again, the Student Federation for International Co-operation, which takes the place of the British Universities League of Nations Society in the universities and training colleges during the war, was given an office and otherwise helped

by CEWC and by the Union. And, in the field of adult education, CEWC has secured the co-operation of the Workers' Educational Association, the British Institute of Adult Education and the education committees of the Y.M.C.A. and the

Y.W.C.A., while talks given by CEWC's members, especially under army education schemes, have brightened the prospects of the post-war League by arousing deep interest among many men and women in the Forces.

WORLD AFFAIRS IN PARLIAMENT

A COMMON PROGRAMME FOR THE ALLIES

By OWEN RATTENBURY

A recent debate in the House of Lords recalled one of the earliest actions of Mr. Churchill after becoming Prime Minister—his sending of Sir Stafford Cripps to Moscow and Sir Samuel Hoare to Madrid. Since Germany's attack on Russia there has never been any doubt about the wisdom of the Cripps appointment. But, in view of the Hoare-Laval business, was Sir Samuel the right man to go to Spain? There was something to be said in favour of sending a Left Wing politician to Red Russia and a Right Wing one to Blue Spain, providing we could preserve perfect balance on the tight ropes. I remember Mr. Churchill replying, in answer to a searching question asked in the House of Commons regarding Sir Samuel's attitude in relation to the Franco Government, that he thought he had been "very clever." On the inner facts, which were not known to most of their colleagues and still less to back-benchers, only Mr. Churchill and Mr. Eden were in a position to judge. Nevertheless the Prime Minister's description of Sir Samuel's work as being "very clever" rather surprised the House and was received in mystified silence. As Lord Templewood since his return to this country, our former ambassador to Spain has, however, made many of us "think again."

The latest of Lord Templewood's speeches in the Lords was made on January 25, after the last HEADWAY had gone to press. It followed a general survey temperately expressed by Lord Addison who introduced the debate. Lord Addison said that "few things are more difficult and nothing is more urgent than to get into practical shape the machinery

of international co-operation for the preservation of peace. It is inevitable, too, that what ever the machinery is, it must be, for the world and for the different nations, some sacrifice of their previous notions of national sovereignty."

Collective Treatment

Lord Templewood contended that, at the conference between the Big Three which all thought to be impending, the time would have come to revise some of the decisions that had been taken piecemeal and unilaterally during the course of the war, and to fit them into a system for Europe that would last. They had been witnessing a series of acts essentially unilateral—perhaps with a general approval of the other parties. He thought it was time, however, that the Allies agreed to a common programme for dealing with liberated areas, to make their programme public, and to have some sort of organisation ready to carry it out. The treatment of liberated areas should be a collective and not a unilateral treatment, in which all three Great Powers should be involved with the addition of France.

Again he thought it was time that the Allies should collectively make their attitude towards Germany far clearer. There had never been a joint and considered pronouncement by all the great Allies, including France. He would like to see a collective statement, if not on what we were going to do, at any rate on what we were not going to do with Germany. The Prime Minister's statement on the limitation made by our own principles in our dealings with Germany was excellent, but

it was unilateral. By a united statement we should largely counteract the propaganda of Goebbels. We should, he urged, get back to the principles of the Atlantic Charter.

U.N.R.R.A. and Other Topics

Lord Samuel drew attention to China, and wondered if there was any prospect of reconciliation between General Chiang Kai-shek's government and that of the so-called Communist State of Yen-an. (I thought the adjective "so-called" was excellent, and that it might be applied to similar statements about Belgian, French, Italian and Greek resistance movements.) Referring to Commander Bower's recent attack on Russia, he trusted that our friends in Russia would realise the complete unimportance of that speaker. On the *Economist* article which had been so much discussed, he thought it might have done good on the whole. Still, he deprecated any bickering continuation—quoting the Chinese proverb, "Do not remove a fly from thy friend's head with a hatchet."

U.N.R.R.A., he suggested, had not been able to do its work of feeding the starving people in Europe—the chief snag being that, it could not do anything for six months after liberation without military consent. South Italy, Greece, Yugoslavia, Belgium and Holland were still suffering tremendously—as many as 200 people a week were dying of starvation in Yugoslavia. Thus, although U.N.R.R.A. had perhaps not been a complete failure, nobody could call it a success.

Dumbarton Oaks, other measures of the kind, treaties of alliance between Russia and Britain, and the like were not the last word. As Walt Whitman had said:—

"Were you looking to be held together
by the lawyers
Or by an agreement on paper? or by
arms?
Nay—nor the world nor any living thing
will so cohere."

There was much said by many speakers about Greece. I leave that. Whether the E.D.E.S. with its leader Plastiras, backed up by the British Government, is entirely right, or E.L.A.S. and E.A.M. are entirely wrong; and whether witnesses allowed to contact only one side can give satisfactory testimony, will be the subject of discussion in Parliament for months to come.

The Government Reply

Lord Cranborne answered. The suggestion that the Government was lukewarm on China was entirely unfounded. The basic principle which must actuate us and our allies in dealing with liberated countries was government of the people, by the people, for the people, on a basis of free and universal suffrage election, with secrecy of the ballot and no intimidation. That was our object in Greece, Poland, Yugoslavia. Also food and supplies: for starving people rapidly become savage people. The six months' period mentioned by Lord Samuel was an estimate for planning purposes. In practice it might be shorter or longer, the governing factor being simply military necessity. In the areas mentioned the only limiting factor was that of transport facilities—it was just a hard physical fact.

With regard to Lord Templewood's suggestion that there should be only united action, that was not always possible. Of course it was desirable that it should be so. No Great Power should act without full consultation with the others, and that principle H.M. Government had observed in every case.

Only the Big Three could decide if and when it would be useful to make such a combined statement as urged by Lord Templewood. President Wilson's Fourteen Points and the charges of breach of faith afterwards did not encourage such a declaration. He spoke of the League of Nations. The United States did not join for fear of being dragged into European disputes. We did join in the hope of preventing those disputes flaring into war. Similar considerations influenced us in intervening in Greece. Our intentions were then, as they always had been, to prevent bad from getting worse. The Great Powers could not dissociate themselves from the affairs of their neighbours; but their intervention and assistance, so long as they used them properly, could only do good.

I should also like to draw the attention of our readers to two very interesting debates which I cannot touch this month. They will be found in the House of Lords *Hansard* for February 6 and 7. One is on Federal Union (with a reply by Lord Cranborne) and the other on the millions of stateless inhabitants of Europe.

THE I.L.O. PREPARES FOR PEACE

For the third time during this war Mr. Ernest Bevin, as Minister of Labour and National Service, welcomed the Governing Body of the International Labour Office in London, at the opening of its 94th session. Mr. Bevin is at his best on these occasions. His sincere belief in the I.L.O. comes out in every sentence which he utters, so that he leaves on everybody the impression that his visits are something beyond the routine duties of a Cabinet Minister.

On this occasion he dotted the i's and crossed the t's of previous Government pronouncements on the I.L.O. After speaking of international action which was being taken to prepare the conditions of a people's peace, notably the Dumbarton Oaks proposals for establishing a General International Organisation, he came on to the place of the I.L.O. among the new international bodies.

"The Government," said Mr. Bevin, "desire to put the International Labour Organisation as high in the scale of world organisations as possible."

But some way must be found of coordinating the various international organisations so that they could work in concert. The I.L.O. was proud of its status and its great record of service. "It seems to me important," Mr. Bevin continued, "both in its own interest and in the interest of the new world organisation, that it should not be completely independent of that organisation, but should be a definite part of the organisation in its constructive work for peace. For my part I take the view that, as this organisation is a tripartite one and brings together, as no other organisation does, the combined views of management and operatives' organisations and the Governments, it must be in a position in relation to the highest authority equal to that of any other branch. That is to say, it must not be put in a subordinate position to the Economic and Social Council, but rather work on parallel lines so that the views of industry, together with the economic repercussions of any proposals, may be considered by the world organisation together and on equal terms."

"It is the duty of this generation," he concluded, "to hold on to every international organisation which has survived this war and which goes on to the future generation."

Relations With Other Bodies

Serious work began in the fierce glare of publicity. Arc lights and cameras were evidence enough that a news reel was being made.

The Governing Body was chary of saying too much about its relations with the Dumbarton Oaks organisation. That was understandable in view of the tentative nature, so far, of the proposals. But a report was adopted welcoming the progress made in the Dumbarton Oaks conversations towards laying the foundations of a system of world security and affirming the desire of the I.L.O. for association with the general international organisation on terms which would permit it to make its best contribution to the general effort while retaining the necessary authority for the I.L.O. to discharge its responsibilities.

Mr. Phelan, the acting director, presented a report on the relations of the I.L.O. with other bodies. This, as Mr. Carter Goodrich (the chairman) commented, was particularly interesting as indicating the amount of international effort which was going on. Such bodies as U.N.R.R.A., the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organisation, and the Conference of Allied Ministers of Education were already in close touch with the I.L.O. It was decided to extend reciprocal arrangements (e.g., representation at meetings and exchange of documents) with others like the provisional International Civil Aviation Organisation.

Industrial Committees

Perhaps the most important immediate outcome of the meeting was the decision to set up seven international industrial committees for the major industries of the world. This was a scheme in which the British Government—and Mr. Bevin in particular—took keen interest.

The closest parallel was the existing Joint Maritime Commission of the I.L.O., with this important qualification, that this

body consisted of seamen and shipowners with no governmental element. The question arose whether or not the new committees were to be tripartite. Some of the employers wanted them to be a "get together" of employers and workers of various nations, leaving the Governments to secure their information at second hand. The wiser view prevailed, by 21 votes to 8, that all three parties to industry should be represented. All the experience of the I.L.O. goes to prove that often the governmental representatives can preserve the balance between the employers and workers. Also, since in the long run the decisions reached have to be carried out by the action of Governments, it is right that they should have some say in the shaping of policy.

The seven new committees will be for the following industries: Transport, mining, iron and steel, engineering, textiles, oil, and building.

Fast or Slow?

During some of the discussions a mild controversy arose as to the tempo at which the I.L.O. should work. In one speech, for example, Sir John Forbes Watson (British employers) seemed to hint that the Organisation had sometimes moved too fast and aimed too high. He was vigorously taken up by Mr. J. Halls-worth (British workers), who urged that the demands of millions of men and women, particularly those from the Forces, would necessitate an even more rapid rate of progress.

Sir John had used in support of his argument the fact that so many countries had ratified a mere handful of the International Labour Conventions. Mr. Halls-worth agreed with him that something should be done to get more ratifications. Mr. Phelan intervened to point out that the record of ratifications was far from being so gloomy as some were inclined to assume. During the 25 years' life of the I.L.O. more than 130,000,000 people had been covered by social security measures. No other organisation had been responsible for so many legal obligations between country and country.

The Next Conference

Has Italy, in the Churchillian phrase, "worked her passage"? The Governing Body, confronted with the Italian Govern-

ment's application for re-admission to the I.L.O., deferred an answer to this question until the next International Labour Conference.

There was lively speculation, before and during the early stages of the Governing Body meeting, as to where and when the next Conference would meet. The possibility of getting back to Geneva was discussed in many conversations. Privately the view was expressed that, under present conditions, "you can't count in dates but in events."

On its last day, nevertheless, the Governing Body felt confident enough that the European War would be over by the autumn to accept an invitation from the French Government to hold the next International Labour Conference in Paris, probably in September or October. This may well be the first big international "peace" conference to meet on the soil of free Europe. **LESLIE R. ALDOUS.**

A PREFACE TO PEACE. By Harold Callender. (Allen and Unwin, 40, Museum Street, W.C.1. 288 pp. 7s. 6d.)

Not every book intended for the American reading public represents very much more than a waste of precious paper when issued in a British jacket. Mr. Callender's vast knowledge and experience of other countries and continents than his own, the fruit of his extensive travels for the *New York Times*, puts this volume into the exceptional category. Whether he is sketching in the background of the international scene, assessing the position of various nations in the present set-up, or estimating the parts that they may play in the future, he never loses his sense of abiding values. To his way of thinking one of the chief lessons to be learned is that it is far more important, and would require far less effort, to have the foresight and collective will to prevent such violent onslaughts as we have been resisting than to defeat them once they have begun. He eloquently pleads for a peace that young men can believe in. It is unlikely, conditions being what they are, that we shall get an unbreakable, foolproof, guaranteed peace, with no risks left. But it is worth taking the imperfect one that is coming into the realm of practical politics, with all its cracks and flaws, and seeing what can be done with it.

LONDON CALLING

A COLLECTIVE AND CONSTRUCTIVE SYSTEM

By SIR ARTHUR SALTER, M.P.

In a Message to the London Regional Federation

The League of Nations is a quarter of a century old, for January 10, 1920, was its legal day of birth. And we are now in the sixth year of another great war! All of us have been recalling our earlier hopes, asking ourselves what went wrong, wondering whether we were on the wrong track. Such questioning is inevitable—and, indeed, salutary. But it should lead not to despair, but a stimulus to new effort.

We may make improvements in some respects, but the main reason why the League did not save us from another war is not to be found in the provisions of the Covenant but in the fact that it was not sufficiently supported. The greatest industrial power was not a member; in her absence Great Britain and France hesitated at critical moments. Germany and Italy were for a period a fifth column within the fortress. It is significant that the new plan, first drafted at Dumbarton Oaks by officials of the U.S.A., Russia and Great Britain (two of whom were not members in 1920) is, in its essential principles, the Covenant revised. The main difference is not in the scheme itself, but in the countries which propose to support it.

The most important lesson from the past that we old Leaguers should, I think, draw is this. The new League is essential,

but it is not everything. We must make it as strong as we can; but we must simultaneously work in other ways to reduce the strains on it. Work to ensure peace must be along several channels, not one only. We must not look on a League system as a kind of Maginot line, which lulls us into a sense of false security and makes us think that nothing else is needed. We shall have to take other measures to ensure that Germany and Japan shall not again be strong enough to break the peace. We must, in our economic, political and social policy, try to reduce the miseries, the injustices and the passions that provide the fuel for the war-monger. We should, in my view, welcome "federal union" where and when it is possible, and not regard it as a hostile alternative to a League system. Free democracies must be not only free and democratic, but strong and efficient. Peace must be something positive, not just the absence of war, but a collective and constructive system which offers scope for the ardent energies which, if they find no better outlet, dictators and war-mongers distort and debase into the passions which serve their purposes. In a word, our strategy for safeguarding peace must be like the strategy which is alone effective for defence in war—it must be not a single line of passive defence but "defence in depth."

UP AND DOWN THE COUNTRY

Dumbarton Oaks easily topped the list of subjects on which the L.N.U. received requests for speakers during February. Scores of applications came not only from Union branches in all parts of the country, but from many other organisations.

Lord Lytton addressed a meeting in the Guildhall, CAMBRIDGE. Miss K. D. Courtney's engagements included an address to the AUSTRIAN LEAGUE OF

NATIONS SOCIETY, and visits to GUILDFORD, READING, EXETER, NEWTON ABBOT and SIDMOUTH—all on the subject of Dumbarton Oaks. As a result of the Exeter meeting, it was decided to revive the local Branch of the Union.

"Holland's Present Position and Future Hopes" was the title of the L.R.F. luncheon meeting in February. The speaker, Mr. J. J. van der Laan, returned

to Europe in 1937 after twenty-five years in the Dutch colonies, and when his country was overrun, he escaped alone to England in an open boat. His account of the present situation was naturally pretty sombre: the collapse of the whole transport system, rations which yielded only 700 calories a day (one quarter of our own), a black market price of £1 per lb. for potato peelings, were some of the items in a grim catalogue. But Dutchmen had resisted bravely, and there was no doubt that in fifteen or twenty years Holland could re-establish its former life again—always provided that, through Dumbarton Oaks or in some other way, security could be ensured.

At the next Buffet Luncheon on Tuesday, 13th March, it is hoped that the speaker will be Mr. Dingle Foot, M.P. (Governmental duties permitting), and his subject "Outlook for Peace." This will take place as usual at the Y.W.C.A., Gt. Russell Street, at 1 p.m., but *not in the Lounge*. Refreshments will be served in the room to the right of the Enquiry Desk, and the meeting at 1.25 p.m. will be in the Queen Mary Hall (2nd Floor).

Our MONTAGUE BURTON BRANCH (LEEDS) continues its monthly luncheon hour meetings, with probably the biggest audiences in the country. An impressive list of distinguished guests attended the recent meeting addressed by Captain Hubert Beaumont, M.P. for the Batley and Morley Division of Yorkshire, who gave cogent reasons for reaffirming steadfast belief in the principles upon which the League of Nations was founded. The high moral principles expressed in the Atlantic Charter must be translated into deeds. It would be the bounden duty of each man and woman to make sure that their Governments represented the people's will. Sir Montague Burton, who welcomed the guests, referred to Captain Beaumont's "friendly and fatherly interest" in the affairs of the Branch.

Addressing the KINGSTON BRANCH at the Surbiton County School on "The Price of Peace," Sir Walter Layton said that the European nations must co-operate in three essentials—military, political and economic. He wanted to see groups of nations co-operating on a council. Under the auspices of the CEWC a conference

on "The Jewish Problem" was held at Kingston Technical College. Addresses were given by the Rev. W. W. Simpson and Dr. Allan Schiper, with Miss Monica Luffman in the chair.

HALIFAX BRANCH organised a Brains Trust on the subject "Why Dumbarton Oaks?"—a most satisfactory meeting with an excellent attendance. "Personally," writes Miss Symonds, the Branch Secretary, "I think the public are really interested and thus our meetings will continue to improve."

AMBLE BRANCH staged a novel meeting when the Mock Parliament of "Novum Orbis" held a debate on the Dumbarton Oaks plan. After keen discussion, a resolution welcoming the plan was carried unanimously.

When Mr. F. L. Whelen spoke on his four years in occupied Paris to our LETCHWORTH BRANCH it was noted that Mr. A. Fuller, the Chairman, was supported on the platform by representatives of several sympathetic local groups. He called upon the audience for co-operation in meeting the new approach to world security. There would still be the great need to build public opinion.

BEDDINGTON, CARSHALTON AND WALLINGTON BRANCH organised a Public Youth Debate on "The Dumbarton Oaks Peace Plan."

At the Annual General Meeting of the NEW SOUTHGATE AND FRIERN BARNET BRANCH Mrs. M. G. Stevens gave an address on "OUR Part in the Branches."

ROTARY CLUBS which had L.N.U. speakers included: ASHFORD (Mr. Edwin Haward); HORSHAM (Dean of Chichester); KENNINGTON (Mr. J. Belcher); REDHILL (Mr. J. T. Catterall); and ST. ALBANS (Mr. F. L. Whelen).

WOMEN'S INSTITUTES included: BREDON and MALVERN (Mr. Catterall); SHALBOURNE (Mr. L. R. Aldous).

Mr. H. H. Walker spoke on Dumbarton Oaks at LAUNCESTON, TAVISTOCK and PADDINGTON.

We regret to learn of the death of Mr. Travers Buxton, of the St. Marylebone Branch, for many years a faithful supporter of all L.R.F. activities.

FROM HEADWAY'S POST-BAG

BRETTON WOODS

(From the Earl of Lytton)

Sir,—Mrs. White's article is more critical than informative. She expresses her own opinion in characteristically vigorous language, but says nothing to help her readers to form their opinions. If any of our members knows what the Bretton Woods proposals are and thinks them mischievous, he should, as Mrs. White suggests, write his views to his M.P. or his local Press. It would be unwise to be equally positive about views which are only second-hand.

In common with Mrs. White I do not like the Bretton Woods proposals. They are not nearly so favourable to our interests as the Keynes plan. It is reasonable to suppose that Lord Keynes also preferred his own plan, but he could not get the Americans to accept it. They could not persuade him to accept their first plan, and Bretton Woods was a compromise between the two. It does not give us all we should like and a great deal will depend on how it is interpreted and carried out, but does any reader of HEADWAY believe that Lord Keynes would have agreed to it if he thought that it would strangle our trade, restrict our credit, increase our unemployment, and involve us in continual friction with other nations? It is permissible to believe that Lord Keynes knows at least as well as Mrs. White what this plan really means. If he agreed to it, it was because he believed that, with all its defects, this plan was better than no plan—and that is really the whole point. If we could get agreement for a better form of international control of exchanges and currency I would join with Mrs. White in urging the Government not to ratify the Bretton Woods plan, but if we have to choose between that form of control and no control at all, then I would prefer Bretton Woods to nothing, and I expect that was also Lord Keynes' reasons for agreeing to it rather than the sacrifice of British interests on the altar of American appeasement as Mrs. White imagines.

LYTTON.

Sir,—As a delegate who was prepared to oppose Mrs. White's resolution at the General Council Meeting, and who strongly supported the motion to pass on to other business because of its wisdom, I should like to record some criticisms of her article on Bretton Woods which appeared in HEADWAY for February.

Professor Murray and Viscount Cecil both warned the General Council that the forces of isolationism were not dead and that the attack on world organisations would come, not as a direct condemnation, but as an attack on details in the hope that the organisations would be rejected because the details were not satisfactory. President Roosevelt has since warned America and the world against "Perfectionism."

At Bretton Woods a world problem was recognised and an attempt at a practical solution suggested. Unsatisfactory, perhaps, as any solution based on a compromise between conflicting interests must inevitably be; but to condemn the proposals outright, as Mrs. White does, is to play into the hands of the isolationists. As with the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, the success or failure of the scheme will depend not so much on the details of the machinery, but on whether or not there is the will to make the machine work and the will to improve it when faults and deficiencies are found. Surely it is the fundamental task of the Union to encourage the development of such a will and not to discourage it as Mrs. White would have us do.

Although I admit that my knowledge of Bretton Woods has been largely gained at a W.E.A. class, it does seem that Mrs. White misrepresents the agreement in her article. For example, she says that it entails a return to the gold standard. As far as I know, the Monetary Fund required twenty-five per cent. of the contribution of each country to be in gold so long as the gold contribution does not exceed ten per cent. of the total gold holding of the country. Also only two per cent. of the contribution (only twenty per cent. of which is to be called) to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development is to be in gold.

Again, Mrs. White rightly says that "for trade expansion there is need of cheap money (a low bank rate)." She does not mention that the proposed rate of interest for loans from the International Bank is one to one and a-half per cent. This low rate will probably set the rate for all international loans.

R. O. GIBSON.

(Chairman, Hartford Branch).

DIARY OF EVENTS

Jan.

24. Land Route to China opened. Red Army across the Oder.
25. General de Gaulle's Statement of French Policy. German Assault in Alsace.
26. Red Army cut off E. Prussia Garrison.
28. Memel captured by Russians. Enemy Bridgehead in Alsace cleared.
29. Red Army cross frontier into Pomerania.
30. Czech Recognition of Lublin Administration.

Feb.

1. London Poles Break with Czech Government.
2. French Army enters Colmar.
4. American Troops pierce Siegfried Belt.
5. Americans enter Manila.
7. Meeting of Prime Minister, President Roosevelt and Marshal Stalin announced.
8. Field-Marshal Montgomery's new Offensive. Paraguay declares war on Axis.
11. Anglo-U.S. Trade Mission in Switzerland.
12. Official Statement on "Big Three" Conference at Yalta. Greek Agreement signed in Athens.
13. European Council of U.N.R.R.A. meets. Russians occupy Budapest.
15. Far East Council of U.N.R.R.A.

April

25. United Nations Conference on the International Organisation (San Francisco).

National Peace Council

Sir,—In comment on Cicely M. Howells's letter in your February issue, may I say (a) that the National Peace Council is not a "pacifist society" as she implies, but a federation of some forty organisations, only a minority of which is pacifist, and (b) that it has never, as far as I am aware, "attacked" the League of Nations Union? We have our differences but our relations remain (I hope) friendly and respectful.

GERALD BAILEY,
Director, National Peace Council.

BOOK REVIEWS

DER FUEHRER. By Konrad Heiden. (Gollancz, Henrietta Street, W.C.2. 614 pp. 10s. 6d.)

We are witnessing the eclipse of the Hitler legend. For that reason it may be that Konrad Heiden's brilliantly painstaking treatise will be studied more intently in years to come than at the present time. We are too near to give a great and unlamented failure even a place in history. Nevertheless, for those who feel a pathological interest in Hitler, this is the book to turn to. It is an adaptation rather than a translation of the monumental original in German, some sections of which are omitted and others revised. The story told, with a tremendous correlation of detail drawn both from personal experience and documentary evidence, covers the period of Hitler's rise to power, with its climax in the blood bath of 1934. In it is to be found the key to the subsequent degradation of the German nation and the enslavement of a continent. Here, too, is the explanation of the growth of that sinister philosophy of force which seemed at one time destined to overwhelm the world.

PRINCIPLES OF PROSPERITY. By Francis W. Hirst. (Hollis and Carter, 25, Ashley Place, S.W.1. 188 pp. 8s. 6d.)

At a time when it is widely realised that there must be a sane balance between the political and the economic principles of peace-making Mr. Hirst's little book is just what the man-in-the-street has been asking for. The author, from half a century of practical experience, knows economics and finance inside out. Yet, in showing exactly what Adam Smith and later political economists were getting at, and the extent to which their theories work out at the present time, he gets away from mumbo-jumbo and jargon. The ordinary reader, who is seeking for a simple explanation of a subject that has widely been dubbed baffling and dismal, will be correspondingly grateful.

THE GOOD SAMARITAN. By Max Huber. With a foreword by the late William Temple. (Gollancz, Henrietta Street, W.C.2. 77 pp. 2s. 6d.)

Professor Huber is President of the International Red Cross. Detailed

accounts of the work of this organisation will be found elsewhere. Urged by a glowing inner conviction, the author here sets out his own conception of the abiding ethical principles inspiring the Red Cross. Narrow national limitations, party or theological discriminations have no place in the Good Samaritan's creed. We have a glimpse of a vision which is as large as humanity itself.

BERLIN OR PRAGUE? By Gustav Beuer. (Lofox, Chancery Lane, W.C.2. 80 pp. 2s. 6d.)

As the liberation of Europe proceeds one problem of the utmost importance is that never again shall a "Sudeten problem" be faked up, paving the way for future attacks on an enlightened democracy by an aggressor. There is purpose in Mr. Beuer's historical background, covering seven centuries, leading up to the betrayal of Czechoslovakia and more recent tragic events. Hope comes from that section of the German population who loved their Czechoslovak homeland; but for all that the problem is one of immense difficulty. A final solution, in the author's view, depends upon the utter destruction of Nazism, the rooting out of the fifth column on Czechoslovak soil, and the transformation of the remaining German population into good patriots and democrats.

BRITISH-SOVIET RELATIONS AND THE FUTURE. By Reginald Bishop. (Russia To-day, 150, Southampton Row, W.C.1. 16 pp. 3d.)

This pamphlet attempts a rapid, and consequently somewhat superficial, survey of the links—official and unofficial—which have been forged between Britain and the Soviet Union during the war. Something is said on the significance of U.N.R.R.A., Hot Springs and Bretton Woods where "monetary theorists played second fiddle to the practical organisers." On Dumbarton Oaks the author advances what is generally assumed to be the Soviet case for the veto in the Security Council. A knotty point, he admits, is involved, but there is enough goodwill on both sides to find a solution. In any case, Russia's record shows that she will use her strength wisely and with moderation.

INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE TO REFUGEES. Report by Sir Herbert Emerson. (Allen and Unwin, League of Nations Publications. 11 pp. 9d.)

This report examines the latest position of refugees in Europe and in overseas countries. It deals not only with the present activities of the League but with those of the Intergovernmental Committee as well as co-operation contemplated with U.N.R.R.A. and the American War Refugee Board. There is also information regarding the measures planned for the post-war period. In the High Commission for Refugees, it is seen, we have an organ of the League the work of which has not at any moment been interrupted by the war.

GLORY AND BONDAGE. By Edgar Snow. (Gollancz. 263 pp. 10s. 6d.)

A brilliant American correspondent describes his visits in the critical days of the war to India, Burma, China and Russia. The account of India is superficial and partial. Easy talk of "the Indians" ranks with easy conclusions about "the Europeans." Mr. Snow's *Red Star Over China* is brought up to date with the same intimate knowledge. But the rewarding core of the book is Russia. We have thoughtful answers to key questions—why Russia has beaten Germany, what is the real nature of Germans *in action*, how far the "Socialist State" continues to-day, what Russia wants (50 years' peace and friendly States round), and how she will face the acid test when the hour comes, after the war, to return to national boundaries. There is the proper stuff of history in these replies.

AND YET I LIKE AMERICA. J. L. Hodson's War Diary. (Gollancz. 302 pp. 10s. 6d.)

We are paid full measure and running over for following Mr. Hodson through America, in the winter and spring of 1943-44. We get inside the skin of hundreds of American men and women, and find their reactions to the problems of life, so many of which are ours in common. We touch the edges of all sorts of life, penny plain and twopence coloured. And there is so much to love and like. The two nations will never agree on all points; but if we face with clear eyes the cost of *not* working together—death to our grandsons and theirs—we shall compromise, we shall get along fine.

UNDER THE NAZI NOSE

During four years of German occupation the Paris Branch of the International Labour Office secretly continued its work under the very nose of the Nazis.

Miss Rommel, for many years secretary of the Branch, organised a network of clandestine activity. Perhaps her fine, Aryan-sounding name helped to disarm German suspicions! The Nazis took possession of the Boulevard Saint Germain office, but she was not deterred. At her flat in the Rue Tolbiac two rooms were piled ceiling-high with I.L.O. publications, reference material and files. From this centre, at great risk, information was passed on to the underground movement throughout France. Those who regularly received I.L.O. material included the General Confederation of Labour, the National Council of Resistance, officials of the Ministry of Labour in Paris, and editors of the underground Press.

The supplies of material never ran out. They were replenished in part from the

Geneva headquarters of the I.L.O., with which Miss Rommel found ways and means of maintaining contact. The stocks confiscated by the Germans, too, were systematically pillaged. In this work Madeleine Péné, a stenographer on the I.L.O. staff, played a daring part. When the office was requisitioned, the Germans offered her a job. She accepted it. In the weeks and months which followed, with the help of the caretaker and an office boy, she smuggled out documents and publications. Her position enabled her to intercept messages and correspondence addressed to the I.L.O. and pass them on to Miss Rommel.

Once again the Paris Branch is working in the open. The Germans in their hasty evacuation left behind stores of I.L.O. publications in the cellars. Two complete sets of I.L.O. publications and documents which the German Labour Front had removed for their own use were later found intact in another office in Paris.

OUR RESPONSIBILITIES

By R. P. ODELL

How much do we, as individuals, want lasting peace, and what are we prepared to do about it? Now is the time to ask ourselves this question and to find a genuine answer to it, an answer so clear-cut that the swirl of post-war events will not cause any deviation.

For, parallel with all official efforts to solve this international problem, there must also be a determined effort on the part of us all, the ordinary men and women of the world, to do our share. Without our co-operation any scheme that may be built up will be seriously handicapped from the outset.

We aim at total peace, at a world in which war will never be allowed as a means of settling disputes. It is something which has never yet been achieved. Most wars have ended with measures being taken which have been intended as deterrents against aggression. But they have always failed in their object. Why? Because there has been little or no attempt among individuals to adjust themselves to

live in a world of peace. Once men can learn to live amicably with their fellow-men, irrespective of nation or creed, we shall have gone a very long way to finding what we want.

This war, caused by the egotistical ambition of Hitler and Mussolini, has parallels in history. Peter the Great, Napoleon and Frederick the Great provide us with three examples.

The desire for personal prowess, the accumulation of wealth, the acquisition of territory, the misdirected urge for self-expression or power, the sense of satisfaction of the sadist in seeing others suffer at his slightest word, the fanaticism of religious wars. All these have played their part as causes of war. The egotist is unable to see the point of view of others, or even the pitfalls that lie in his own path. When this self-centred characteristic is allied to a forceful personality and the power of leadership, the dangers become acute.

The desire for revenge, too, is a potent cause of war. It is a seed which lies dormant in the heart of a nation until someone for his own ends cultivates it and it produces a crop of hate, a crop of which is harvested by that man to satisfy his lust for power. The present war with its atrocities, its bombing of civilians and its threat to all decencies, has probably prepared the ground for a vengeful attitude more than any other, and the eradication of such an outlook is one of the biggest tasks before us.

It is not suggested for a moment that we can live the sort of Utopian existence where there are no clashes of interests and no petty squabbles with our neighbours. But we can use more intelligence and forethought in their solution, and we can educate ourselves to become more broad-minded in our attitude to others.

For it is in education that our hopes must lie. Education which does not stop at fourteen or fifteen, or even at forty or fifty. Education for the masses all over the world. Civilisation without this foundation will never function smoothly. It can never progress without a parallel advance in mental development. The two must go hand in hand.

The schoolmaster must aim at more than giving his pupils a grounding in elementary facts. He must rouse their curiosity so that they go out into the world anxious to find out things for themselves, to continue with the process of self-education. Only thus can we become intellectually alert and more able to tackle the problems that lie ahead.

Education should be a path which we follow all through life. It is not based on academic success alone, but on the ability which that success brings with it. The capacity to understand current problems and the sources from which they spring. To be able to see both sides of the picture and yet to be able to point unwaveringly to the right side.

The days are past when we could afford to leave school to concentrate solely on our own private concerns. We must keep abreast of world events and so make ourselves more competent to found a society where our children can enjoy security and prosperity.

It is the small, undeveloped mind which thirsts for revenge. It is the same type of mentality which seeks for self-expression in some form of petty tyranny. We cannot eliminate this type of mind from society, but we can, and must, so isolate it that it loses its power for evil. It cannot prosper in a generation sufficiently intelligent to recognise its potential dangers. Hitler and Mussolini would never have been blindly accepted and followed had the German and Italian peoples been willing and able to think intelligently and act courageously.

Our target is permanent peace. It is an ambitious one, and its only chance of achievement lies in our being willing to work for it, every man jack of us. If we sit back in our armchairs and leave it all to a few leaders we shall not deserve peace nor shall we maintain it. We have all got our individual parts to play.

MAIN CONTENTS

	PAGE
Editorial: The Crimea Conference - - - - -	1
The Gradual Liberation of Enemy-Occupied Countries - - - - -	2
CEWC. <i>By Maxwell Garnett</i> - - - - -	4
Parliament: A Common Programme for the Allies.	
<i>By Owen Rattenbury</i>	6
The I.L.O. Prepares for Peace. <i>By Leslie R. Aldous</i> - - - - -	8
A Collective and Constructive System. <i>By Sir Arthur Salter, M.P.</i>	11
Post-Bag: Bretton Woods. (<i>Lord Lytton and R. O. Gibson</i>) - - - - -	12
Under the Nazi Nose: How I.L.O. Beat Gestapo - - - - -	15
Our Responsibilities. <i>By R. P. Odell</i> - - - - -	15