

51083

# HEADWAY

## IN WAR-TIME

*The Journal of the League of Nations Union*

No. 65

FEBRUARY 1945

PRICE 3d

### EDITORIAL

## STILL IN BATTLEDRESS

Peace is not yet with us, and the League of Nations Union must for a time carry on in battledress. The most urgent necessity is still to finish off the job of winning the war, for without that all plans for founding the "General International Organisation" promised at Dumbarton Oaks will hang fire. But all of us, in the spirit of the recent General Council meeting, should be getting ready for the time when, our pledge to play a full part in the national war effort redeemed, we can concentrate on our fundamental task of helping to secure this time a lasting peace.

Recent events have given the Union a lot to think about. What is happening about us to-day? The disturbing reports of strife and unrest in so many places that we read of in our newspapers show two things. First, the Union's work of educating, enlightening and mobilising public opinion is becoming increasingly essential as the war enters upon its final frenzy. It is, moreover, work that can be done by no other British organisation. Secondly, the job before us will be—indeed, already is—one of extreme difficulty. But the Union never was a society to shirk its plain duty. Upon Branches and members will largely depend the extent to which its voice is heard. With vastly increased membership it will become a force that will really count in the post-war world.

First and foremost, we want to see established the General International Organisation, strengthened and free from the weak-

nesses of the League and firmly upheld by human will. But it is also important that the new Organisation shall start to operate in an atmosphere, and amidst general international conditions, that will give it a fair chance.

Even before the peace, therefore, the Union is bound in some measure to play the rôle of a watch-dog. In the confused situation arising from the liberation of territories occupied by the Germans, developments are already apparent which must be giving our statesmen some headaches. Premature territorial arrangements and decisions regarding frontiers may be reached which may prejudice the whole peace structure of to-morrow and handicap the new International Organisation from the start. The Union is not a "starry-eyed" organisation. It knows that we seldom get all that we want in this world, that compromises are sometimes inevitable, and that the peace after this war is unlikely to be perfect from purist standards. Yet there are certain ethical principles applicable to international affairs, such as those set out in the Atlantic Charter, which for us must be the touchstone of all that is done. Any departures from these principles must be justified by good reasons, and not merely motives of expediency. This is neither the time nor the place to discuss these thorny problems in detail; but readers may be reassured by the knowledge that the Union's Executive is fully alive to potential dangers and is carefully studying the whole situation.

BRITISH LIBRARY  
FEB 1945  
OF POLITICAL  
ECONOMIC SCIENCE



## I.L.O. "FULLY ALIVE"

Says MR. PHELAN

As HEADWAY goes to press, the Governing Body of the International Labour Office is opening its meeting in London. Owing to the time factor, it will not be possible to give readers a full report until our next issue. Last month Mr. Edward J. Phelan, Acting Director of the Office, gave a brief outline of the principal items of business. In an interview before the Governing Body meeting, he spoke in optimistic terms of the prospects before the I.L.O.

"This will be a most important meeting of the Governing Body," said Mr. Phelan. "It is a follow up of the International Labour Conference at Philadelphia last April and May. The Governing Body did meet then, but it had little time to decide what should be the next steps to carry out the decisions of the Conference.

"Philadelphia quite definitely manifested the fact that the I.L.O. had survived the difficulties of the war period. The Governments, employers and workers from 41 nations, who attended the Conference, still regarded it as being fully alive. The Governments declared, as plainly as they could, their intention of seeing it continued. We already knew what Britain thought from what Mr. Bevin and Mr. Eden said at the last meeting of the Governing Body in London. At Philadelphia we had complete confirmation in the form of the message from President Roosevelt, who told us, 'There is no need to set up a new organisation.' Roughly, the verdict on the I.L.O. is this: It hasn't done a bad job of work. It is a suitable agency to continue to work in the same sphere when the war is over."

In a bird's-eye view of the agenda Mr. Phelan discussed the important question of the relationship of the I.L.O. with other international organisations. It was in close relationship with the United Nations Food Organisation and had been able to give a great deal of information from its own experience. I.L.O. representatives had been present at Bretton Woods and at the two U.N.R.R.A. conferences. With the new international educational agency that was being built here in London it was maintaining constant liaison.

"That," remarked Mr. Phelan, "is the horizontal position. What will be the vertical position with regard to the Dumbarton Oaks organisation? As those proposals are still in the tentative stage, the Governing Body cannot take any decision at the present moment, but it can examine some of the principles that will have to be respected. I can assure you that a good deal of thinking is being done, particularly with regard to the relations of the I.L.O. with the proposed Economic and Social Council."

Asked whether expansion of work would make Montreal an unsuitable centre for the I.L.O., Mr. Phelan stressed that Geneva was still the official headquarters. "We left a small staff in Geneva," he said, "which has been supplying us with valuable information on social conditions in occupied countries and even in enemy countries. It would be desirable to get back to Geneva where we left our tools. You must remember that we arrived in Montreal with no documents and almost no clothes. But there is, of course, the political aspect. If the seat of the new organisation is somewhere else, and if the I.L.O. is tied in closely with that new organisation, it will be desirable for the I.L.O. to set up shop in the new international centre. But in that case we shall move there from Geneva and not from Montreal, for Geneva is the place where we have our equipment."

On the principle of I.L.O. representation at the Peace Conference, Mr. Phelan thought that much would depend upon the way in which the peace was negotiated this time. "But," he added, "when the time comes to decide the relation of the I.L.O. with the over-all organisation, we should like to be heard."

## OBITUARY

As we go to press, we regret to learn of the sudden death of VICE-ADMIRAL S. R. DRURY-LOWE, for many years an active worker and speaker for the Union and member of the Executive Committee.

## "TO-MORROW'S CITIZENS"

"I am a great believer in Youth," declared Lord Cecil at the recent General Council meeting of the League of Nations Union. Our President must have been encouraged in his belief by the series of Christmas Holiday Lectures organised early in January by the Council for Education in World Citizenship. The Council, which is the successor of the old Education Committee of the Union, works on a very broad basis to promote international understanding and the study and teaching of international affairs. Again this year between two and three thousand young people of 16 to 19 years of age attended its four day holiday course at the Central Hall, Westminster.

The speakers included Sir Frank Alexander, the Lord Mayor of London; the Earl of Lytton; Dr. Gilbert Murray; Professor Sir Charles O'Reilly; Sir Arthur Salter; Mr. John Morris, author of *Traveler from Tokio*; Mr. Paul Rotha; and Mr. Herbert Morrison.

The course secured plenty of publicity in the Press. Unluckily some of it was misleading and gave a completely wrong impression. A very short address, lasting about fifteen minutes, was given by Dr. Barbara Simonds, a young war widow. Her husband, Major John Simonds, who was killed at Arnhem, had before the war worked most actively for peace and had spoken on the League of Nations Union platform. His widow spoke of the tasks before us and of the vital necessity of this time building a lasting peace. One paragraph, on the subject of "hate," was reported out of its context and her audience's reactions were misrepresented. What Dr. Simonds actually did was to urge her young hearers not to be afraid to hate evil things, and to fight by word and deed those who were completely opposed to the progress of society. The Conference itself passed a resolution dissociating itself from the sentiments attributed to it by certain sections of the Press, and expressing disapproval of their sensational methods which resulted in distortion of the opinions of speakers and of the reactions of their audiences.

Mr. Herbert Morrison, who heard this frank declaration from the platform, was

plainly delighted with such blunt speaking. When his turn came to address the young people, his advice was:—"Stand on your own feet. Work, study, think!"

In fact, there was no disposition at all for the boys and girls to accept without question everything that was told them by the distinguished speakers. After the lectures, they split up into groups to discuss everything for themselves. Reports from the various groups were read out in the Hall on the final day of the Conference.

Some of the broad conclusions reached may here be summarised, as indicative of what intelligent young people are thinking. They were against a "peace of revenge," as likely to sow the seeds of another war. German re-education was felt to be a problem that the Germans themselves must tackle, under Allied control. Though there was some division of opinion, they were generally in favour of the trial and punishment of war criminals. For the future, it was of the utmost importance that the United Nations should remain united. Lively controversies ensued on the causes of war and ways and means of maintaining full employment. The League, it was decided, failed because it had no backing of armed force behind it. After the war there must be some sort of international force behind the International Authority, and also control of armaments.

And so, after a showing of films on the last day, nearly 3,000 boys and girls returned to their schools all over the country, ready for a new year's work for the study and understanding of international affairs.

L.R.A.

### PUTNEY BRANCH

MR. REGINALD BISHOP  
Editor of RUSSIA TODAY

"WILL RUSSIA UNITE  
FOR PEACE?"

Thursday, March 1, at 7.30 p.m.

59, Putney Hill.



## THE MENACE OF BRETTON WOODS

By E. M. WHITE

The vast majority of men and women desire supremely security to live their peaceful lives with reasonable freedom and opportunity for advancement. Rightly we seek (as at Dumbarton Oaks) means to achieve security from the fear of invasion and enslavement, but we should also face the fact that the unrest which leads to aggression and war has its main cause in economic systems which condemn millions to unemployment, poverty and frustration.

Seeking a better system, and bearing in mind our national endeavour for "full employment in a free society" and our national need for a great expansion of trade, we decide first that international trade should be an exchange of national surpluses for mutual advantage, and not (as at present) a scramble for markets in which success in achieving "a favourable balance" is inevitably at the expense of the other party to the transaction. Next we see that for trade expansion there is need of cheap money (a low bank rate), large credit facilities and the power to control imports and to prohibit dealings in foreign currencies. Reciprocal trading agreements between countries whose economic systems are complementary rather than competitive are highly desirable, such agreements requiring acceptance of payment in each other's currencies.

But the proposals emanating from Bretton Woods not only achieve none of these things but would actually preclude them. They entail a return to the gold standard and an immense restriction of credit; they would mean the end of the Sterling Area which has been the salvation of our trade since we abandoned the gold standard in the disastrous slump of 1931; by their veto upon "discriminatory currency arrangements" they would prevent the reciprocal trading agreements mentioned above; and they provide that when we have discovered our mistake in adopting such a system we shall not be permitted to withdraw from the scheme, the penalty for such a step being complete trade boycott by all the other nations who are in

it—including the members of our own Commonwealth!

Is it surprising that a resolution was put on the Agenda of the recent Council meeting of the Union asking the Government not to ratify anything so dangerous? It is to be regretted that the Council, lacking any helpful lead from the platform, and characteristically timid of pronouncing an opinion upon something cold-shouldered by the Chairman, evaded the issue by the expedient of a "Next business" motion.

The proposals exactly suit America, a creditor nation stuffed with gold. But for the debtor nations (and are not we all now debtors to America?) they would be a stranglehold, involving a terrifying restriction of international trade, vast unemployment in the mainly manufacturing countries and continual international friction.

One must presume that what actuated the British representatives at Bretton Woods to acquiesce in such a scheme was a desire to avoid displeasing America: an "appeasement" policy. Far be it from me to belittle what we owe to America. We owe her more than money; we owe for comradeship aid at our time of direst need. But that is no reason for refusing to face facts and accepting proposals which must inevitably mean ruin not only for this country's foreign trade but also for most of the others. If an economic show-down with America has to come, it had much better come now, when there is good comradeship between us and we are fighting side by side against a common enemy.

If the virus of appeasement has attacked the Union (which certainly in its heyday was never squeamish about informing the Government of its views) I suggest that plain men and women should not shrink from the effort to inform themselves of the implications of this Bretton Woods Agreement\* and then write individually to the Prime Minister and to their M.P.'s and urge the non-ratification of an instrument so menacing to the future peace of the world.

\* *The Economic Reform Club, 25, Haymarket, S.W.1, issues an illuminating pamphlet on the subject.*

## THE POST-WAR TREATMENT OF GERMANY

REPORT BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE\*

In considering the treatment of Germany after the war one overriding consideration should govern our attitude to every proposal, namely, how can a recurrence of German aggression in the future be most effectively prevented? The complete and unconditional disarmament of Germany is, of course, necessary—there are no two opinions about this—but the experience of the last twenty years shows that disarmament is not enough. The problem is not how to disarm a defeated enemy—that is a simple matter—the problem is how to keep that enemy powerless to strike again. This cannot be done by one generation. Whatever conditions are imposed upon a country after its defeat in war, they will be ineffective if that country continues to be an enemy, unless future generations in the victorious countries are willing to continue their enforcement.

There are two ways in which a future German aggression can be prevented:

- (1) The first is that the German people should cease to wish to make war on their neighbours.
- (2) The second is that, so long as the wish to make war remains, successive generations should be willing to enforce the conditions which will make it impossible to gratify the wish.

The first is, of course, the most effective remedy and should be the ultimate aim of any long-term policy, but experience has taught us that it is far too dangerous to rely on, and for immediate action the second alternative is the only possible course.

In considering the measures to be taken with Germany after the war, therefore, we should constantly have in mind what the attitude of successive generations will be towards any action we may consider necessary to deprive Germany of the power to make war in the future. In this connection it is relevant to recall a conversation which Andre Maurois had with Lord Lothian in 1936. In his autobiography, *Call No Man Happy*, M. Maurois records that he met Lord Lothian in London when the re-occupation by Germany of the Rhineland seemed imminent. Lothian asked Maurois what France would do if Hitler marched into the Rhineland. Maurois replied: "I am not in the confidence of the Government, but I hope the French army will not permit it." "And by what right?" said Lothian; "Germany can do what she likes in her own back garden."

This conversation shows that it is not suf-

ficient to make a treaty with or impose conditions upon an enemy unless the conditions are such that a later generation will feel itself morally justified in enforcing them. There is no doubt that those who decreed the demilitarisation of the Rhineland in 1919 contemplated that any attempt by Germany to re-occupy that territory would be resisted by force, yet only fifteen years later France received no support from her Allies in resisting the first threat to her security. In fact the matter which requires special study by those who would prevent another war is not so much the settlement made at the end of the last war, but the reason for the reluctance of those who won that war to use the power which they possessed to enforce the conditions which they had imposed upon their defeated enemy.

In the light of past experience we must realise that reasons of economy will prevent nations that have no aggressive intentions from maintaining large armed forces in peace time for defence, especially if the only potential enemy has been completely disarmed. Other reasons will cause strong popular feeling against a lengthy occupation of enemy territory. These considerations suggest the following measures as the most effective means of preventing future aggression:

- (1) Complete and unconditional disarmament.
- (2) An efficient system of inspection and control to ensure that disarmament is complete.
- (3) When the general occupation is ended, the maintenance of small garrisons in a few key positions.
- (4) The occupation to be shared by as many nations as possible, so as to prevent too heavy a burden falling on any one.
- (5) An effective system of collective security measures.
- (6) The avoidance as far as possible of territorial changes which future generations may not be willing to maintain.
- (7) The establishment of sound and equitable economic conditions, so that it may be possible for nations to live comfortably within their frontiers and to trade freely with their neighbours.
- (8) An efficient international organisation for the ventilation of grievances, the

\* *This Report was presented to the General Council and received general approval.*



## WORLD AFFAIRS IN PARLIAMENT THE POLISH PROBLEM

By OWEN RATTENBURY

Shortly after the discussion on the Address, recorded in last month's HEADWAY, came the Polish debate with another speech by the Prime Minister. It was so important, and moreover the House was for three weeks in recess in the meantime, that it must be described even if the news is somewhat belated.

### "Unknown Quantities"

The whole discussion must have caused many to follow Miss Rathbone's example and "ask a few questions." One was conscious above all of the many "unknown quantities"—unknown certainly to a large proportion of the Members and without doubt to the general public. Was the Polish Government in London in any way representative of the men who fought so gallantly in France and in the Battle of Britain and on other fronts since? That seemed to be the general assumption. But why did the Jews in their company want to remove their allegiance to the British Army? Are there other minorities of the same sort on this side?

Then whom do the Lublin Committee represent? Are they just a few people

*(Continued from page 5)*

rectification of conditions that can be proved to threaten the peace of nations, and the effective co-operation of all nations in the promotion of human welfare.

- (9) The re-establishment as soon as practicable of friendly intercourse and co-operation with Germany in the spheres of science, art, learning and industry, so as both to lessen the feelings of bitterness on both sides and to encourage Germany to place her ambitions in a field where she may justly expect great success, with benefit rather than injury to the rest of the world.

If such conditions can be established and sincerely maintained, the long-term policy of finding a form of world society in which Germany can not only participate but excel without injury to her neighbours, may become realisable in the course of years.

scratched together by the Soviet Government as "safe" men who have agreed to Soviet principles? It seemed, in the debate, to be widely assumed that they were. Then is the position caused by the Katyn accusations still outstanding? Do we want everywhere to stick to boundaries which some say contributed to this war? Do we allow Polish history to be cited for 300 years back while we decide that Russian history must be bounded solely by what has happened since Lenin took control?

### The Prime Minister

The Prime Minister would not assent to all that. He stood by the Curzon Line with slight modifications. That was the arrangement he had made with Stalin and he would stick to it at the Peace Table. But Poland must be a strong and reliable nation, and friendly with Soviet Russia. He advised, as the British Government advised in 1921, that anything beyond the Curzon Line was not in the interests of Poland herself. Still, this would reduce the Poland we had known since its revival after the last war, and she would require compensation. Then she should have East Prussia with 200 miles of Baltic sea coast and the great harbour of Danzig, and certain territories in the West. They would be extremely valuable compensation.

Mr. Churchill regretted that the Poles had not been able to come to some satisfactory agreement with Russia. He regretted the retirement of M. Mikolajczyk in whom he had the greatest faith—that he had not been able to carry the Polish Government with him in his attempts to come to an arrangement.

It was significant that practically every speaker, from whatever angle he spoke, made the same expression of confidence in this leader of the Polish Peasants' Party. It was the one point of unanimity in the debate.

### The Critics

Speeches from Mr. Price and Mr. Mander, which practically backed up the

Prime Minister, started the discussion. The first doubt came from Miss Rathbone, who wanted to know what had happened to the millions of people taken away from their homes by Soviet Russia on two occasions—first, when Russia in agreement with Germany occupied half Poland (saving it perhaps from the same intensive bombing as the rest of Poland received from the Luftwaffe) and afterwards, when the Germans took the whole of Poland and a great part of Russia. Moved great distances and suffering hunger and exposure in Russia and Siberia, what was happening to them now? Ought we not to have some statement from Russia about that?

Captain Alan Graham, from his intimate association with the Poles in London, is naturally regarded as the voice most likely to express their point of view. His speech was much more moderate in tone than I had expected. True, he made the full claims for Poland who, he said, had contributed much to European civilisation. The Russian demands he summarised as the taking of half Poland's territory and her government by the Lublin Committee—an utterly unrepresentative body of Poles provided by Russia, whose power and authority rested solely on Russia, the child of the OGPU and Russian bayonets. The surrender had to be made without any guarantee of Polish independence. The United States Government had refused to guarantee Poland; Mr. Churchill had given some verbal assurances and so had Mr. Stalin, but the latter had made other statements that had not been implemented. There was no moral justification for such demands on Poland, our martyred ally who had given us such indispensable aid at the time of the Battle of Britain, and was the first power to fight against Nazi Germany. We were bound by Article 3 of our guarantee of 1939 to Poland to support her not only against armed aggression but against any attempt "to undermine Polish independence by processes of economic penetration or in any other way." Five million Poles, he added, had died in the struggle against Germany—one-seventh of the population.

The time, continued Mr. Graham, had come when we should say to "our great ally, Russia, of whose many services we are abundantly conscious, that she must treat Poland as what she is—a civilised,

Christian, European nation, and not as if she was a paltry Asiatic tribe of Uzbeks or Tajiks." That was frank, at any rate, whatever one may think of a Christian discrimination in treatment between one set of people and another on the ground of size or continental origin.

A violently anti-Russian speech came from a surprising quarter—Mr. Ivor Thomas, the Labour member for Keighley; a supporting speech, as moderate as Captain Graham's, from Major Petherick, which backed up Captain Graham's point of view; a fairly extreme anti-Polish speech from Mr. Mack, who, however, did useful service in pointing out that the break between the London Polish Government and the U.S.S.R. had arisen out of the terrible accusation made by the former with regard to the Katyn massacres, which appeared in fact to have been perpetrated by the Germans.

Mr. Pethick-Lawrence defended the policy of driving Germans out of East Prussia, pointing out the way in which the Germans themselves had transferred whole populations from the countries which they had occupied, but pleading that no solution that was not effected by consent could be lasting.

### Mr. Eden's Reply

Mr. Eden said that we had not only esteem but affection for our Polish allies, their gallantry and their sufferings. We had fought also on the same side as Russia in three wars. Since 1941 we had laboured unceasingly to try to solve Soviet-Polish differences. The prospects now were not so good as when M. Mikolajczyk was Premier. But there had never been any suggestion from Russia that our relations with Poland should be affected by their dispute. In fact, he had expressed the view to M. Mikolajczyk that American, French and British associations with Poland should be continued and if possible be strengthened. Mr. Eden then went into the history of the Curzon Line. We had told the Polish Government in 1920 that the Curzon Line would leave her ethnographical frontier unimpaired, and we urged the Poles not to refuse those terms. The chances of any agreement now seemed very bleak, but they would go on trying.

So there the matter hangs in the air.



## BROADCASTING AND EDUCATION FOR PEACE

By A. E. SOUTH

*(The place of Broadcasting in Education for World Citizenship is a large and controversial subject. HEADWAY, whilst not necessarily identifying itself with the views in the following article, hopes that they will stimulate discussion.)*

It cannot be questioned that the war has revealed to the average man the pitifully inadequate nature of his education. With each successive military operation he has been brought in contact with countries, races, cities and governments that hitherto he was almost wholly ignorant of. And even now many of us mouth place-names that are topical, but meaningless to us in a geographical and historical sense.

Moreover, men like Lord Vansittart have formulated theories that only those with some knowledge of history can adequately judge. How can the average man whose education at the elementary school terminated in a historical sense with Queen Elizabeth and the late sixteenth century, fully understand problems like those of East Prussia, Poland and Germany—problems on which even the experts disagree? Yet the creation of the new Europe cannot be left entirely to experts. If the present war has taught us anything, it has taught us that the democrat must accept the responsibility of freedom, that he must take an active interest in government or see freedom die.

There is another facet to this problem of education. Vast numbers of men and women have had their education interrupted owing to the exigencies of the war, and when they return to civilian life, they will require the blank spaces filling in.

For those who require specialised knowledge there are universities, training colleges, organisations like the W.E.A., night schools, correspondence courses, and so on. The bulk, however, will immediately be faced with the task of obtaining work, and in any case, will wish to relax, to forget the strain, terror and ennui of war in home life, and will shelve the less urgent matter of education. How can these people be reached? This is an important matter, for on them the future rests. If they repeat history, if they fall into the cynicism and complacency that charac-

terised the 'twenties, then their children may pay for their mistakes, as they have paid for those of their parents.

Once the Englishman's home was his castle, and only friends and relatives came into it. Now is not the occasion to challenge this view of the home, except to say that those who make their homes castles are either stupid or afraid, for outside there is always the teeming wonder and excitement of life, and the wise man keeps his door open and lets some of it in. In any case, so few homes are castles nowadays. In almost every home every day strange voices are speaking and singing. The housewife switches on the wireless, and lets in the world. And it is by the wireless the great blanks in our knowledge of the world can be filled in post-war years.

So far the B.B.C. has not actively or imaginatively approached the problem of education. There have been many talks on science, economics, foreign policy and religion, interesting enough in themselves, but unrelated to any general plan. Too often such talks are opinionated, and therefore without genuine value. For there are two views of education. One would appear to be the totalitarian view, which is to present people with an already formed opinion, backed by the appropriate authorities—scientific, religious, political; the other would appear to be the democratic view, which is to give people the means by which to form opinions of their own.

In saying that so far the B.B.C. has given little thought to the uses of the wireless as an instrument of education, no criticism is intended of the Brains Trust, which is stimulating and amusing, an aperitif to thought, or of the many series of talks launched under high-sounding names, which are usually inconclusive, delivered by men with strongly divergent viewpoints, and ending in no genuine synthesis. All that need be said is that none of these is educational.

In post-war years it will be of overriding importance that the ordinary Briton should have a rudimentary knowledge of European history. Let the idea be repudiated immediately that ordinary people are not interested in history. This is untrue. The country is crowded with people mourning (a) that they have forgotten; (b) that the British history taught to them in elementary schools was as valueless in a historical sense as the skit "1066 and All That," and without its redeeming quality of wit. Many historical films and historical novels are successful, not because of their stories, but because of their background, because people have a nostalgia for the past.

This nostalgia is good. People should be encouraged to look back at the past—not only, however, at the good, but at the bad. It is a sound corrective to pessimism to know what the past actually meant to the common man. To return to the problem of Poland, all the ordinary man is presented with is a series of opinions, which he is incapable of judging, and which he accepts or rejects by rote or label. Would it not be more helpful to give him objectively an account of Poland's grim past—her agonies between the pincers of Russia and Germany—so that his judgment should not be blind? For so much hangs on the judgment of the ordinary Briton in the years immediately ahead of us. He must be made to understand that the problem of Europe is not primarily the headache of Mr. Eden or Mr. Churchill or Lord Vansittart, but his headache.

How should the B.B.C. deal with history and its concomitant—geography—in post-war years? Certainly not as it teaches British history to children in schools broadcasts—in watery playlets—nor as it gives write-ups of Allied countries to adults, with much music, an uplifting script, a number of narrators, including the "Square Four" gentleman who officiates at football matches in peace-time. Rather it should give a body of talks embracing the whole of European history that would dovetail one into another, forming part of a coherent plan, and continue for at least twelve months. These should be given as far as possible by natives of the countries concerned, and the test of them should be their factual accuracy, their presentation. They should be supported by talks on the geography of Europe, by performances of European plays, by talks on contemporary

European crises, by talks in themselves frivolous yet calculated to make us understand the peoples of Europe better, e.g., "A Russian considers the British public school," or "A Frenchwoman considers British cooking," and, as ever, by broadcasts of European music. Afterwards, of course, the scope of such broadcasts would extend much further, into Asia and Africa, but first we must learn to be good Continentals; that is, if the British contribution to the rehabilitation of Europe is to be worthy of us as a people.

There are, of course, many other aspects of this matter of education through the wireless. It is necessary for the adult democrat to have an adequate knowledge of economics, of local, national and imperial government, and of national and imperial industries and geography. But again the necessity is for a comprehensive plan. Recently there was a talk on "Nationalisation" over the air. It took up exactly five minutes. How exactly this knotty word could be defined in so short a period of time, and how listeners could derive satisfaction from so tabloid a talk, it is difficult to say. Educational activities should be attempted adequately through the wireless or not at all. It would help in good citizenship if broadcasts were given of important parliamentary debates, and typical council proceedings. The great merit of the wireless is that it can be anywhere, and reach anywhere. No longer should half the world not know how the other half is living. And if those in control of the B.B.C. realised the powers at their disposal they would surely not be content, as now, merely to proceed along old familiar channels.

All this is said in full realisation of the fact that the bulk of people after the war will desire, first and foremost, to be entertained. But there were two wave-lengths before the war serving this country. Why should there not be three wave-lengths in post-war years? It would then be possible for two wave-lengths to enable the people to have their fill of entertainment, and for this additional wave-length to enable them to complete the blank spaces in their knowledge, to become good citizens of their country, and vital components in the libertarian Europe to come.

Thus the B.B.C. would satisfy all needs, and become an adequate instrument of democracy.



## UP AND DOWN THE COUNTRY

THE LONDON REGIONAL FEDERATION found it amazingly gratifying that neither intense cold nor a blinding snowstorm prevented the usual large audience from turning up at the January buffet luncheon, to hear Sir Arthur Salter, M.P., speak on "UNRRA and Relief in Europe." He showed that the great work undertaken by UNRRA had been frustrated by political complications in liberated countries. The problem had been better handled after the last war, but the scale had then been vastly smaller and there had been no question of liberation proceeding simultaneously with continued and bitter fighting. In Greece a civilian body such as UNRRA had to fit itself in under military conditions. There was vast displacement of populations, and UNRRA was seeking to solve the problem of resettlement and repatriation.

At the next L.R.F. buffet luncheon—on Tuesday, February 13, in the Lounge of the Y.W.C.A., Great Russell Street—Mr. J. J. der van Laan will speak on "Holland's Present Position and Future Hopes."

When Sir Ralph Wedgwood visited RUGBY to address the Branch on the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, he readily agreed to give another midnight talk on the same subject to some 500 night shift workers.

"Things Worth Fighting For" was the subject of a Brains Trust at Cheltenham College, organised by our CHELTENHAM BRANCH. The members were the Rev. H. Clarkson, Mr. A. G. Elliot-Smith (Headmaster of Cheltenham), Canon J. B. Goodliffe (Rector of Cheltenham), Alderman D. L. Lipson (the Borough Member), Miss Picton-Turbervill, and Mr. A. G. Dye (Question Master). An audience of 400 yielded a collection of over £10 and some new members. Mr. Dye, the Branch Secretary, writes of the good time that he had while addressing the young engineers at a local factory.

The Freshwater Memorial Fund benefited as a result of the Brains Trust organised by the BATHGATE BRANCH. Even more successful than last year, the meeting attracted an audience of 400. The team consisted of Sheriff Sir George Morton, Mr. C. G. Hawkins, Mr. H. Walker Russell

and Dr. L. E. Ryall (all of the East of Scotland District Organisation Committee) together with Dr. Ranyard West, of Edinburgh University, and Dr. H. J. L. Robbie, Rector of Bathgate Academy. Mr. R. A. Robertson, Branch Chairman, acted as Question Master.

The treatment of Germany after the war aroused much interest at the BROMLEY BRANCH'S Brains Trust at the Public Library. Some interesting views were heard from Mme. Lewin (a Frenchwoman), Miss Freda White, Mr. S. L. Hourmouziou (Greece), and Dr. S. F. Osiakowski (a Russian). Mr. Leighton L. Irwin was Question Master, and Councillor A. J. Howe wound up with a speech stressing that, unless the new international organisation received support from people of good will in all countries, it would fail.

LEAMINGTON BRANCH reports that its paid-up membership is 415—the highest since 1939. Of this number 54 are new members.

HARROW BRANCH, up to the end of December, had collected 806 subscriptions, and expects to get about 30 more when people away or out can be contacted.

A party of American officers led by Captain Maurice Bennis and Miss Elsie Davies of the American Red Cross recently gave short talks to the GREEN LANE, COVENTRY, BRANCH on "American Points of View." All were in favour of an international authority with teeth.

### TOWARDS WORLD RECOVERY

The work of U.N.R.R.A., the I.L.O., the Dumbarton Oaks Conference, etc.

HENRY CARTER, C.B.E.

Foreword by THE EARL OF PERTH

2s. 6d. (Postage 3d.)

### THE ROAD TO SECURITY

DAVID MITRANY

4d. (Postage 1d.)

NATIONAL PEACE COUNCIL  
144 Southampton Row, London, W.C.1.

## IT CAN BE DONE

Within the London area three Branches have recently demonstrated that a good deal can be accomplished even during this difficult period of war. One Secretary drew attention to Lord Lytton's appeal for members. A lady on his Committee volunteered to fix a target of ten new members within the month. These she secured so easily and quickly that she raised her own target figure and reached it within the original period set.

A volunteer in another Branch offered to canvass one road. She enrolled 13 new members. A lucky number surely for the hard-working Secretary who has by personal effort maintained a pre-war membership of close on 400!

Another Branch thought it would try out the suggestion to approach organisations existing in and round its area and see if they would allow L.N.U. speakers to address their meetings. Since the beginning of last year, and in spite of the difficulties of the flying-bomb period, this enterprising Secretary has been responsible for arranging over 100 such meetings!

Such encouraging experiences would seem to suggest that there is greater readiness among the public to co-operate with the Union than is generally realised, and that where Secretaries and other workers show courage and initiative, their efforts have met with a surprising degree of success.

## SCOTLAND

There are encouraging signs that the period of war difficulty is passing. Branches which managed to maintain their activities throughout are now showing progress both in membership and in public interest at their meetings. It is a well-earned reward for devoted service under difficulties.

The revival of other Branches, which had suspended activity, is also a feature of recent months. Without a strong Glasgow Branch for example there can be no complete L.N.U. work in Scotland and the progress made there is most gratifying despite the fact that all the workers are heavily engaged in other duties. Before substantial progress can be made, however, in so densely a populated area an office is essential, and that is the major deficiency at the moment. A great effort is needed to recapture the second city in the Empire, for the L.N.U.

The Scottish National Council has been restarted with some difficulty as it also is needed for consolidating the work and for liaison with other similar bodies.

In the East the actual losses have never been so heavy and several stalwart Branches have had a good year. Outstanding features have been the visits of the Dean of Chichester, Professor Paton and Professor Newell. The last named gave a series of lectures to crowded audiences in Edinburgh and elsewhere.

The Brains Trust has also been in great

demand. At its last appearance at Bathgate it included two Knights, three Doctors of various distinctions and the President of Rotary for Scotland. It is always willing to visit Branches and has travelled to Perth and Blairgowrie amongst other engagements.

Another new development has been the establishment of a School Citizenship Association in Edinburgh which held amongst other activities a "Target for Tomorrow" week in the Assembly Halls of the Church of Scotland. This was widely attended from both Scotland and England and great credit is due to the work of its Committee in securing speakers and hospitality. Their work is now extending to Paisley and should soon spread elsewhere.

The amount of work possible in 1945 is immense but much of it must be left undone unless adequate funds are available and old friends resume their former activity. The tide has turned. Why not make it a flood?

## TO LORD CECIL

I express my warmest thanks to you and to the League of Nations Union in Council Assembled for your congratulations on my birthday and for the terms of honour in which you have conveyed them to me.

WINSTON CHURCHILL.



## “WILSON”

By HUGH WALKER

At midsummer stories were crossing the Atlantic to tell of a film called “Wilson” which was then enjoying two novel bits of publicity—the hisses of the isolationists and a Forces ban for fear it should swing the soldier vote to Roosevelt. Our hopes were raised, those of us who had believed so much in Wilson’s League. All autumn one poster in every ten it seemed was telling the great metropolitan public that here was “the most important event in fifty years of motion picture entertainment.” Our hopes were dashed, for we’d heard that one before.

Now that this long film—running to nearly three hours—has reached the screen of the Odeon, Leicester Square, what is the verdict? Right away it scores high marks for the sincere and painstaking way it sets out to tell the story of President Woodrow Wilson and to point the moral of his rejection. The mere choice of such a theme was a piece of commercial courage by 20th Century Fox, the producing company, and if they had made a less worthy film they would have deserved the good will of L.N.U. members on that count alone. Now that a pretty good picture has emerged, those who are reading this must make up their minds to see it for themselves and drag their friends along, too. That is the only good will which registers with Wardour Street and which in the long run leads to better films.

Biography, if it has any veracity at all, has a ready-made story; the art of the business is in the selection and in the emphasis, and here, before seeing the picture, one imagined the worst. Would the screen Wilson have shed politics for glamour? Well, he hasn’t, and a really fine figure emerges, superbly conveyed through the acting of Alexander Knox. A bit larger than life probably—a twentieth century Lincoln with the odds on Wilson if comparisons were pressed; a natural, but a shade too heavy, emphasis on the happy domestic bits (“Problems confront him, but he still finds time to be a husband and father,” as one of the handsome publicity brochures puts it); a rush through the peace negotiations so that their history becomes a bit tenuous; and no very clear explanation of why this good and practical man (such is the portrait) should in 1920 have missed it so entirely with the Senate and citizens of the United States. These seemed to me the principal defects in the department of selection and emphasis, but they do not seriously weaken the general impact of the picture.

The film opens in 1909 at Princeton, of which university Dr. Woodrow Wilson has been President for seven years. His role has

been a reforming one and he has his enemies. But his political writing and speaking have won him something of a national reputation and in 1910 he is offered the democratic ticket for Governor of New Jersey. Miraculously to the British cinemagoer he emerges, intact as a man and successful as a candidate, from an electioneering campaign of noise and gesture which clearly descends from some primitive rite!

Regardless of the political bosses Wilson fulfils his liberal election pledges, and in 1912, via another and even rowdier Convention, he becomes the Democratic Presidential Candidate. Popular response to his moral appeal, plus divisions in the Republican ranks, make Wilson, his first wife, and their three children, the new occupants of the White House. Here the technicolour cameras digress to show what really authentic scene building can do and the result is certainly impressive. The colour is beautifully handled and one experiences the sense of being personally transported into the presidential home. Domestic tragedy comes to Wilson in 1914 by the death of Ellen, his wife during thirty years. The part is well and sympathetically played by Ruth Nelson, and given such a wife one can see how Wilson’s qualities of mind and character were able to ripen in the way they did. The popular vote, which likes its heroines handsome, may go, however, to Mrs. Wilson II (played by Geraldine Fitzgerald), for she certainly brings beauty to the screen.

Black crepe still decorates the front door of the White House after the funeral of Ellen Wilson when news comes of the Lusitania sinking. From this point, reached a little more than halfway through the film, interest quickens for those who want a world rather than a national slant on President Wilson. Over the issue of “war” or “no war,” country and Cabinet are divided, but military preparations begin.

In 1916 a small majority votes Wilson a second term, and when the Kaiser orders a resumption of submarine warfare he asks Congress to declare war on Germany. To recall some of the high spots of American participation in World War I, an interesting device of “flashback” is employed. The audience is seen inside the cinema on to whose screen are thrown actual newsreel shots taken in ’17 and ’18. This, of course, is not new—I think it was more cunningly done in “Thunder Rock”—but the transition from colour to black-and-white and back again makes it rather interesting.

From here to the end of the film we are listeners to words of the greatest power and

logic. Whether it be to “doughboys” in a Red Cross Club, to Congress when he presents his Fourteen Points, to Allied statesmen at the Peace Conference, or to his own countrymen during a lightning tour of the States, Wilson is preaching the great cause of the League of Nations. These speeches are magnificent, both in the substance and in the utterance.

People of L.N.U. interests are likely to grumble at the sketchy treatment of the peace negotiations and to the reduction in stature suffered by Clemenceau, Lloyd George (badly made up and with only one line to say) and Orlando. But the villain of the day is not cut down, and Sir Cedric Hardwicke, playing the part of Senator Lodge, turns him into a sinister figure indeed.

The end is tragedy—the Senate refuses by

57 votes to 37 (a two-thirds majority being necessary) to ratify the Treaty and so bring the United States into the League, and in 1920 the democratic candidate is decisively beaten by Harding. On March 4th, 1921, at a few seconds before noon, Woodrow Wilson, now an invalid, goes through the formality of leaving office. Passing through a group of Senators and Congressmen, headed by Lodge, he turns to them. “The President has nothing further to communicate,” he says. With twenty odd years of twilight and darkness to inform him, he who hears those words to-day knows better.

“Wilson” is to be generally released into suburban and provincial cinemas on and after March 19. Ask your local manager if he is showing it.)

## FRESHWATER MEMORIAL FUND

Most notable of recent contributions to the Freshwater Memorial Fund is a grant of £75 from the Boeke Trust, “to provide a travelling Scholarship for one year to enable a member to take part in an International Congress.” This grant has been made on the recommendation of our Bournville Works Branch, which in this matter has again shown its enterprise. Another donation comes from Brisbane—the Queensland Branch of the Australian L.N.U.

	£	s.	d.		£	s.	d.
Altrincham	5	0	0	Ilkley	1	0	0
Bathgate	5	0	0	Leamington	15	0	0
Boeke Trust	75	0	0	Moseley	5	0	0
Bournville				New Milton	1	1	0
Town	10	0	0	Ottery St.			
Brisbane	3	3	0	Mary	13	0	
Campton	1	0		Romford	2	6	6
Clifton	10	0		Southbourne	7	3	
Colne	2	2	0	Warwickshire			
Edinburgh	1	3	6	F.C.	2	2	9
Hartford	5	5	0	Yeadon	5	0	
<b>Grand Total (to Jan. 24):</b>	<b>£1,730</b>	<b>3s.</b>	<b>10d.</b>				

## DIARY OF EVENTS

Jan.

3. 79th Congress of U.S. Assembles.
5. Russia Recognises Lublin Committee as Polish Government.
6. President Roosevelt’s Message to Congress.
8. Joint Maritime Commission of I.L.O. (London).
9. American Landing on Luzon.
10. Increased U-Boat Activity Reported. Signs of German Evacuation in Ardennes Salient.
11. Great Russian Offensives Begin.
12. “Cease Fire” Agreement in Greece.
17. Russians Capture Warsaw.
18. Prime Minister’s Review of War and Greek Situation.
19. Heavy German Attacks in Alsace. Red Army reaches Silesia.
20. President Roosevelt’s Inaugural Address. United Nations’ Armistice with Hungary.
21. Red Army Enters East Prussia.
25. Governing Body of I.L.O. (London).

## A SIMPLE ACCOUNT OF DUMBARTON OAKS

with a

### DISCUSSION THEREON

in the form of an Imaginary Conversation.

An attractive covered Vest Pocket Booklet, printed in clear 10 point type. Price 2d. each. A discount of 20% for orders of £1 and upwards.

Obtainable from:—L. N. U., 36, Carpenter Road, Birmingham 15.



## FROM HEADWAY'S POST-BAG

## The Problem of Power

SIR,—The new World Organisation proposed at Dumbarton Oaks will only prove effective, as Marshal Stalin has warned us, if the great Powers continue to act in a spirit of unity and concord in the future. The same weakness was apparent in the League and led to delay and inaction in a crisis. Can we not create an organisation that will stand a reasonable chance of being effective, even if one of the big Powers was not in perfect accord, e.g., was half-hearted about enforcing economic or military sanctions against an aggressor?

There is surely only one system that can overcome the difficulty. It is for all Powers, great or small, to agree in advance to accept the decision of the Security Council, which must have under its immediate control adequate armed force to enforce its decisions and prevent aggression.

This problem of power, as Field Marshal Smuts has called it, has not been faced by the L.N.U. and is still left to a loose arrangement. The London International Assembly has boldly expressed the opinion that "if the World Organisation is to discharge its responsibilities effectively, it should have an International Force at its disposal, maintained out of international funds."

The Dumbarton Oaks plan provides for national contingents of armed forces, especially air forces, to be earmarked for combined action in a crisis under a Military Staff Committee. This can only be regarded as a first step in the right direction towards the creation of a permanent International General Staff and an International Police Force, which alone can make International Law effective. I agree entirely with the late Lord Davies, who warned us that quotas or contingents from national forces could not be relied upon to be forthcoming in a crisis. National sovereign states will find excuses for absenting themselves and, like Article 16 of the Covenant, their promises of support will become a dead letter. A promise is not the same as a fact; the promise to use contingents is not so effective as the existence of an International Force.

The difficulty, I am told, is that neither America nor Russia will agree with such a proposal. I have not seen adequate evidence that this is so and doubt whether it is true; but, in any case, if it is the right and honourable solution to the great problem of the twentieth century, let Britain propose it. It is true that Britain recently went to Chicago with far-sighted proposals for world control of civil aviation, which America rejected: yet there is an overwhelmingly strong case for world control of all air power, both civil and military, in the interest of world peace and security.

But it is inequitable for Britain to press for world control of civil aviation (where the American aircraft industry is in a fortunate position to command a big lead) if Britain is still reluctant to accept the necessity for world control of all military aviation and the creation of an International Air Force. There is a stronger case for world control of military aviation.

R. FULLJAMES, Group Captain.

## Justice and Peace

SIR,—How odd to see the letter of your correspondent who deplores the criticism of the National Peace Council by HEADWAY! In the days of "appeasement" the L.N.U. was bitterly attacked by pacifist societies; I well remember a poster with the caption "A League Bomb Will Kill You As Dead As A German One," and the reproach "Collective In-security," too. Prominent Pacifists supported the appeasement candidate at Oxford, against A. D. Lindsay, who championed The League of Nations.

Also the L.N.U. is not a peace society. We stand for justice, and we know that, if we maintain justice, peace will be added unto us.

CICELY M. HOWELLS.

Liverpool, 23.

## Cart and Horse

SIR,—Your November editorial's cart and horse simile set me pondering. Is it not a fact that the choice of delegates to the League at Geneva was influenced by the candidate's knowledge of English and French (subjects quite extraneous to the matters to be discussed)? And that the bilingual procedure of the League effectively barred debate such as takes place at Westminster? Would not the people take more interest in a body whose proceedings were in a language they could understand?

It seems to me that whoever has the horse should see that it is well shod with the horse-shoe of a single language for international use, essential to the avoidance of lameness again.

C. M. CATHER, Lieut. (S.), R.N.V.R.  
Alexandria.

## LAMBETH

During 1944 LAMBETH BRANCH provided L.N.U. speakers for 130 meetings. Can any Branch beat this achievement? The Branch has virtually doubled its membership in the past three years.

## ON BEHALF OF POWER

By GORDON DROMORE

To-day when phrases like "power-politics," "spheres of influence," "regional arrangements," fly about like catchwords, or form a handy criticism—no distinction being made between their use or abuse—of anyone who is not a "perfectionist" about post-war settlements, it may do us good to take a dose of Mr. Walter Lippmann's head-clearing tonic, "UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY."\* We shall not agree with all that he says, but his book is full of thought-promoting vitamins.

Briefly, Mr. Lippmann analyses "power," and puts forward an urgent plea not to dissolve or to ignore working relationships between countries which have been truly tested by time, nor once again to jump to the conclusion that the universal association which we all hope to build up will or can entirely take their place.

The chief witness is America. What on earth forced her twice in thirty years into a war that she loathed? The answer is power and the genuine national interest: or in other words the emergence of a conquering empire first in one and then in both of the two great basins of the Atlantic and the Pacific. Twice Western Europe was unable to repel the attack, without help from America. And America could not help helping. And the lesson? It is as convincing as an earthquake and that for purposes of security and defence, Western Europe, North and South Americas are one inseparable strategic system.

What does Mr. Lippmann propose to do about it? His solution lies in a system of regional strategic grouping of national states, based on the governing principle that the foreign relations of every state should be definitely fixed, and not suddenly alterable.

By a natural transition from war conditions, the post-war world could be formed into four regional groupings or orbits. First, there would be the Atlantic Community, a loose title but covering a tight consolidation of all the strategic and diplomatic connections already existing

and working with a basic harmony, between the Americas, the British Commonwealth, France and her empire, Belgium and Holland and theirs, Luxemburg, Norway, Denmark, Iceland, Portugal, Spain, Italy, Greece, Eire and Sweden. To the east would lie the Russian Orbit, including states east of Germany and west of Russia, with collaboration in a general world organisation (Russia of the scorched earth will need help to rebuild as much as any occupied country) dependent on maintaining at home those broad democratic liberties which they wish to see abroad. A third orbit would be China and the strategic system centring round her, i.e., East Asia, bounded by Russia and India. Co-operative help would have to be given China to hasten her unity by Russia, the U.S.A., and, though Mr. Lippmann forgets this, Great Britain. Lastly, and in due time a fourth regional orbit would emerge, based on the Moslem and Hindu nations of N. Africa, the Middle East and South Asia.

This regional system offers tangible advantages. It secures the vital interests, from the point of view of maintaining peace and preventing a third world war, of the states who are capable of waging war (both Germany and Japan will be completely demilitarised). It is a definite order of power among national states, as they exist round us in this world of to-day. It requires them to fix and stabilise their foreign policy with their neighbours, within the same strategic system. They do not surrender their sovereignty, but they do reform their old vices of vacillation and arbitrary diplomatic manoeuvres.

Real values here are fundamentally the same as in 1919, but the order and the emphasis are different. Reliance first on national armed force, then on natural allies, then on a general world organisation. The last is, as yet, no substitute for the first.

Mr. Lippmann never loses sight of the General Organisation. But he does not see it becoming in the near future the guardian of the world's peace. It cannot be relied on as yet. President Wilson, he believes, made mistakes from which we suffer to-

\*Published by Hamish Hamilton. 6s.



day. He never defined the difference between self-determination and the right of secession. He prohibited nations, while organising peace, from using the instruments of national and international action. He thought that the League could and would replace the ordinary instruments of international life. In fact Gen. Smuts's words should be reversed. It was Wilson and not humanity who failed at Paris.

Responsibility for order—and if there is no order there can be no peace worth having—must rest with the victorious governments. The true, and immensely important function of any kind of universal society is to facilitate intercourse and co-operation between nations *already at peace*. In this field the League did quite excellent work and should be expanded after this war, maintaining standards and carrying out reforms, concerning itself with individual rather than national security. The General Organisation, the fact is, must concentrate on cultivating the arts of peace. War can only be prevented by the proper organisation of power. But collaboration, co-operation can become a habit by actual practice and more practice. *By Regional grouping we can fix the responsibility for preventing war where alone responsibility can be discharged*—on the governments of the Great Powers and the neighbours with whom they are allied.

And where is Germany *dans cette galère*? Whatever happens Germany must never again be permitted to hold the balance of power in Europe. Prevention of this, prevention of Germany's re-arming, is simply the price of peace. This

remains true, whether a critical time arises some 15 or 20 years hence, when war memories grow dim. And, as Mr. Lippmann points out, in any case by that time Russia alone should be fully the technical equal of Germany, while vastly superior in man power. Germany will be occupied and entirely demilitarised. But it is nonsense to think she can be isolated permanently. There must be an outlet for her superfluous energy, an assured economic future. Yet the problem is difficult. For German expansion in Europe has always meant German militarism and Pan-German domination. And a Federal Europe would inevitably have the old hard German core, the very thing we have gone to war to end. Are there not wiser alternatives? Mr. Lippmann believes such a one would be to make Germany much more dependent on maritime commerce, with a highly important part of her working population manufacturing for non-European markets in payment for imports.

Post-war events, quite probably, may not work out all on Mr. Lippmann's lines. But his book is of high value because, in the last resort, he throws down a challenge of homely fact, that families, homes, countries, flags not charters, blue prints and generalities are what men live for and will, if necessary, die for. Wherefore a universal society is not to be accepted as a substitute for properly planned armed force, solid frontiers, strategic position alliances among natural allies. Now how far is this true, to-day or to-morrow? How far is it the operative principle beneath Dumbarton Oaks?

## MAIN CONTENTS

	PAGE
Editorial : Still in Battledress - - - - -	1
I.L.O. "Fully Alive." Says Mr. Phelan (Acting Director) - - - - -	2
"To-morrow's Citizens" - - - - -	3
The Menace of Bretton Woods. By E. M. White - - - - -	4
The Post-War Treatment of Germany. Executive Committee - - - - -	5
Parliament : The Polish Problem. By Owen Rattenbury - - - - -	6
Broadcasting and World Peace. By A. E. South - - - - -	8
Up and Down the Country - - - - -	10
"Wilson." By Hugh Walker - - - - -	12
On Behalf of Power. By Gordon Dromore - - - - -	15